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HIGHLIGHTS OF THE REPORT

Introduction

The year 2002 will be the twenty-fifth year of operation for the Yale-New Haven Teachers Institute. During that year we expect to mark the twenty-fifth anniversary with one or more events that are intended to increase the visibility of the Institute and encourage further financial support. From its beginning in 1978, the overall purpose of the Yale-New Haven Teachers Institute has been to strengthen teaching and learning in local schools and, by example, in schools across the country. New Haven represents a microcosm of urban public education in this country. More than 60 percent of its public school students come from families receiving public assistance and 85 percent are either African-American or Hispanic.

The Institute places equal emphasis on teachers' increasing their knowledge of a subject and on their developing teaching strategies that will be effective with their students. At the core of the program is a series of seminars on subjects in the humanities and the sciences. Topics are suggested by the teachers based on what they think could enrich their classroom instruction. In the seminars, Yale faculty contribute their knowledge of a subject, while the New
Teachers are treated as colleagues throughout the seminar process. Unlike conventional university or professional development courses, Institute seminars involve at their very center an exchange of ideas among teachers and Yale faculty members. This is noteworthy since the teachers admitted to seminars are not a highly selective group, but rather a cross-section of teachers in the system, most of whom, like their urban counterparts across the country, did not major in one or more of the subjects they teach. The Institute’s approach assumes that urban public school teachers can engage in serious study of the field and can devise appropriate and effective curricula based on this study.

Through 2001, the Yale-New Haven Teachers Institute has offered 149 seminars to 515 individual teachers, many of whom have participated for more than one year. The seminars, meeting over a five-month period, combine the reading and discussion of selected texts with the writing of the curriculum units. Thus far, the teachers have created 1348 curriculum units. Over the years, a total of 77 Yale faculty members have participated in the Institute by giving one or more seminars. Fifty-two of them have also given talks. Thirty-eight other Yale faculty members have also given talks. At this date about half of these 115 participants are current or recently retired members of the faculty.

The Institute’s twentieth year, 1997, had brought to a climax a period of intensive development of the local program. That had included placing all Institute resources on-line, providing computer assistance to the Fellows, correlating Institute-developed curriculum units with new school-district academic standards, establishing Institute Centers for Curriculum and Professional Development in the schools, and establishing summer Academies for New Haven students. In that year, while continuing to deepen its work in New Haven, the Institute began a major effort to demonstrate the efficacy of its approach in other cities across the country.

This effort involved in 1998 the planning stage of a National Demonstration Project, supported by the DeWitt Wallace-Reader’s Digest Fund (now the Wallace-Reader’s Digest Funds). In 1999 partnerships were established between colleges or universities and school districts at four sites that planned to adapt the Institute’s approach to local needs and resources. Implementation grants were awarded to four new Teachers Institutes—in Pittsburgh (Chatham College and Carnegie Mellon University), Houston (University of Houston), Albuquerque (University of New Mexico), and Santa Ana (University of California at Irvine). These grants enabled them to work
with the Yale-New Haven Teachers Institute for a period of three years, from 1999 through 2001. It now appears that all four of the new Teachers Institutes will be able to continue in some form after the current Grant. The Yale-New Haven Teachers Institute will continue to work with those Institutes that elect to join the next phase of its continuing National Initiative, a longer-term process of expansion that will enable the establishment of yet other Teachers Institutes across the country.

The two major sections of this report therefore describe the two complementary areas of activity undertaken by the Yale-New Haven Teachers Institute.

The Program in New Haven

This section of the report covers the offerings, organization, and operation of the Institute's 2001 program for the New Haven teachers who participated as Fellows. It draws extensively upon the evaluations written by Fellows and seminar leaders at the conclusion of their participation.

The report here documents the sustaining of teacher interest in Institute seminars at the higher level recently achieved, as well as the content of the seminars that have been offered, the application and admissions process, the participants' experience in the program, and the preparation for 2002. With respect to long-range planning and program development, it describes the continuing progress in establishing Institute Centers for Curriculum and Professional Development in the schools, placing more Institute resources online, and providing computer assistance to the Fellows. It sets forth the structure and activities of the local advisory groups; and it outlines the process of local documentation and evaluation.

We hope that this section of the report will be of interest to all those who assist in supporting, maintaining, and expanding the program in New Haven. We also hope that its account of our local procedures may continue to prove useful to those who have established new Teachers Institutes in Pittsburgh, Houston, Albuquerque, and UCI-Santa Ana, and useful also to those at other sites who are contemplating the establishment of such Institutes.

National Advisory Committee

The account of the National Advisory Committee occupies a hinge position in this report because this Committee serves in an advisory capacity for both the program in New Haven and the National Demonstration Project.

The National Demonstration Project

This section of the report covers the fourth and final year to be devoted to the National Demonstration Project supported by the DeWitt Wallace-Reader’s
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Digest Fund (now the Wallace-Reader’s Digest Funds). It begins by describing the roles played by the Yale-New Haven Teachers Institute in this Project. It then describes the third year of common work in which all five of the Teachers Institutes have engaged. It draws upon evaluations written by school teachers, university faculty, and directors from the four new Teachers Institutes who participated in the Directors’ Meeting in March (held in New York) and the Third Annual Conference in October (held in New Haven). It also describes the work of the National Steering Committee and the National University Advisory Council, groups that are parallel to those in New Haven.

The report then describes the accomplishments of each of the four new Teachers Institutes. It sets forth the national accomplishments that have already occurred and are expected to occur. It comments upon the learning in New Haven that is also taking place as a result of the National Demonstration Project. And it describes how the progress and the results of that Project are being disseminated and how the Institute’s periodical, On Common Ground, is contributing to this effort.

The report then describes the internal and external processes through which the National Demonstration Project is being evaluated. Internal evaluations are being conducted by the four new Teachers Institutes and by the Yale-New Haven Teachers Institute as monitor of the Grant. These evaluations provide a continuing account of the challenges and accomplishments of the Demonstration Project. The external evaluation, which draws to some extent upon the internal evaluations, is conducted by Policy Studies Associates, commissioned by the Wallace-Reader’s Digest Funds to perform this task.

The Continuing National Initiative

Looking toward the future, the report then points out the opportunity for further expansion of the network of Teachers Institutes. It offers an account of the Proposal for a preliminary phase of consolidation, intensification, and preparation on the part of the Teachers Institutes that elect to participate, to be followed by a longer period during which additional Teachers Institutes would be established in many states. That process will begin in 2002-2003 with each Institute’s assessment of the effectiveness of its past three years, its planning for a major systemic effect in its district, and a collaborative preparation for a national association of Teachers Institutes.

Financial Plans

A final section of the report sets forth the current financial planning with respect to both the New Haven program and the next phases of the national initiative.
THE PROGRAM IN NEW HAVEN

The Seminars and Curriculum Units

From its inception, a tenet of the Institute's approach has been to determine its offerings annually in response to the needs for further preparation and curriculum development that the teachers themselves identify. In 2001 this process, as described later in the report, resulted in the mounting of six seminars, four in the humanities and two in the sciences.

The seminars were assisted by a contribution from the New Haven Public Schools. With major support from endowment revenues the Institute offered the following four seminars in the humanities:

- "Medicine, Ethics, and Law,"
  led by Robert A. Burt, Alexander M. Bickel Professor of Law

- "Art as Evidence: The Interpretation of Objects,"
  led by Jules D. Prown, Paul Mellon Professor Emeritus of History of Art

- "Reading and Writing Poetry,"
  led by Thomas R. Whitaker, Frederick W. Hilles Professor Emeritus of English

- "Race and Ethnicity in Contemporary Art and Literature,"
  led by Bryan J. Wolf, Professor of American Studies and Professor of English

With support from the Sherman Fairchild Foundation and funds from the Howard Hughes Medical Institute grant to Yale the Institute offered the following two seminars in the sciences:

- "Bridges: Human Links and Innovations,"
  led by Martin D. Gehner, Professor Emeritus of Architectural Engineering

- "Intelligence: Theories and Developmental Origins,"
  led by Robert Schultz, Associate Professor, Yale Child Study Center

The following overview of the work in the seminars is based on the descriptions circulated in advance by the Seminar Leaders, the Guide to Curriculum Units, 2001, and the curriculum units themselves. Each Fellow has prepared a curriculum unit that she or he will use in a specific classroom. But each Fellow has also been asked to indicate the subjects and grade levels for which other teachers might find the curriculum unit to be appropriate. These are indicated parenthetically here for each unit.
Medicine, Ethics, and Law

This seminar considered the ethical implications and different legal regulations of new scientific developments and current conduct in contemporary medical practice. The curriculum units prepared by the Fellows grew from these explorations.

The seminar considered the arguments for and against recognition of a "right to die" (either by refusing life-prolonging medical treatment or by directly hastening death through physician-assisted suicide) of mentally competent patients, or by surrogates on behalf of mentally incompetent patients, or by parents on behalf of seriously ill infants. It considered the ethical status of adults and children with physical or mental disabilities, including the existence of a social obligation to provide them with special protections and services. Jacqueline Porter's unit on the right to die deals with this topic.

The seminar discussed new possibilities for genetic manipulations, for the use of reproductive technologies such as in vitro fertilization, and for organ transplantation. Jimmy-Lee Moore's unit on the genome, Stephanie Shteirman's unit on science writing, and Grayce Storey's unit on organ and tissue donors focus on these issues.

The seminar then discussed organizational changes in the delivery of medical care such as the increased prevalence of managed care and increased budgetary pressures for rationing of medical care in ways that are inconsistent with the health needs or wishes of individual patients, and the special risks of such practices for the elderly and members of minority groups. Carolyn Fiorillo's unit addresses many of these questions.
Finally, the seminar considered current practices and past abuses in biomedical research, such as the Tuskegee syphilis experiments, and considered the effectiveness of possible remedies to guard against the repetition of such abuses. Martha Staehili’s unit focuses on a crucial aspect of this topic—the capacity of individuals to make informed choices to protect their own health—through a specific exploration of tobacco use.

Curriculum units, with their recommended uses, included: “How Right are Patients’ Rights?” by Carolyn E. Fiorillo (Health, Biology, and Ethics, grades 9-12); “The Genome: Controversy for All Times,” by Jimmy-Lee Moore (Critical Thinking, Science, English, and Debate, grades 8-12); “The Connection Between Medicine, Ethics, and Law: The Right to Die,” by Jacqueline Porter (Social Studies and Science, grades 6-8; “Science Writing for the Masses: A Primer,” by Stephanie Shteirman (Journalism/English and Biology/Science, grades 9-12); “Making Choices About Tobacco Use,” by Martha R. Staehili (Social Studies, English, Health, and Civics, grades 8-10); and “Organ and Tissue Donors,” by Grayce P. Storey (Ethics, grades 9-12, Biology and General Science, grade 9, Life Science, grades 7-8, and Health, grades 7-11).

Art as Evidence: The Interpretation of Objects

Following an initial theoretical orientation, each meeting of the seminar took place in front of a single work of art in the Yale University Art Gallery or Center for British Art. The seminar would analyze a painting closely and systematically. Beginning with a detailed description of the image and its formal elements, to extract as much factual information as possible from the work itself, the seminar would proceed to a more analytical, deductive interpretation. Each session concluded with a summary reading of the work and identification of the questions it defined about the time and place in which it was made and, in some cases, about its maker. In preparing their curriculum units, Fellows were asked to select a particular work or group of works in one of these museums as either the focus or the point of departure for their unit.

Fellows produced curriculum units on a broad range of topics. Although the art analyzed in the seminar was all American or English, its emphasis was on a methodology that Fellows could adapt for their own teaching needs. For many, it opened up the possibility of adding an art component to their teaching about a particular culture and its language. Another dimension explored was the transdisciplinary possibilities of art and science through their methodological commonalities. Fellows teaching in elementary schools took a broader approach, finding ways to use object analysis to stimulate art appreciation and student interest in history through images. One specialist teacher addressed the challenge of engaging visually impaired and blind students. Fellows found many opportunities to use object analysis to improve student writing, reasoning, artistic creativity, speaking ability, map making, research,
Following an initial theoretical orientation, each meeting of the seminar took place in front of a single work of art in the Yale University Art Gallery or Center for British Art.

The seminar on “Art as Evidence: The Interpretation of Objects.” (Clockwise from left to right: Fellows Radouane Nasry, Stephen P. Broker, Joanne R. Pompano, Christine A. Elmore, Kristi Shanahan, Gail G. Hall; and seminar leader Jules D. Prown.)

acting, charting and diagramming, photography, group discussion and mutual criticism, debate, poetry, field study, laboratory experimentation, and foreign language vocabulary.

The curriculum units, with their recommended uses, include: “Reading the Landscape: Geology and Ecology in the Nineteenth Century American Landscape Paintings of Frederic E. Church,” by Stephen P. Broker (Geology/Science, Environmental Science/Science, and AP Environmental Science, grades 11-12); “Impressionism: Reflections of a Culture,” by Karen de Fur (French, History, and Art, grades 9-12); “Look Before You Think: How to Appreciate a Painting,” by Christine A. Elmore (Reading, Writing, and Art, grades 2-5); “The Christmas Campaign of 1776: Many Voices,” by Gail G. Hall (American History I, grades 9-12); “An Approach to Chemistry via the Analysis of Art Objects: The Scientific Method, Laboratory Safety, Light and Color Theory,” by Patricia A. Morrison (Chemistry or Honors Chemistry, grades 10-12, and Integrated Science, grade 9); “Rites of Passage: Initiation Masks in French Speaking Black Africa,” by Radouane Nasry (French, grades 3-5, and African Literature, Art History, African American Literature, and World History, grades 7-12); “Teaching Art to the Blind/A Study of Chairs,” by Joanne R. Pompano (Life Skills for the Blind, History, and Art, grades 6-12); “The Influence of Jazz Music in Twentieth Century Art,” by Janna Leigh Ryon (Music Appreciation and General Music, grades 7-12); “Documentarians of an Era: A Study of the Paintings of Thomas Eakins and Gustave Caillebotte,” by Kristi Shanahan (Art, French Art, and French, grades 9-12); and “Literacy & Art: The Story Behind the Quilt,” by Kathleen Ware (Elementary Art and Literature, grades 2-4).
Reading and Writing Poetry

This seminar was mainly a workshop in the reading and writing of poetry. It aimed to enrich and deepen the understanding of many kinds of poems, and it explored ways in which one can express one's own experiences, dreams, frustrations, desires, and responses to the world in the languages of poetry. It approached the reading and writing of poetry as aspects of a single process, asking how poems work, how they marshal their strategies and impress themselves upon their readers—and how one can open a bit wider the gates of conscious and unconscious creativity.


The curriculum units apply some of the seminar’s discoveries to a variety of classroom situations—and, as the teachers make clear, each unit contains some strategies or material that might be used at almost any grade-level. Geraldine Martin, Stephanie Zogby, and Jean Sutherland—members of a team from Beecher Elementary School—developed correlated units on African American poetry, to be taught in the first, second, and fourth grades, focusing on the family and on a history of struggle. Pamela Tonge wrote a unit for sixth grade on using poetic expression to enhance reading and writing. Two teachers developed units for use in after-school or Saturday programs. Rebecca

![The seminar on “Reading and Writing Poetry.” (From left to right: Fellows Stephanie Zogby, Geraldine M. Martin, Jean E. Sutherland; seminar leader Thomas R. Whitaker; Fellows Susan A. Santovasi, Deborah E. Hare, Yel Hannon E. Brayton, Judith J. Katz, Julie A. Reinshagen, and Pamela J. Tonge.)](image-url)
Hickey has planned a workshop for students from the sixth to eighth grades in which the writing of poetry will provide practice in thinking and learning. And Julie Reinshagen has planned a writing workshop for students (especially in bilingual courses) from the ninth to the twelfth grades, emphasizing development of their social and emotional responses and their literacy skills, and culminating in the reading and writing of poetry.

Two teachers have developed units for senior English courses, both focusing to some extent on the links between music and poetry. Susan Santovasi will lead the students in a Women’s Literature course from popular songs to more traditional poetry by women. Deborah Hare will incorporate rap music and twentieth-century poetry in a more widely ranging senior course that also includes journals, drama, and film. Two teachers have developed units for high-school creative writing courses. Judith Katz will immerse her students in the reading and writing of Haiku. And Yel Hannon Brayton will emphasize the poet’s eye, the sense of wonder, and the craft through which vision may be distilled in a variety of forms.

Curriculum units, with their recommended uses, include: “African American Poetry: Miss Wednesday and Friends Take Us on a Journey of Feelings and Friendship,” by Geraldine Martin (Reading/Language Arts, grade 1); “African American Poetry: Family and Traditions,” by Stephanie Zogby (Reading/Language Arts, grade 2); “African American Poetry: Songs of Protest and Pride,” by Jean Sutherland (Language Arts [Reading, Writing, Speaking], Social Studies [African American History], and Social Development, grades 3-6); “Using Personal Poetic Expression to Enhance Reading and Writing,” by Pamela J. Tonge (Middle School Reading, grade 6); “Weaving Words: Poetry for Everyday,” by Rebecca J. Hickey (Language Arts, grades 6-8); “The Poet Within: A Workshop Series,” by Julie Reinshagen (English, grades 7-10, and Enrichment/Remediation, grades 7-12); “The Poetry We Sing: A Woman’s Perspective,” by Susan Santovasi (English, grades 10-12); “Poems, Prayers, Promises, and Possibilities: the Music of Poetry,” by Deborah Hare (English, grade 12); “Haiku: An Introduction to Writing and Discussing Poetic Form,” by Judith Katz (Creative Writing, grades 7-12); and “The Poet’s Eye,” by Yel Hannon Brayton (Creative Writing, grades 9-12).

Race and Ethnicity in Contemporary American Art and Literature

This seminar examined literature, film, and painting produced by artists of color in the United States over the past several decades. The goal was twofold: to gain an acquaintance with writers and artists from a variety of different ethnic and racial traditions, and to consider the relations between film and writing. The seminar examined films and fiction from Latino, Asian American, African American, and Native American artists. It addressed questions of difference: what sorts of issues engage artists of color, how do they express their concerns, how do they attempt to relate their work to that of the “mainstream”

culture? The seminar focused on two theoretical concepts of particular importance: “hegemony,” the way that the beliefs and values of the mainstream culture come to be accepted by those outside the mainstream, and “the borderlands,” a boundary place where peoples of different cultures interact with and affect each other.

Among the novels and stories read in the seminar were Sherman Alexie, The Lone Ranger and Tonto Fistfight in Heaven; Rudolfo Anaya, Bless Me, Ultima; Julia Alvarez, How the Garcia Girls Lost Their Accent; Sandra Cisneros, “Woman Hollering Creek”; Joy Kogawa, Obasan; Toni Morrison, Beloved; and Americo Paredes, “The Hammon and the Beans.” Among the films considered were Sherman Alexie, Smoke Signals; John Ford, The Man Who Shot Liberty Valance; Spike Lee, Do the Right Thing and Bamboozled; Jonathan Demme and Toni Morrison, Beloved; and John Sayles, Lone Star. It also examined a variety of works of art in the Yale University Art Gallery.

The curriculum units range through a variety of issues: film, family, fashion, tragedy, children’s literature, art, and graffiti. Val-Jean Belton considers the question of graffiti in a unit for students in advanced drawing and painting classes. Elsa Calderón integrates film and painting in a unit on the three heritages that define Spanish speaking culture in the New World. Judith Dixon focuses on the Underground Railroad in the nineteenth century and the Civil Rights era in the twentieth century, in a unit that uses art and literature to bring African American history to life for fifth-grade students. Sandra Friday rethinks the idea of introducing high school students to children’s literature by having them study the literature in order to teach it themselves to younger children. Jon Moscartolo uses film and painting in a unit for eighth and ninth
grades that teaches the history of Puerto Ricans in the United States and invites the students to produce art expressive of their own experience. Diana Otto’s unit brings Shakespeare’s *King Lear* together with an adaptation of that tragedy in Jane Smiley’s *A Thousand Acres*, supplementing that study with other films that use the conventions of the tragic genre. Angelo Pompano uses video documentaries to introduce students to the history of prejudice and the ways it has been overcome. His unit then invites each student to become an oral history video maker, dealing with issues of prejudice in their family histories. Abie L. Quiñones-Benitez uses a wide range of multidisciplinary materials to familiarize her students with the rich cultural heritage of Puerto Rico. Joan Rapczynski converts a high school United States history class into a forum for exploring the history of Native Americans. Dina Secchiaroli uses American literature and film to help students understand the history of the American West. And Toni Tyler turns to clothing and fashion to introduce students how clothing design has enforced class and gender codes.

Curriculum units, with their recommended uses, include: “Race, Gender, Ethnicity, and Aesthetics in the Art of Graffiti,” by Val-Jean Belton (Art, grades 10-12); “Using Art, Film, and Literature to Explore the Hispanic Identity,” by Elsa M. Calderón (Spanish 4 Honors, AP Spanish Language, AP Spanish Literature, and Spanish for Spanish Speakers Advanced Level, grades 9-12); “Utilizing Art, Literature, and Film to Teach Black History,” by Judith Dixon (Social Studies, and Reading/Language Arts, grades 5-6); “High School Students Research, Read, and Write Children’s Literature,” by Sandra Friday (Reading and Creating Children’s Storybooks/English, grades 9-12); “Expressions of Anti-Racism Through Painting: The Puerto Rican Community from *West Side Story* to Connecticut,” by Jon Moscartolo (Art, grade 8, and Introduction to Art, grade 9); “The Tragic Genre from Classical to Contemporary: *King Lear* and *A Thousand Acres*,” by Diana Otto (English, grades 11-12); “Through Their Eyes: Video Taping Oral History,” by Angelo J. Pompano (Unified Arts-Video Production, and Social Studies, grades 7-12); “I Have a Border in My Mind: The Puerto Ricans’ Arts and Culture as Factors for Self-Esteem,” by Abie L. Quiñones-Benitez (English, Social Studies, Art, and Reading, grades 7-8); “Native American Culture in Crisis,” by Joan Rapczynski (U.S. History, grades 10-11); “Debunking the Myth of the American West,” by Dina Secchiaroli (American Literature, U. S. History, American Studies, and Art, grades 7-12); and “A Chronological Look Through Fashion History: A Trip Through Fashion History as Art and Film,” by Toni Tyler (Family and Consumer Science, grades 9-12).

**Bridges: Human Links and Innovations**

While focusing on bridges, this seminar offered opportunities for discussing the multiplicity of relationships between their rationales for design, engineering, and construction. It included a field trip to bridge sites as well as a project to design and construct a model bridge. The seminar also focused on the historical development of communities served by bridges, including human deci-
The seminar included a project to design and construct a model bridge.


sion-making that affects the landscape and the community, and reshapes their growth and being for decades thereafter. Texts included Judith Dupré, Bridges; David O. Billington, Robert Millart’s Bridges; Robert S. Cortwright, Bridging: Discovering the Beauty of Bridges; Roland J. Mainstone, Developments in Structural Form; Heinrich Engle, Structure Systems; and Santiago Calatrava, Dynamic Equilibrium: Recent Projects.

One curriculum unit examines the history of significant New York bridges and their impact on the American Industrial Revolution. Two curriculum units are focused on how bridges shape and serve the adjacent communities. Each concentrate on bridges located near the New Haven schools that the students attend. Although significantly different in specific content, the other curriculum units present some technical aspects of bridges as they focus on simple principles of engineering processes, basic mathematics, applicable mechanics of basic physics, and pure geometries, all of which enter into the construction of bridges. Most of the units include hands-on projects that are created to capture the students’ interest in designing and making models appropriate for their study. Through the subject of bridges, teachers have sought ways to involve young people in learning useful principles that have an impact on the everyday patterns of each person’s life.

The curriculum units written in the seminar, with their recommended uses, include: “The East River Bridges of New York: An Expression of American Industrial Expansion,” by John Buell (U.S. History, grades 9-12); “Bridging the Math Gap,” by Creola Smith (Mathematics/Science, grades 5-8, and Mathematics, grades 9-12); “Bridges: Joining Communities Together,” by Roberta Mazzucco (Social Studies, grades 2-5); “Fair Haven Community and the Grand Avenue Bridge,” by Saundra Stephenson (Social Studies and Mathematics, grades 7-9); “The Basic Mathematics of Bridges,” by Lewis...
This seminar provided a historical overview of the development and growth of intelligence testing in the U.S. and covered the major theoretical models of intelligence.

Intelligence: Theories and Developmental Origins

This seminar, in which the seminar leader was assisted by Walter S. Gilliam, Associate Research Scientist, Child Study Center, provided a historical overview of the development and growth of intelligence testing in the U.S. and covered the major theoretical models of intelligence. The traditional theory posits a general factor of intelligence (g) that can account for a variety of specialized skills and talents. The notion of a unitary g factor was discussed in depth, as there is a longer tradition and more research evidence to support its existence and predictive value than for competing theories. Sternberg’s Triarchic Theory of Intelligence and Gardner’s Theory of Multiple Intelligences were each examined in detail. Discussion of these three theories was woven into all aspects of the seminar, including discussion of the brain bases of intelligence, the growth and development of intelligence, and programmatic attempts to foster and enhance intelligence in school and special education settings.

The Fellows came from widely different backgrounds and professional roles: a school social worker, a guidance counselor, four special education teachers, a physical education teacher, a kindergarten teacher, a music teacher, a social studies teacher, a mathematics teacher, and a science teacher. Their discussions revolved around a central theme: “How can we foster the native skills and intelligence that often remain locked within our students?” The curriculum units all integrate theory into practice and offer many helpful teaching exercises and suggestions for practical teaching materials. Though ranging widely, they fall into three thematic groups.

One group focuses on enhancing self-knowledge, a critical ingredient in school and life success. It includes the units by Dina Pollock, Cynthia A. Wooding, Afolabi James Adebayo, Angela Beasley-Murray, and Francine Coss. A second group deals with enhancing student performance through improved attention, focus, and concentration during the learning process. It includes the units by Linda Baker, Michael Vollero, Doreen Canzanella, and Robert P. Echter. A third group engages the theme of teaching multiple intelligences and student awareness of their many talents. It includes the units by Yolanda Trapp, Thomas R. Merritt, and Judith L. Bellonio.
Curriculum units, with their suggested uses, include: "Getting to Know Yourself: Developing and Accessing Intrapersonal Intelligence Among Early Adolescents," by Dina Pollock (Social Work Counseling Groups and Social Development Courses, grades 7-9); "Self-Fulfilling Prophecy in African American Students: Exploring African American Achievers," by Cynthia A. Wooding (Social Studies/Social Development, grade 5); "Teaching Awareness of Human Development," by Afolabi James Adebayo (grades 9-12); "The Semantics of Intelligence as Illustrated in John Steinbeck’s Of Mice and Men," by Angela Beasley-Murray (Reading, grades 9-10); "Developing and Assessing the Intelligence of a Kindergartener: A Practical Approach," by Francine Coss (Language Arts, Mathematics, and Science, grades K-2); "Quiet Time: An Environment for School Success," by Linda Baker (grades 4-5); "Nurturing the Body and Mind in Physical Education with Mozart," by Michael Vollero (Physical Education, grades K-6); "The Musical Learner: Rhythms and Reading," by Doreen L. Canzanella (Reading, grades 1-6); "Working with Children’s Powers Not Their Handicaps," by Robert P. Echter (Special Education/Literacy, Mathematics, and Social Studies, grades K-12); "Multiple Intelligences: The Learning Process in Our Students," by Yolanda U. Trapp (Language Arts, grades 1-4, and Science, grades 7-12); "A Multiple Intelligence Approach to the Physiology of the Brain and How Middle School Students Learn," by Thomas O. Merritt (Science, grades 7-8); and "Multi-Sensory Manipulatives in Mathematics: Linking the Abstract to the Concrete," by Judith L. Bellonio (Mathematics, grades 5-6).
The Process of Determining the Seminar Topics

Between October and December 2000, the teachers who served as Institute Representatives and Contacts for their colleagues had canvassed other teachers throughout New Haven elementary, middle, and high schools to determine the topics they wanted Institute seminars to address in 2001. (Please see Appendix for lists of teacher leaders.) The Representatives met together twice monthly and communicated individually with the School Contacts with whom they were responsible for staying in close touch. The Director of the Institute then recruited Yale faculty members who were qualified and willing to lead seminars that engaged the desired topics. Their specific proposals were then considered and approved by the Representatives.

In their evaluations, the 2001 Fellows indicated that the Institute Representative for their school had been helpful in many ways: by maintaining frequent contact with them, asking for their views on seminar subjects for the following year, encouraging and assisting them to apply to the Institute, and promoting the use of Institute-developed curriculum units. (Chart 1, reading from left to right, moves from the more helpful to the less helpful activities of the Representatives.) As a result, 45 (75 percent) of all Fellows said in the end that they had, while the program was being planned, sufficient opportunity to suggest possible topics for seminars. This is a substantially higher rate of satisfaction than was indicated by the Fellows in 2000 (59 percent).
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Chart 1

Institute Representatives’ Helpfulness to the 2001 Fellows

Fellows indicated that the Institute Representative for their school had been helpful in many ways.

The Fellows’ Application and Admissions Process

Having worked with teachers in their respective schools during the preceding months, the Institute Representatives met on January 2 to receive for distribution in all schools copies of the Institute application form, brochure, and descriptions of the seminars to be offered. At this meeting a general presentation of the subjects of the seminars ensured that all Representatives could explain to their colleagues the purpose of each seminar.

On January 9 the Institute held an open house for prospective applicants where any teacher might learn more about the planned seminars from the Representatives and from the seminar leaders, who attended and conducted discussions in small groups with interested teachers. This year’s open house had the best attendance ever—by seminar leaders and teachers. Perhaps one-third to one-half of the some 60 teachers had never been Institute Fellows. One seminar leader said: “I was much impressed by the teachers who came up to speak with me at the open house—lots of different fields and levels, varied areas of interest, and some good preliminary ideas about units. If the actual enrollment reflects the same qualities, my seminar will be off to a good start.”
On January 16 the Representatives met to discuss their progress in working with prospective applicants and to hand in their own completed applications. The final deadline for teachers applying to the Institute was January 23. This date was selected so that teachers would apply in advance of the February school vacation. The office would then have the vacation period to process application materials, and the review of applications could be completed during February to provide the earliest possible notification to teachers who were accepted.

There are four principal criteria for teachers to be eligible for consideration as Fellows:

• The applicant must be a current New Haven school teacher who will be teaching in New Haven also during the school year following Institute participation.

• The applicant must agree to participate fully in the program by attending and coming prepared to all scheduled meetings and by completing research and meeting due dates in the preparation of a curriculum unit.

• The teacher must demonstrate in the application that his or her specific interests are directly related to the seminar as it has been described by the seminar leader.

• The applicant must also show that the seminar and the curriculum unit that he or she proposes to write are directly related to school courses that he or she will teach in the coming school year.

For some years it has been the policy of the Institute to allow no more than twelve teachers to enroll in any seminar. The small size of the seminars is necessary both for the collegiality of the Institute experience and for the individual attention that each teacher’s work in progress receives from the seminar leader and from other teachers in the seminar.

During the planning process 103 teachers expressed definite interest in participating in one of the seminars to be offered. Of those teachers, 52 were from high schools, one from a transitional school, 23 from middle schools, 14 from elementary schools, and 13 from K-8 schools. By the application deadline, the Institute Representatives, assisted by the school Contacts, had obtained applications from 71 elementary, middle, K-8, and high school teachers in the humanities, social sciences, and sciences.

The individual application form calls for the interested teachers to specify the subjects and grade levels they teach, the course or courses in which they plan to introduce the material they study in the Institute, and their willingness
to meet each of the Institute’s requirements for full participation. The applicants also write a brief essay describing why they wish to participate in the seminar to which they are applying, and how the curriculum unit they plan to write will assist them in their own teaching. Writing this essay is, in effect, their first step in formulating a curriculum unit through which they will bring the material they study from the seminar into their own teaching.

The team application form requires the interested teachers to demonstrate how the team envisions working together in inter-grade and/or interdisciplinary ways and must outline plans for a culminating activity in the school. Teams may receive preference during the admissions process, and are required to submit a final report on their work together during the following school year. If a team is not admitted as such, however, the members of the team may be admitted to the program as individual Fellows. And the Institute encourages such Fellows to work as informal teams in their schools.

The applications were then reviewed by three groups: seminar leaders, school principals, and seminar Coordinators. The seminar leaders examined the applications for their relationship to the seminar subject. This afforded each seminar leader the opportunity, as well, to tailor or enlarge the bibliography for the seminar so that it would address the specific interests of the teachers who are accepted.

At the same time, the applications were reviewed in the applicant’s own school, in keeping with the decentralizing of administrative functions and decision-making in the school district. The Institute’s Representative for each school contacted the school principal or the principal’s designee, who is asked to review each teacher’s application. The intention is to increase awareness
within each school of the projects that teachers wish to pursue in Institute seminars, to afford an opportunity for the principal and other educational leaders to examine the relationship between teachers’ applications and school plans, and to increase the likelihood that the teachers will have a course assignment in which they can use their curriculum unit. In this review, the following questions are posed:

Is the applicant’s proposal consistent with, and significant for, the curricula and academic plans for your school?

List the courses and/or the grade levels where the proposed unit will be used; if there are none, state “none.”

Will the applicant be assigned next year one or more of these courses in which to teach the unit?

Please indicate any special merits or problems you find with the application.

When this procedure was introduced in 1998, Reginald Mayo, Superintendent of the New Haven Public Schools, had written to all principals: “We believe this is a highly promising way for ensuring that the assistance that the Institute provides to individual teachers and to teams of teachers has the best prospects for advancing each school’s academic plans.” This process informs the consideration of each application, provides each applicant pertinent feedback, and often provides a significant opportunity for Institute Representatives to talk with their principals about the Institute.

Because it is very important that principals appreciate the nature and the importance of the curriculum units that teachers in their school will be designing, we include here some excerpts from their comments on the Fellows’ applications:

“This seminar is consistent with our curriculum and academic plans for our school.”
—School Principal

This seminar is consistent with our curriculum and academic plans for our school. Teaching students to think in a critical, analytical and creative way is a skill that will be utilized for many years to come.

The proposed unit relates directly to two courses in our Science Department offerings as well as the District frameworks. It will help make the study of Science more interesting and attractive to our students.

As educators we are constantly looking for ways to improve students’ learning. Improved teaching strategies are critical in this type of mission. When students achieve—and especially special education students—it improves self-esteem and their chances for success in life. Also, when teachers search for ways to become more
effective in their instructional approaches and share them with colleagues it is not only professional, it is productive for student achievement.

It will beautifully complement the Comprehensive Arts Program already in place but with an added plus of a strong emphasis on building literacy skills.

We need to do everything we can to instill the habit of reading in our students. This is a most worthy unit!

Introducing beginning language students to poetry may make the language more interesting to our students. If the introduction of poetry leads to success for students, it will motivate them to try harder.

It is a well-known fact that young people often find it difficult if not impossible to concentrate on the rigors of school due to personal problems and emotional difficulties. This proposal is an important step in helping young people and their families deal with the problems in a positive way.

This teacher’s previous work in this area has shown excellent results. Additional work will continue to benefit all of his students and his art program.

It is a hands-on project—our students receive a huge benefit from this kind of assignment.

I look forward to the development of this unit by a librarian and would like to see us use it as a springboard in building our collection of poetry books.

As in the past, the Institute formed a group of teachers who served as Coordinators to assist with the organization and smooth operation of the seminars. The Director, with the assistance of the Steering Committee, selects these Coordinators from the group of Representatives who had earlier helped to plan the program of seminars. The Steering Committee is now routinely involved in thinking about teacher leadership and identifying the positions for which individual teachers are most qualified.

There is one Coordinator in each seminar. They act as a liaison between the seminars and a Coordinators’ committee to facilitate the exchange of information and to provide teacher leadership without diminishing the collegial rapport within each seminar. A seminar Coordinator must be, and must
As in the past, the Institute formed a group of teachers who served as Coordinators to assist with the organization and smooth operation of the seminars.

As in the past, the Institute formed a group of teachers who served as Coordinators to assist with the organization and smooth operation of the seminars.

Seminar Coordinators Meeting. (Left to right: Coordinators Karen G. de Fur, Dina K. Secchiaroli, Jacqueline E. Porter, Jean E. Sutherland, Joseph H. Lewis, and Francine C. Coss.)

intend to continue as, a full-time teacher in one of New Haven’s public schools. A Coordinator accepts the following responsibilities:

1. To work with school Representatives at the conclusion of the application process, to serve on an admissions committee to consider proposals for curriculum development submitted by teachers applying to become Fellows, and to make recommendations to the Director about whom to accept as Fellows.

2. To monitor the progress of a seminar through observation and conversation with participants, and to give progress reports at weekly seminar Coordinators’ committee meetings.

3. To report to the seminar members any organizational information which should be circulated, such as the schedule of any visitors and notice of Institute-wide activities.

4. To act as a resource for members of the seminar, providing information about unit-writing deadlines, guidelines for writing curriculum units, computer assistance available to Fellows, copyright procedures, and University facilities Fellows may use.

5. To be available to the seminar leader to provide information on Fellows’ perceptions of the seminar and on Institute policies generally, and to offer assistance as may be needed.

6. To assist with the smooth operation of the seminar by keeping track of Fellows’ promptness and attendance and the timeliness of
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their written submissions, and by encouraging Fellows to make and keep appointments for individual meetings with the seminar leader.

7. To attend and come prepared to weekly committee meetings with the Director (beginning January 31) and to take professional days as needed for the above purposes.

When the seminars began, each Coordinator would participate as a Fellow in a different seminar. At this earlier point they served as an admissions committee. They met after school on January 31 to conduct a first reading and discussion of the applications to their respective seminars. They then contacted all teachers whose applications needed to be clarified or amplified. On February 7 the Coordinators met again for a full day, by taking professional leave, for their final consideration of the applications and their decisions.

During their review, the Coordinators considered the findings of the school administrators and seminar leaders and made recommendations to the Director about which teachers the Institute should accept. By these means, the Institute seeks to ensure that all Fellows participate in seminars that are consistent with their interests and applicable in the courses they teach. The Institute accepted as Fellows 71 New Haven teachers, 47 in the humanities and 24 in the sciences. Two teams of teachers were admitted with the expectation that team members would coordinate their curriculum units and work together during the school year, planning cross-grade and cross-department instruction and school-wide activities. Only one of those teams, however, carried its plans

A meeting of seminar leaders and Coordinators was held to discuss the admissions process and to review the seminar and unit writing process and the policies and procedures of the Institute.
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to a conclusion in the seminar. A meeting of seminar leaders and Coordinators was held on February 27 to discuss the admissions process just completed, and to review the seminar and unit writing process and the policies and procedures of the Institute.

Consistent with the Institute’s aim to serve the largest possible proportion of all New Haven teachers, 33 (or 46 percent) of the teachers accepted in 2001 were participating in the Institute for the first time. Of these first-time Fellows, 22 were in the humanities and 11 were in the sciences. More than one fifth of all the Fellows accepted (22 percent) were Black, nearly three quarters (72 percent) were White, and 7 percent were Hispanic.

The Fellows Who Were Accepted

Fellows came from 7 of the 8 high schools, 4 of the 6 middle schools, 3 of the 6 K-8 schools, and one of the 4 transitional schools. Of the 22 elementary schools, 8 had teachers participating. The Institute first admitted elementary school teachers in 1990; this year 14 (20 percent) of all Fellows were elementary school teachers. Eighteen (25 percent) were middle or K-8 school teachers, and 38 (54 percent) were high schoolteachers. Four schools had five or more Fellows; 10 schools had three or more. Overall, about 31 percent of the Fellows were 41-50 years old; 30 percent were younger and 40 percent were older.

As Chart 2 (facing page) shows, about one fifth of the Fellows (19 percent) had four or fewer years of total experience in teaching. The Institute

*The seminar on “Race and Ethnicity in Contemporary American Art and Literature.” (Left to right: Fellows Dina K. Secchiaroli, Val-Jean Belton, and Abie L. Quiñones-Benitez.)*
Over half of all Fellows have been in their present teaching position four or fewer years.
Many of the 2001 Fellows did not major in college or graduate school in the subjects they currently teach.
Chart 4 shows the subjects Fellows taught in the 2000-2001 year of their Institute participation. Overall, more than three fifths (64 percent) of Fellows in the humanities (as compared with 53 percent in 2000) and over three quarters (78 percent) of Fellows in the sciences (as compared with 71 percent in 2000) had not majored either in college or in graduate school in one or more of the subjects they taught in that year.

**Chart 4**
Subject Taught by 2001 Fellows

Understandably, therefore, when the 2001 Fellows were asked about the incentives that attracted them to participate in the Institute, they responded (as Chart 5 shows, reading left to right from the most to the least important) that

**Chart 5**
Incentives for 2001 Fellows to Participate
the most important incentives were the opportunities to develop materials to motivate their students (95 percent), to exercise intellectual independence (93 percent), to increase their mastery of the subjects they teach (89 percent), and to develop curricula to fit their needs (88 percent). Indeed, incentives that might be imagined to be important for teachers with access to Yale University—credit in a degree program and access to Yale athletic facilities—were much less important for Fellows in the Teachers Institute.

As past Institute studies have shown, Fellows are in most respects highly representative of all New Haven teachers. So, for example, this year’s Fellows continue to reflect the gender and ethnicity of all New Haven teachers, though there are great disparities overall between the ethnic and racial characteristics of New Haven teachers and those of their students. (See Table 1 below.) Similarly, the Yale faculty members who have led Institute seminars generally reflect the wider faculty at Yale.

### Table 1

**Ethnicity and Gender of Participants**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>Hispanic</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>non-Hispanic</td>
<td>non-Hispanic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All Male Female</td>
<td>All Male Female</td>
<td>All Male Female</td>
<td>All Male Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institute Fellows, 2001</td>
<td>72% 15% 57%</td>
<td>22% 5% 17%</td>
<td>7% 0% 7%</td>
<td>0% 0% 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institute Fellows, 1978-2001</td>
<td>69% 20% 49%</td>
<td>26% 6% 21%</td>
<td>4% 1% 3%</td>
<td>1% 0% 1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Haven Public School Teachers, 2001</td>
<td>73% 20% 53%</td>
<td>18% 4% 14%</td>
<td>7% 1% 6%</td>
<td>1% 0.3% 0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Haven Public School Students, 2001</td>
<td>12% 6% 6%</td>
<td>57% 29% 28%</td>
<td>30% 15% 15%</td>
<td>2% 0.8% 1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institute Coordinators, 2001</td>
<td>67% 0% 67%</td>
<td>33% 17% 17%</td>
<td>0% 0% 0%</td>
<td>0% 0% 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steering Committee, 2001</td>
<td>75% 25% 50%</td>
<td>25% 0% 25%</td>
<td>0% 0% 0%</td>
<td>0% 0% 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representatives and Contacts, 2000-2001</td>
<td>60% 19% 42%</td>
<td>31% 6% 25%</td>
<td>6% 2% 4%</td>
<td>0% 0% 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institute Seminar Leaders, 2001</td>
<td>100% 100% 0%</td>
<td>0% 0% 0%</td>
<td>0% 0% 0%</td>
<td>0% 0% 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institute Seminar Leaders, 1978-2001</td>
<td>87% 74% 13%</td>
<td>8% 6% 1%</td>
<td>5% 3% 3%</td>
<td>0% 0% 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yale Faculty, 2001 (includes tenured and term ladder faculty)</td>
<td>85% 63% 22%</td>
<td>3% 2% 1.2%</td>
<td>2% 2% 0.7%</td>
<td>9% 6% 3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Totals may not add to 100% due to rounding.
Activities for Fellows

At the first organizational meeting of each seminar, held on March 6, 2001, the seminar leader distributed an annotated bibliography on the seminar subject and presented the syllabus of readings that he or she proposed that the seminar would consider. The Fellows described the individual curriculum units that they planned to develop. This afforded the members of each seminar an overview of the work they were undertaking together and the projects they would pursue individually. The bibliographies both introduced the seminar subject and guided Fellows as they began research on their curriculum units. One wrote, “I found the reading used as preparation for the class sessions to be lengthy, but incredibly interesting and from a wide variety of sources—case law, statutes, memoirs, academic papers.”

Another wrote:

The reading list was a wonderful, comprehensive overview of the subject and a valuable addition to my professional library. The readings were very thought provoking, expanding my understanding and knowledge of the subject. I have already shared articles from the seminar readings with colleagues and will continue to refer to and share these articles in the future.

A third Fellow wrote:

The seminar leader responded to a request to be introduced to specialized library materials by organizing a tour of the reference room at Sterling and a session in the computer classroom at the undergraduate library. The librarians were well prepared with show-and-tell reference materials and excellent handouts; the computer session was very informative and useful.

Some Fellows emphasized how demanding they found the work to be. One said:

My experience in this year’s seminar has been both exhilarating and frustrating. I have enjoyed my interactions with the Fellows, seminar leader, and staff. It was very helpful to receive feedback from the professor and the Fellows during the different phases involved in writing a unit. The frustration I encountered was in trying to see how all the pieces would fit in the process of developing my unit of study. The guidelines that were given and the professor’s guidance were very helpful, but I feel I did not take full advantage of this because I didn’t fully grasp the whole scope of what was entailed in writing this unit.
"The Fellows brought a richness of personal experience and a thoughtfulness and wisdom to discussion of these topics that I have often found lacking in graduate students."

—Seminar Leader

The seminar on "Race and Ethnicity in Contemporary American Art and Literature." (Left to right: Fellows Toni L. Tyler, Jon J. Moscartolo, Sandra K. Friday, Dina K. Secchiaroli, and Val-Jean Belton.)

Another said:

I was a bit daunted when we were assigned the task of building a model. At the time I felt that the assigned readings and the writing of the unit were enough of a workload without the addition of an extra project. I must say, however, that I found the model to be a rewarding task, which helped me to overcome a negative attitude toward certain kinds of hands-on activities.

The seminar leaders also commented on what they perceived to be the Fellows' responses to the weekly readings. One said:

I've taught this material many times to graduate students; though they tend to be more analytically rigorous and precise than the Fellows, nonetheless the Fellows brought a richness of personal experience and a thoughtfulness and wisdom to discussion of these topics that I have often found lacking in graduate students, no matter how analytically smart.

A somewhat less satisfied seminar leader, with a very different topic, said:

Any expectation that Fellows would be informed and challenging soon narrowed to less than 40 percent of the group. The seminar was a joy to present to this minority of highly interested Fellows. Preparatory readings were distributed at the very first session yet about half of the Fellows went to the library to read the material and slightly more than half of the participants actually bought the only text identified for the seminar. All other books on the Bibliography were on library reserve. Often, web sites became
substitute reading sources for several Fellows. Although encouraged to use web sites, they became crutches for last-minute information seekers exclusive of the base reading assignments.

Before the second seminar meeting all Fellows met individually with their seminar leader to discuss their projects. The Institute requires that Fellows schedule at least two such conferences as part of the unit writing process; many Fellows, however, meet more frequently with their seminar leader. At the end of the program, almost all Fellows (95 percent) said that they had ample opportunity to discuss their choice of readings with the seminar leader.

During the period that preceded the regular weekly meetings, Fellows continued their reading, both preparing for the upcoming seminar discussions and working toward a brief prospectus of what their final units would contain. At the second seminar meeting, on April 10, Fellows submitted this prospectus, presented their revised unit topics, and began to discuss the common readings. The regular weekly seminar meetings began on May 8; thereafter Fellows continued to develop their units in stages, with a first draft submitted on May 22. The weekly meetings of the seminars continued through July 17, with Fellows submitting the second draft of their units on July 3 and their completed units by July 31.

For several years, Fellows have been asked to submit the prospectus, together with a revised topic of the unit and a list of appropriate readings, at the time of the second seminar meeting. This allows them a full six weeks to write a first draft. The due date for the second draft is late enough to allow Fellows ample time to address the comments they received on the first draft from other Fellows and from the seminar leader. Some seminar leaders have urged that the revised topic, preliminary reading-list, and first draft be submitted somewhat later, and some have informally instituted yet another draft between the first and second drafts. Every year, too, some Fellows are concerned that the writing of the unit begins before they have entered well into the seminar topic, or that too much work must be done at the end of the school year, when they are heavily committed to their teaching. Nevertheless, a majority of the Fellows have been satisfied with this schedule. In 2001, 66 percent of the Fellows thought the unit writing deadlines occurred at the right time in relation to the school calendar.

The Institute attaches great importance to the process through which Fellows develop their curriculum units, and many Fellows commented upon the benefits derived from following this process. One wrote:

I was surprised by the complexity of writing a curriculum unit for the YNHTI. I had never written a curriculum unit before. I had written class plans and was somewhat put off by the insistence that class plans would be insufficient for the Institute’s purposes. I...
also found it difficult to let go of the idea that I should be writing to an audience of teachers who would be looking for help teaching this subject to their students. I was incredulous that the Institute didn't want me to write about my previous experience. Rather the goal was to project what I would do to take my experience to the next level. Once I understood all this, I still had to write my unit three separate times. The good news is that I think my product is valuable. I wish I had understood all of this sooner. If I had, perhaps my final editing would have been finer than it is.

Another Fellow said: “We were required to present our prospectus as well as the first draft of our individual units. In this way we were able to get feedback from other members of the group. Sometimes suggestions were offered that other teachers were able to incorporate into their units.” And a third Fellow said: “Teachers worked together and crossed the span of our buildings and schools to become a network of learners and teachers. We ended up sharing books and resources for not only our units but also the classes we were currently teaching.”

At the conclusion of the seminars, most Fellows indicated that the program schedule (84 percent) and the guidelines for writing a unit (93 percent) had been useful to them to a great or moderate extent. This year 62 percent of the Fellows said they tried out the subject matter and 72 percent said they tried out the strategies of their units in their classroom. Of those who did, most Fellows (89 percent) said that this influenced what they included in the final units.

During the first two months of the program, which serve as a reading period, all Fellows also met together on Tuesday afternoons for a series of talks. These talks are designed to expose all Fellows to some of the work done in seminars other than their own, and to subjects and leaders of possible future seminars. Ordinarily, therefore, some current or prospective seminar leaders are included in this series, while some other faculty members are invited to speak on topics the school Representatives believe will be of particular interest to many Fellows. The talks given in 2001 were: “The History of Yale and New Haven in the Twentieth Century,” by Gaddis Smith, Larned Professor Emeritus of History; “Intelligence: Theories and Developmental Origins,” by Robert Schultz, Associate Professor, Yale Child Study Center; “Observing the Earth from Space,” by Ronald B. Smith, Professor of Geology and Geophysics; “Bridges: Path, Symbol, and Function,” by Martin D. Gehner, Professor Emeritus of Architectural Engineering; and “Can Exposure to a Stressful Environment Cause Behavioral Changes Resembling ADHD? Evidence from Basic Research,” by Amy Arnsten, Associate Professor of Neurobiology.

Although the talks have recently met with more favorable response than was once the case, they remain somewhat controversial. One Fellow wrote: “Weaknesses in the Institute? Only one—the lectures are unnecessary, unendurable, a waste of time, poorly delivered, excruciating.” Another wrote: “A
major weakness is the excessive number of large group lectures at the beginning. Most are unrelated to an individual teacher’s area of teaching or chosen seminar.” A third wrote: “Lectures still need to be more motivating and realistic to the children in the New Haven Public Schools. A survey should be given to all participants about what kinds of lectures they would like to see.” And a fourth Fellow wrote: “I think the talks should be dispersed throughout the months of April, May, and June.”

This year as last year, however, most Fellows saw in the talks the purposes for which they were organized. They said that to a great or moderate extent the talks provided them intellectual stimulation (89 percent) and a sense of collegiality and common purpose among Fellows (83 percent). Three quarters (77 percent) said the talks were successful to a great or moderate extent in providing an overview of Fellows’ work in the seminars. A slightly larger proportion (81 percent) said that the Institute scheduled the right number of talks.

One Fellow wrote: “I feel the lectures this year were very interesting. There were a wide variety of topics that covered subjects very relevant to the students of New Haven. The lectures provided the opportunity for all participants to get an overview of the seminars that other Fellows were attending. I feel this is an important part of the Institute.” Another wrote: “Although they were usually not related to the material I taught, I found them very interesting. I think they would be enhanced if a short annotated bibliography was distributed at each, so that teachers could investigate topics at later times.” And a third Fellow wrote: “The lecture series was stimulating and useful to me as a teacher in New Haven. The lectures on intelligence, the biochemistry of ADD, and the history of the relationship between Yale and New Haven were particularly valuable.”

Indeed, many Fellows reported that the talks prompted them, to a great or moderate extent, to read about their topics (51 percent), discuss the topics...
Most Fellows saw in the talks the purposes for which they were organized: intellectual stimulation and a sense of collegiality and common purpose among Fellows.

Fellows at one of the talks in the lecture series.

with their students (47 percent), and discuss the talks with other teachers (71 percent).

As in recent years, the Institute scheduled a session on curriculum unit writing, well before the regular meetings of the seminars began. Before starting on their curriculum units, the Fellows all need to understand the central role that the process of writing plays in Institute seminars. As part of their admissions folder, all Fellows had received Institute guidelines and mechanical specifications for preparing curriculum units, which outline the Institute writing process and the five steps for Fellows’ formulating, reformulating, and enlarging their individual units. On March 20, a panel of Coordinators first spoke to all the Fellows on these topics: “Checking and Using the Index and Guides,” “Addressing Your Audience and Narrowing Your Topic,” Following the Institute Process for Unit Development,” “Taking Advantage of Technology for Electronic Communications and Research,” “Preparing an Electronic Version of the Curriculum Unit,” and “Aligning Your Unit with School Plans and District Goals.” Then the Fellows were divided into seminar groups, where each Coordinator led a discussion of purposes and practices in writing Institute curriculum units. This afforded an opportunity for the first-time Fellows to learn about the guidelines and other aspects of curriculum unit writing from experienced Fellows. It also encouraged experienced Fellows to share that experience and allowed all to discuss how the completed volume of units might display a range of teaching strategies and contain a standard form of annotation. By leading these discussions, the Coordinators also identified themselves as being knowledgeable about the process of writing curriculum units, so that other Fellows might seek their advice.

At the Coordinators’ weekly meetings with the Director, which were held on the day after seminar meetings, they discussed the progress of each seminar and gained an overview of the program. In addition, the Coordinators met with the seminar leaders immediately before the program began to provide
them with information about the teachers who had been accepted and to begin to define their role in assisting with the conduct of the seminars. Both seminar leaders and Fellows acknowledged in their evaluations the essential role of the Coordinators. Almost all Fellows (94 percent) agreed that the Coordinator had provided teacher leadership without diminishing the collegial rapport within the seminar. Fellows found the Coordinators to be helpful either a lot (93 percent) or a little (7 percent) in providing information about unit writing deadlines; helpful either a lot (85 percent) or a little (15 percent) in providing information about guidelines for unit writing; helpful either a lot (82 percent) or a little (13 percent) in providing information about the use of University facilities; and helpful either a lot (75 percent) or a little (18 percent) in facilitating discussion of Fellows’ work in progress. Few Fellows found the Coordinators unhelpful in any respect.

To maintain current information on the program and to address any problems that arose, the Institute Director met monthly with the seminar leaders as a group. This also afforded the seminar leaders, two of whom were conducting an Institute seminar for the first time, an opportunity to talk with each other about their approaches to the seminar and experiences in it.

Rewards for Fellows

The seminars have always been regarded as the core collaborative experience of the Institute, and each year the Fellows’ comments about the seminars have been rich and positive. Again this year their comments were often very enthusiastic indeed. One said:

I enjoyed this seminar immensely. By engaging participants in critical thinking and hands-on writing, the seminar leader created a shared learning experience for all of us. He was also gracious in accepting our suggestions and recommendations for structuring seminar time and selecting materials. Added to this was his great store of knowledge about the subject. The seminar was very successful and the best one of the seven that I have participated in thus far.

Seminar leaders described their seminar in both specific and general terms. One said:

My expectations were based on my previous seminars, and they pretty much proved to be the case—a bright and interesting group of people who would coalesce into a collegial and mutually supportive class; a wide disparity between the best work and the least good; and lively discussion. The discussions were animated, usually on target, and marked by humor as well as insight. There was considerable similarity with comparably structured seminar work with Yale students, especially graduate students, with some
The seminars afford the Fellows an otherwise too rare opportunity to talk and work with other teachers across the artificial boundaries that often separate grade levels, schools, and disciplines.
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Fellows less on top of the process and the direction in which the analysis was going. But the best of the Fellows performed comparably to good Yale graduate students.

Another said:

The seminars were conducted initially as wholly "intellectual" affairs. After a discussion of pending deadlines and work requirements, we would plunge into a discussion of the week’s materials, which would then occupy us for the remainder of the session. Once we hit the midway point in the seminar, however, we began each class with reports by 2-3 Fellows on their Curriculum Units. Over time, these reports tended to take greater bites out of our class discussions. I was torn between allowing the Fellows the scope to present their curriculum units as they felt best, and reining in overlong reports. In the end, we wound up with a little of both.

Although less often expressed than in some recent years, a continuing theme in some Fellows’ comments was the appreciation and understanding they gained of their own and other cultures as a result of what they read. One Fellow wrote:

An equally important component of the success of the seminar was the diverse group of teachers who participated in it; there were African American, Hispanic American, and Euro-American men and women who were deeply concerned about these issues of race and ethnicity.

Another Fellow wrote:

My curriculum unit entitled “Native American Culture in Crisis” may be incorporated into the survey course for either U. S. History I or U. S. History II that is required of all 10th and 11th graders. My unit offers suggestions for further study and interpretation of the history of Native American-U. S. government relations, as well as an overview of the present-day Indian reform movement.

The seminars also afford the Fellows an otherwise too rare opportunity to talk and work with other teachers across the artificial boundaries that often separate grade levels, schools, and disciplines. One Fellow wrote: “I thought that the mix of people also helped to make the discussions and classes very helpful. We had teachers from elementary to high school levels. Everyone made valuable suggestions about the units as we went through the seminar.”

Ever since the Institute’s inception, its participants and staff have sometimes been asked whether the co-professionalism among Yale faculty members
The collegiality on which the Institute is founded is perhaps best illustrated by the mutual respect between Fellows and seminar leaders that the seminar experience engenders.

The seminar on "Bridges: Human Links and Innovations." (Left to right: seminar leader Martin D. Gehner; Fellows Liza L. Bowen, Gwendolyn Robinson and Joseph H. Lewis.)

and New Haven school teachers, for which the program is widely known, is authentic. The collegiality on which the Institute is founded is perhaps best illustrated by the mutual respect between Fellows and seminar leaders that the seminar experience engenders. One seminar leader, for example, said:

As always, I would stress the importance of collegiality, of mutual respect. A sense of humor is desirable, but should not detract from the fundamental seriousness of the seminar. If a Fellow seems not to be attending seriously enough to the class, or is tardy or absent excessively, it is important to stay in touch with the Coordinator, who plays an enforcement role, to gain an understanding of the nature of the problem. The seminars should be for discussion, not lecturing. It is good to build in some time at some points along the way for the Fellows to discuss pedagogical issues—how they intend to use their units in class. Former Fellows can be of great help in discussing issues openly in seminar.

In turn, Fellows expressed their respect for their Yale colleagues:

I also learned a lot from my seminar leader. His expertise and personality made this learning experience even better. If he were to lead another seminar on a different subject and I was able to use it, I would definitely take it.

Last year's and this year's Institute contain no differences for me. I have had two great and inspiring seminar leaders, who were skillful in the Socratic method of facilitation and direct-interactive strategies.
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What a positive experience! Our leader is insightful, extremely intelligent, and best of all, a good group leader in that he listens to all of our questions and patiently helps us with possible answers. His bibliographies were very useful, classroom discussions were at a high level intellectually, and his comments on my unit were very helpful.

The seminar leader’s knowledge of the content is inspiring and his method of teaching has made us better able to teach to our classes, and not only the material we covered. By his modeling of analysis, we can imitate that in the class on anything we teach.

Relating Seminar Topics to Curriculum Units

Each Institute seminar must balance the complementary and inseparable but sometimes competing demands for studying the seminar topic and developing specific applications of that knowledge for school classrooms. The Fellows, coming from elementary, middle, and high schools, are obligated to develop curriculum units that have some demonstrable relation to the seminar topic, but they are free to work out curricula that enter territory not covered in detail by the seminar. The curriculum units, therefore, have a diversity of subject and approach that one would not expect in a regular university course on the seminar topic. As a result, discussions in the seminar, while doing justice to the common reading, can also range widely over substantive and pedagogical issues relating to the curriculum units. Some comments by seminar leaders and Fellows quoted earlier have already indicated that each seminar approaches these demands somewhat differently as seminar leaders strive to strike an appropriate balance.

In recent years the Institute has also encouraged Fellows to build into their curriculum units both subject matter and skills that are called for by the local curriculum framework—including a strong emphasis upon literacy—and the state Mastery and Academic Performance Tests. One Fellow said: “The focus of the city is literacy. A lot of literacy lessons can be drawn from my unit. There are three literacy lessons mentioned in my lesson plans.” Another said: “My curriculum unit will serve to enhance the third grade museum program developed by the Comprehensive Arts Program that has for a long time been a part of the third grade curriculum in our district.” And a third Fellow said:

Since so much of the school curricula is directed at the Connecticut Mastery Test, and a lot of that has to do with problem-solving, I can create a Writing Prompt that would have them explaining why, where, and how a bridge should be built in a given community. For Math, they can design a bridge noting the geometry (shape) and measurement (size/dimension) for an actual bridge they will build. Reading Comprehension sheets can easily
be developed using the books from the students’ reading lists and the vocabulary words in the unit.

In the end, a sizable majority of this year’s Fellows (83 percent) said that there had been an appropriate balance in seminar between general study of the seminar subject and Fellows’ work in progress on their units. As one Fellow put it: “The most significant benefits of this seminar were the ability to discuss the subject matter in an academic sense while discussing how to approach teaching the subject matter in a similar and non-watered-down manner.”

After the curriculum units were completed in July, they were compiled in a volume for each seminar. In October the volumes were deposited in the libraries of all elementary middle, and high schools, so that New Haven teachers, whether or not they have been Fellows, might use them in their own teaching. As in the past, the Institute prepared a Guide to the new units, based on synopses by the authors and their recommendations of the grade levels and school courses to which their units apply.

The Institute is also updating the Index of all the 1348 units contained in the 149 volumes the Institute has published since its inception in 1978. The Index and Guide are deposited in all school libraries and distributed to the teachers who serve as Institute Representatives for the schools. A full set of the new curricular resources is provided to those school district administrators who have responsibility for curricula system-wide.

Maintaining a library set of units has proved most difficult in those schools that do not have a full-time librarian or, in some cases, even a library. In 1993-94, the Institute therefore sought to determine the best location for Institute material to be deposited in every New Haven school, and it has since continued to supply units missing from any collection, insofar as the volumes have been still in print. As described below, the Institute has also created an electronic version that makes its curricular resources more widely accessible.

Results for the Participants

As in past years, Fellows in 2001 spoke of the results of their Institute participation especially in terms of intellectual growth and renewal. Just as the opportunity to increase mastery of the subject one teaches was an important incentive for most Fellows (89 percent) to take part in the Institute, almost all (96 percent) said that they had gained knowledge of their subject and confidence to teach it by participating in their seminar. Only one Fellow disagreed with the statement that the seminar helped with intellectual and professional growth.

Many Fellows described the Institute experience as having increased their professional confidence and morale. Several of their comments follow:
The excitement ignited while preparing my unit is still as intense. That excitement I know will carry over into my classroom. My students will be the recipients of my exuberance. What I have learned will enable me to answer far more questions my students may have, and it will allow me to be far more creative in my planning. That will translate into more interesting and direct-interactive lessons for my students.

I believe that my curriculum unit will capture the attention of students normally not intrigued by the subject matter and will awaken in other students creative ideas for further research. I think it will make teaching more exciting both by providing a different approach and because of the thorough planning that went into developing the unit.

Being North African, I thought that working on African art would be easy. However, this was not the case. The more research I did, the more I found out how much I did not know, especially in regard to Black Africa. The work done for this unit has certainly increased my knowledge and makes me more confident in front of my students.

I especially feel more prepared to aid students in the creation of their own poetry related to the unit’s topics. Using various techniques for teaching poetry discussed in seminar should lead students to a clearer understanding of poetic elements which they may use in the development of their own poetry.

One aspect of my teaching that will certainly improve will be my teaching of writing. I believe that writing is as important a part of the history curriculum as it is of the English curriculum. Before writing this unit, I had not written extensively for a number of years. This experience has exercised my skills and renewed my feel for the writing process.

I noticed a change in my approach to my work during the last few months of last school year as I began to think about and develop my unit. As my thinking became clearer and my focus sharper, my interventions with students improved as a result. Now that the unit is completed and I will have detailed lesson plans to use in my work, I think my approach to teaching this subject will be much more organized, more coherent and deeper. The research that I conducted will have a positive influence on my work, not only with students but also in my consulting role with teachers, parents, and administrators. The wide reading I engaged in exposed me to a multiplicity of ideas, issues and approaches that have stimulated my thinking and made me a more flexible, better educated professional.
Fellows spoke, too, of the access to Yale facilities they had gained from participation. From the Institute’s inception, all Fellows have been full members of the University community, listed in the directory of faculty and staff, and granted use of facilities and services across the campus. For most Fellows (85 percent) access to Yale’s academic facilities such as the library was an incentive for their participation, and 57 percent reported that membership in the Yale community had been greatly or moderately useful to them. One Fellow said: “It was exciting to be able to be at Yale and use your facilities. I am impressed with the resources available, the libraries, the number of documents available. I liked having access to all this. I loved the Sterling Library even though I did more of my research at the Art and Architecture Library.” Another said: “The Yale resources I made the most use of were the libraries and the Film Study Center, both of which were invaluable to me in writing my unit.”

Nor do Fellows see the results of the Institute as limited to their own classrooms, or even to teachers who have participated in the seminars. Almost all of them said that they plan to encourage or assist other teachers in using the unit they prepared; more than half said they planned to do so with three or more other teachers. As a group, the Fellows planned to encourage or assist a total of 251 other teachers. Fellows this year provided various accounts of the more extended influence the Institute has had, and will have, for themselves and their schools. Several Fellows wrote:

My institute participation should positively affect the school curricula. I will share my unit with other teachers and hopefully we will be able to team-teach at least part of the unit. It could also affect school curricula in other New Haven high schools as the unit will be available to other teachers, especially French teachers. French curricula are similar in each school and would be complemented by this unit.
My unit this year was developed with the philosophy of resource-based learning in mind. As a high school library media specialist, I teach as a member of a team. Either an individual lesson or longer research experience is planned collaboratively with a classroom teacher. I believe that American history teachers will see my work as a terrific foundation on which to develop the learning experiences and look forward to introducing teachers to these materials and activities. In addition I believe that the process by which I developed this unit can serve as a model for other topics in American history and other curriculum areas as well.

The area that I will teach, clothing as an expression of social and political attitudes of a culture, has not been given much attention, but I hope to introduce this unit in our department throughout the school system in New Haven and at all grade levels at a small scale in the beginning.

Since I am the science director for our middle school, I believe I will have direct involvement in developing the science curriculum. I will create an 8-week program that will directly involve all my research on my multiple intelligence curriculum.

Each year we are attentive to the responses of both first-time and veteran participants because we want a high proportion of New Haven teachers to become Fellows and we also want the Institute to become a regular part of Fellows’ professional lives. Both groups cite their own rewards. One first-time Fellow wrote:

This is my first year participating in the Institute. Yale continues to be a rarified environment in which I felt like something of a timid guest. The strength of the program is the depth of knowledge that the faculty brings to the subject matter. The weakness of the program is that most teachers in New Haven have too many students, not enough time, and not enough money. We are used to shorthand and shortcuts, and many of us are excellent jugglers. YNHTI requires us to slow down, think long, hard and deeply before we commit to paper.

Another Fellow wrote:

As this is my first year, I can’t comment on how it compares with other years, but I can say that I’m certain it is better than any staff development offered by New Haven or my other two employers. Its strengths are the caliber of the seminar leaders, the academic focus of the seminars, and its expectation of scholarly effort by the participants.
For returning Fellows, the rewards of participation do not diminish over time, because the experience becomes cumulative, and not repetitive or redundant. In fact, many teachers report that the benefits increase as one has more experience as a Fellow. One returning Fellow wrote:

This was my third year participating in the Institute. I also served as a representative for my school and as seminar coordinator. My participation was great for my curriculum. It also gave me a positive experience that I shared with some of my fellow teachers. I believe that sharing my experience gave a few colleagues the courage to participate. When participation increases in any school, the school’s curriculum can only be improved.

Another Fellow wrote: “After the fifth year of participation I could say that every seminar has been effective, and successful, enhancing our knowledge of how to learn; promoting the unification of special and general education programs.” And a third Fellow wrote:

I always look forward to teaching my curriculum units to my class. I am easily able to incorporate the unit activities into the third-grade reading/writing/language arts curriculum unit. In the actual teaching of the unit I get to see what really works and what doesn’t and I am then able to refine the unit for future use. As a result of my work with the Institute, I am able to teach my students about subject matter that is quite varied, including such topics as Ancient Egyptian civilization, Islamic art and architecture, Modern Latin American women, ancient mythology, and the art of Van Gogh, Picasso, Hopper, and Dali, to name a few.

Every year since 1990, when they became a regular part of the Institute, elementary school teachers have spoken of the advantages of the Institute for them specifically. This year one elementary school Fellow said: “The group mixture of elementary through high school teachers afforded an opportunity to see the different levels to which poetry could be expanded and used.” Another said:

This year’s Institute has proven to be both productive and stimulating for my teaching profession in the elementary classroom. Once again I am excited about having a fresh and new curriculum unit to present to my first grade students this coming school term. This year’s professor had a beautiful balance in asking teachers for outside class preparation. Many years I have felt totally overwhelmed with preparing a curriculum unit, outside class preparation, and all of the demands for teaching in my own classroom that are becoming more involved every year. Our professor was very sensitive in these areas and it was much appreciated.
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Seminar leaders, too, speak of what they gain from participation. They not only appreciate their expanded involvement in public education and the University's home community, they also find that there are often benefits accruing to their own scholarship and teaching. Presenting their experience is especially important because the Institute is often asked to explain the incentives and rewards for Yale faculty members who participate. One seminar leader this year said:

As always, I was invigorated by the interchange with the Fellows. It is especially interesting to try to figure out ways in which one's expertise, which is primarily knowledge of the field but also of human and institutional resources, can be brought to bear on an actual teaching situation in secondary education. It is gratifying when one can suggest a classroom activity that the Fellow finds on target. There also is a public service component here. It is satisfying to explore a practical extension to the broader teaching profession of one's work on the university level, and to have that contribution appreciated in salary.

Another said:

The seminars have always for me been an opportunity to extend and deepen my own acquaintance with material that I've not been able to teach in my regular courses. They have also provided me with many insights into the possible strategies for dealing with this material. I've often learned in this way from the Fellows. But most important for me, I think, has been the opportunity to work with serious adults in an educational context and focus with them on the difficulties inherent in ourselves and our tasks.

Teams of Fellows

For the past eight years the Institute has admitted teams of at least three teachers from one school to a seminar with the expectation that the team members would work as a team. They would coordinate their curriculum units and work together during the school year, planning cross-grade and cross-department instruction and culminating school-wide activities, such as assembly programs, science fairs, or some kind of publication. Each team member, however, must write a unit that could be taught independently. This program, highly successful in several schools, has encouraged teachers who were previously reluctant to participate in seminars on an individual basis to apply to a seminar as part of a school team.

As we have noted, this year a team of Fellows from Beecher Elementary School enrolled in the seminar on "Reading and Writing Poetry" and focused their units upon the topic, "Using African American Poetry to Increase Knowledge and Pride." Each unit targeted a more specific area: feelings,
protest and pride, and family and tradition. All had a strong emphasis on developing student literacy through reading, writing, listening, and speaking. Members of the team have discussed their culminating assembly with their curriculum director, and have begun to meet on a regular basis to coordinate their activities and to plan the event, which will involve other staff members and parents. They hope to hold the event before the April vacation in 2002.

Benefits for Students

The ultimate purpose of the Institute is to strengthen teaching in New Haven’s public schools and in this way to improve student learning throughout the schools. Contrary to what some would expect of a partnership involving Yale University, the Teachers Institute intends to serve students at all achievement and performance levels. Fellows often, in fact, write their units for students at more than one level. While most Fellows (88 percent) reported that their new curriculum units were designed for their “average” students, more than half (60 percent) reported that they were designed for their “advanced” students and almost three fourths (72 percent) also reported that they were designed for their “least advanced” students.

These excerpts from the plans of several Fellows illustrate the wide range of unit use in the schools.

This curriculum unit in bio-medical ethics will definitely impact my teaching, and the students I serve. Because my program deals with students bused into the building, there is not much chance that I will impact the curriculum at my school. The curriculum will be utilized in full, however, in my other program.
"This unit allows me to actively engage students in issues that wrestle with morality and ethics, life vs. death, perseverance vs. surrender, and a multiplicity of other life struggles."

—Institute Fellow

STOP@UNH (The Science and Technology Outreach Program at the University of New Haven). The program works with New Haven students in grades 7-12. I teach the Thinking Skills/English component. This unit allows me to actively engage students in issues that wrestle with morality and ethics, life vs. death, perseverance vs. surrender, and a multiplicity of other life struggles.

I plan to use my unit with the entire sixth grade at my school during science class. By doing this, our sixth grade science curriculum will improve tremendously. Presently, our sixth graders have not participated in the school-wide science fair and this unit will address that issue because I plan to teach bridge building from an inquiry method so that the students can develop the skills needed to complete a science fair project.

The curriculum developed is going to greatly benefit my students in understanding and appreciating art and art history. These are subjects that are very difficult for students who are blind or visually impaired. This curriculum addresses the problems that these students may encounter and will help provide the students with the skills to appreciate and enjoy art, art history, and art museums.

The most important effect that the curriculum unit will have on my school will be my last lesson plan, in which I intend to have an urban/suburban "poetry slam." This "poetry slam" will incorporate students from East Haven High School with my students from Wilbur Cross. In other words, one group is primarily white while the other group is primarily Black and Hispanic. I did a creative writing program with these two groups last year, so I know
something like this is possible but I did not know how to bring it to fruition. My Institute seminar gave me the perfect solution. Most people believe these two groups of kids have nothing in common, but they have poetry in common and rap music and the need and the desire for self-expression.

I intend to use materials and lessons that I prepared for my curriculum unit during the upcoming school year teaching 5th and 6th graders. In fact, I ran the Computer Lab at this year’s Gear Up (summer school) Program for New Haven Students grades 7, 8, and 9 at Gateway Community College. Although my curriculum unit was intended for 5th and 6th graders I modified the computer portion of it and used it during the summer session. The lessons were well organized, well received and extremely beneficial. The lessons enabled the students to look at math from a different angle. The students truly loved the lessons, and although they were being challenged they were having too much fun to complain.

To attempt to gauge the impact of this year’s units in New Haven classrooms, we asked Fellows about the number of students to whom they planned to teach their new unit, and on how many days. Fifty of the Fellows planned to teach their unit to 25 or more students; 28 of that group said that they would teach their unit to 50 or more students. The total number of students to be taught a unit by this year’s Fellows is 3,382. Chart 6 indicates the lengths of time the Fellows planned to teach their units. For all Fellows, the unit is a significant part of their teaching plans.

*Chart 6*

Number of Days 2001 Fellows Plan to Teach Their New Unit

For all Fellows, the unit is a significant part of their teaching plans.
Almost all of the Fellows agreed that they have a higher expectation of their students' ability to learn about the seminar subject.

—I place the heaviest emphasis on literacy through art because the third graders I teach are reluctant to read or write."

—Institute Fellow
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Fellows continue to be optimistic about the responses they anticipate receiving from their students to the material they had studied and developed in the Institute. Almost all of the Fellows responding agreed that, as a result of Institute participation, they have a higher expectation of their students’ ability to learn about the seminar subject. Almost half of the Fellows (45 percent) strongly agreed with that conclusion. We have already quoted some Fellows who spoke about how their own enthusiasm for a subject would motivate students, and how they planned to involve students more actively in classroom learning. Others said:

I am teaching a course entitled “Survey of French Art” in which I lead my students through several different types of art styles. It is a course taught in English, open to the entire school body. Thanks to my seminar leader, I have found an approach that I think will be exciting. We will compare some examples of “inner city” American art with French art. In doing so, we will analyze not only style and form, but subject matter and change in cultures.

The curriculum I have prepared is intended to boost the self-esteem of the children I teach and to familiarize them with the many struggles and accomplishments of African-American people. I do this through the use of quilts as a form of art and a means of storytelling. I introduce the children to the tradition of oral history in Africa and show how life in America demanded a more secretive form of communication for Africans. One of the ways they kept family histories and traditions alive was through the use of quilts. I place the heaviest emphasis on literacy through art because the third graders I teach are reluctant to read or write. I hope that by the selection of artists and their story quilts I will encourage the children to use quilting as a form of storytelling and thus provide them with a reason to read and write.

I believe that my students are going to be very engaged by my unit that deals with issues of exclusion and “being different” in children’s storybooks. The purpose of the unit is to expose at-risk teenagers to a genre of literature that many of them may have missed when they were children and to let them discover through researching articles on the internet the urgency of reading to young children. Not only will they read many children’s stories that address these issues and make numerous trips to the children’s department at the Public Library, but they will also make trips out to read to young children in New Haven and suburban schools, and, finally, they will write and illustrate their own children’s storybooks. These storybooks will be on display in our school.

We also asked Fellows who had participated in the Institute in prior years to report on student responses they had actually observed when teaching units
they had previously developed in the Institute. Their comments were very much in the same vein. One Fellow said:

Having the Institute available has been invaluable in helping me to build a library of innovative curriculum units for my classes. For example, we have addressed cultural diversity issues through units that focus on the poetry and culture of Mexico and the family in China, and have explored the meaning of traditional Jewish holidays that become alive through literature, food, dances, and drama. Other units relate to themes on early pioneers, puppetry, and drama. I have discovered that non-interested students in the beginning of a project get caught up in the success of others and participate joyfully along with their peers. Sometimes, this is due to a collective effort such as making an animated movie in class or participating on stage through a rehearsed drama production or being filmed reading a piece of one’s own poetry with a puppet creation.

Another Fellow said:

The last unit I prepared has been the one I have used the most in class. It was also the one I ordered supplies for from the Institute. I wrote the unit on ways in which films could be used to get seniors knowledgeable about college through watching Spike Lee’s films like School Daze, Higher Learning by John Singleton, and a documentary on Morehouse College. I have used this curriculum for the last few years and I am grateful because it works. It is a great way to start the school year because it helps kids examine college life, and figure out what they want in a college, what
questions to ask, and not feel quite so negative when it comes
time to write that college essay!

Another Fellow said:

Last year I wrote my unit on the Harlem Renaissance, for at-risk high school students. The results were spectacular. With money from a grant from the New Haven Education Fund for materials and money for film and processing and books from the Institute, my students reproduced the most amazing artwork from the Renaissance. The teacher who team-taught with me, and I, took the students to Harlem to the Schomberg Center for Research in Black Culture and to the Apollo Theatre. Forty pieces of art reproduced by the students were on exhibit in downtown New Haven along with a traveling exhibit of photos from the Smithsonian Institute, on the Civil Rights movement. We took our whole school downtown to see their art mounted with the art from the Smithsonian. It was a memorable day. We have photos and slides documenting the unit that took up one whole marking period. We can’t wait to do this unit again, making additions.

And yet another Fellow said:

I have participated in the Institute for the past four years, developing curriculum that I have used. Other teachers have also used the various curriculums within my department and have found them to be extremely helpful. In the summer of 1997 I developed a unit on the “Latino Experience.” I used this unit in the classroom and celebrated Latino experiences through food and music. In 1998 I developed a unit on “Civil Rights Through Film.” I have used many of the films to enhance my lessons on the Civil Rights Movement. In 1999 I developed a unit on the “New Immigrant Experience.” Every spring I coordinate a trip to Ellis Island. In 2000 I developed a unit on “Search and Seizure,” which I have used when teaching the Bill of Rights and the Constitution.

Participants’ Conclusions Overall

We asked Fellows about the extent to which several features of the Institute had been useful to them. As shown in Chart 7 (facing page) below (reading again left to right from the most useful to the least useful), very few Fellows said that any aspect of the Institute had not been useful. In fact, except for the series of talks, membership in the university community, and computer assistance, each aspect of the Institute was regarded as useful to a great or moderate extent by three fourths of the Fellows or more. About half (56 percent) responded that favorably to the talks, about half (57 percent) to membership and more than two fifths (43 percent) to computer assistance. (The latter figure is no doubt misleadingly low, since the question did not take into consid-
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Chart 7
Program’s Usefulness to the 2001 Fellows

Each aspect of the Institute was regarded as useful to a great or moderate extent by three-fourths of the Fellows or more.

We asked seminar leaders to provide their overall conclusions about the strengths and weaknesses of the Institute. One of them wrote: “I continue to be a fan of the Institute, with its emphasis on content, collegiality, and teacher initiative.” Another seminar leader wrote:

The strengths of the Institute are tangible: the way it expands the intellectual horizons of the Fellows; the way it helps bring “cutting edge” scholarship into the public school curriculum; the way it provides teachers with an opportunity to exchange ideas and advice among themselves; the way it energizes all those who participate in it. My concerns (I hesitate to call them criticisms) are two: that the Curriculum Units are too hit or miss by nature. I would love to see the Institute involved in curricular development in a more systematic manner. And I would like to see “the writing process” itself made the subject of Institute seminars. I think that the sorts of intensive instruction in the teaching of writing that goes on at a program like the Bread Loaf School of English should be folded into the Institute.

And a third seminar leader wrote:

The Institute, I’ve come to believe over the past twenty years, is a necessary link between the University and the community, and an
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important pilot project on the national scene. Its strengths are obvious: the encouragement, and the facilitating, of true professionalism in the body of teachers—offering them the chance for creative shaping of substantive curriculum, for sustained responsibility in their own organization, for deepening and extending their knowledge and their pedagogical repertoire. The chance for creativity is essential, but it may sometimes have led—or may seem to others to be likely to lead—to apparently eccentric or self-indulgent products. What the Institute now must cope with is the understandable national emphasis on testing and assessment. It probably must engage yet more directly and systematically the process by which even the most creative curriculum units, which are directed toward the acquisition of valuable knowledge and intellectual skills, can be clearly shaped—and can be seen to be shaped—in accord with district priorities and the public sense of what our national education ought to accomplish.

We also asked Fellows to provide their overall conclusions about the strengths and weaknesses of the Institute. One Fellow wrote:

I have been an Institute participant before and find the strengths are on-going. The speakers are very knowledgeable in the areas of their presentation topic. They share their information in a commendable manner. It is a perk being able to have access to the libraries and the other facilities. Offering CEUs is very good. These are great drawing cards of the Institute. The only downside is that the honorarium is outdated. Teachers, especially new ones, are finding it difficult to participate because of conflicts with other mandatory programs. I find they are willing to become participants in the Institute but are just overwhelmed.

Another Fellow wrote:

The strengths of the Institute are many, and that’s why I am drawn, year after year, to reapply as a Fellow. It provides me with the intellectual stimulation I so crave after teaching young children all day. The lecture series presented an interesting mix of topics that I found informative and thought-provoking. Having Yale Library privileges was essential for this seminar as I found myself doing research not only at Sterling and Cross Campus but also at the Art Library. My professor was always very helpful in suggesting relevant sources, and both meetings I had with him served to help me get a clearer focus on my topic and explore the many directions I could take as I developed my unit. Our coordinator was excellent and she provided us with all necessary information both in class and through e-mail. She was very conscien-
tious. I particularly enjoyed the camaraderie among the Fellows in my seminar. There were always lively discussions going on, and we were given ample opportunity to discuss our units in class. As far as I am concerned, there were not any weaknesses in my experience with the Institute this year.

Despite a range of specific complaints about scheduling and procedures, the Institute's offerings were generally received with enthusiasm, and the results of its program were quite consistently praised.

In their evaluations, almost all the Fellows said they intended to participate (62 percent) or might participate (35 percent) in the Institute in one or more future years. Only two Fellows said they did not intend to participate in the future. One was intending to retire. The other wrote: "I wasn't prepared for the tremendous time commitment that is required to participate in the Institute. Although I enjoyed my participation it was difficult to meet deadlines during the school year." These proportions are very similar to those in 2000.

We should add that there are now 41 members of the administration of the New Haven Public Schools who have participated as Fellows of the Institute for periods of one to eighteen years. The increasing presence of former Fellows in positions ranging from Assistant Principal and Principal to Associate Superintendent has clearly rendered the Institute more visible and has encouraged other teachers to participate in this program.

Electronic Resources and Assistance

From the Institute's inception, Fellows have been full members of the Yale community with access to resources throughout the University. For several years the Institute has been exploring how computing can enhance its partnership, because computing overcomes the barriers of time and distance that can impede collaboration, and because it is a non-hierarchical form of communication and therefore consistent with the collegiality that is a tenet of the Institute's approach.

In 1995 Fellows became eligible to purchase Yale computer accounts, and a number of Fellows have therefore had Internet access and e-mail provided in this way. Although this option remains available, the accounts can be held only for the period in which the teachers remain Fellows. The Institute therefore emphasizes now the assistance it can offer to Fellows in securing Internet access and setting up e-mail with providers who offer longer-term accounts. The Institute has often referred Fellows to the Internet Information Center, which serves the entire Yale community. During the past three years, however, the Institute has offered more direct assistance from its own office. Fellows are also able to use the facilities and assistance at the Yale Computer Centers.
The electronic resources and services available to Fellows include many opportunities to learn about and use computing.

Because of the benefits to the Fellows and to other teachers that result from having the curriculum units on-line, the Representatives had decided that, beginning in 1999, Fellows must submit their curriculum units and guide entries in electronic as well as printed form. They are asked to follow the Institute’s recommendations on word-processing software and hand in the disk version of their second draft directly to the Institute computer assistant (or to the seminar leader, if she or he chooses to perform this function), who checks them for formatting errors and readability. They are returned with a checklist that indicates any problems. This procedure, which sets the stage for a discussion with the computer assistant, ensures that the final version on disk will be free of those problems. This year, when any Fellow came in with a disk, the computer assistant spent at least five minutes at that point, going through the disk and showing the Fellow what needed to be fixed.

The electronic resources and services available to Fellows include many opportunities to learn about and use computing, regardless of previous experience and expertise. The Yale University Library sponsors a series of hands-on computer classes each semester on a variety of topics, including an overview of the Library’s online services, an introduction to Netscape, Internet search engines, and subject-specific Internet workshops. Classes take place in the Electronic Classroom in Cross Campus Library, and are free of charge.

In addition to such Workshops, and in addition to the mandatory assistance provided through the checking of all of the disks on which curriculum units would be submitted, a good number of the Fellows sought additional assistance. In 2001 Fellows received computer assistance on a variety of topics, which included getting started with computing, setting up an e-mail account, getting started on the Internet, using the Internet in research and teaching, using Institute resources on-line, and word-processing and file handling for the preparation of curriculum units. When meeting with the Institute computer assistant, most of them asked for help with basic word processing functions. Their greatest problem was converting their documents to files that could be read by Institute computers, which are equipped with MS Word 97. Fellows also had minor questions about paper-writing itself, including format and documentation.

Forty percent of the Fellows made use of assistance in person, 42 percent by phone, and 29 percent by e-mail. For 34 of the Fellows (57 percent) the availability of computer services was an incentive to their participation. Most Fellows who did not use the computer assistance said they did not need it because they had previously acquired computer skills, or because they had other resources at home or school. A few said they did not do so because of time constraints during the school year. Most who took advantage of the assistance, however, were full of praise for the expertise, the patience, and the persistence of the computer assistant and others whom they consulted.
Of the Fellows using the additional computer assistance, 8 found the assistants helpful in getting started with computing; 8 found them helpful in setting up e-mail and Internet access; 15 found them helpful in using the Institute’s curricular resources on-line; 19 found them helpful in using the Internet in research and teaching; and 21 found them helpful in word processing and file handling for the preparation of a curriculum unit. (See Chart 8.)

**Chart 8**

Computer Assistants’ Helpfulness to the 2001 Fellows

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Number of Fellows</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Setting up e-mail and internet access</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Getting started with computing</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using Institute curricular resources on-line</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using the Internet in my research and teaching</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Word-processing and file handling for the preparation of my curriculum unit</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Electronic versions of the Institute’s publications are now available at its Web-site. The address is http://www.yale.edu/ynhti/. The full texts of almost all the units written between 1978 and 2001, plus an index and guide to these units, are thus available to teachers on-line. Information about the Institute (its brochures and most recent Annual Reports) is also available, as is the text of its periodical *On Common Ground*. To call attention to this resource, the Web location has also been advertised prominently on the cover of *On Common Ground*, which contains articles regarding school-university partnerships and is intended for a national audience.

The Institute has created a “guestbook” on its Web-site, in order to invite comments and suggestions from those who have visited the site. In recent years the site has been used by more and more people in many parts of this country and abroad—school teachers from both public and private schools (including Fellows from other Teachers Institutes in the National Demonstration Project), school and university administrators, parents, volunteers, university professors, high school students, graduate students, librarians, military personnel, home schoolers, local policy-makers, and others conducting research or having an interest in education. We estimate that, from its inauguration in June 1998 through December 2000, the Web-site was visited by

*The Institute’s Web-site has been used by more and more people in many parts of this country and abroad.*
The full texts of almost all the units written between 1978 and 2001 are available to teachers on-line.
evident that the curriculum units written in New Haven have been of great value to many teachers of a variety of subjects. A school administrator in New Hampshire said: “Outstanding resources for teachers!” A graduate student in Arizona said: “Best Web-site dedicated to multicultural education.” A teacher in Arkansas said: “With sites like this there is NO EXCUSE for the non-teaching of these issues in our public education system.” A teacher from Wisconsin said: “As a health educator in diabetes and first year medical students who is transitioning to teaching in the public schools, this site has helped me to appreciate how to integrate literature into the curriculum on a variety of topics.” And a teacher in Washington said: “Thank you for all the work you’ve done and continue to do.”

Institute Centers for Curriculum and Professional Development

In 1996 the Institute undertook with the New Haven Public Schools a new program designed to broaden and deepen its efforts to strengthen teaching and learning in the schools. It offered several elementary, middle, and high schools the opportunity to establish an Institute Center for Curriculum and Professional Development within their buildings. Five such Centers were established in 1996. Over the next four years the Institute has articulated and refined the concept of the Centers, prepared policies and procedures for them, and designed, constructed, and delivered special furnishings to them.

The Institute aims to situate the Centers around the city, targeting the larger schools, so that the majority of New Haven teachers will have a Center at their school or at a school near them. During most of 2001, eleven Centers were in operation. They are located at two elementary schools (L. W. Beecher and Davis Street Magnets), one K-8 school (East Rock Global Studies Magnet), three middle schools (Fair Haven, Jackie Robinson, and Roberto Clemente), and five high schools (Cooperative Arts and Humanities, Hill Regional Career Magnet, Hillhouse, Wilbur Cross, and Sound Magnet). During this year several of the high school Centers have continued to be challenged by school renovations and construction. Our current emphasis is on developing the high school Centers, which are being supported by the Arthur Vining Davis Foundations. For that reason the Summer Academy, described below, focused this year upon preparation for the high school curriculum. Previous Academies had focused upon elementary and middle school.

These Centers are not permanent installations but must be annually renewed. A Center may remain in a school so long as the school has a need and a desire for it, but it can then be moved to another school. Moving Centers from school to school increases the citywide exposure to the Institute. The Steering Committee, which makes these decisions, has developed criteria for targeting sites. A suitable site must be of sufficient size, with a critical mass of participants and a sufficient leadership. It must be able to rely upon a favorably disposed school administration and an appropriate school plan, and it must be...
located in such a position that the majority of the New Haven teachers will have a Center at their school or a near-by school.

The Institute and the New Haven Public Schools view the establishment of Institute Centers as a vital component of curriculum reform efforts system-wide. The Centers carry out school-based plans and address the District’s “Kids First” goals, which call for more site-based management, improvement of curriculum and instruction, greater staff development, increased parental involvement, and improved physical condition of schools. The Centers directly address the first three of these goals and provide new opportunities with respect to the last two. They attempt to create in schools a place that will be conducive to the kinds of conversations teachers have with each other and with their Yale colleagues in Institute seminars. They are intended to increase the visibility and use of Institute resources and include teachers who have not before been Institute Fellows. They disseminate Institute-developed curriculum units more widely, and help the teachers to learn how to use curriculum units that are on-line, explore computing as a means of collaboration, and apply the Institute's principles in new ways within the school environment itself.

The Centers therefore operate from attractive and properly equipped rooms in the schools themselves, containing special furnishings designed by Kent Bloomer, Professor of Architectural Design at Yale, who has led two Institute seminars. Bloomer has designed for each Center two pieces of furniture that will remind the users that a Center is a way of bringing teachers together, and that it is a function of the mutual presence of Yale in the schools and the schools in Yale. Combining utility and symbolism, these pieces have a solidity and elegance in harmony with the tradition of design at Yale University, and an evident durability suggestive of the Institute itself. One piece is a round table, with a hole in the middle, which provides the “center” about which eight people can sit. The center of the table is filled with a circular design, the Yale-New Haven Teachers Institute logo multiplied as a continuous fret, which is done in tile and set in cast metal for permanence. The second piece is a very high bookcase, designed to hold volumes of the curriculum units and other Institute materials, with hand-plated inlay work across the top that carries the same continuous fret depicting the Institute logo. A banner continues the logo of the fret into the room.

Each Center also contains at least one computer with a high-speed modem so that the teachers have easy access to the Institute’s Web site. As noted in the Annual Report for 2000, the Institute has upgraded the computer operating systems at the older Centers to Windows NT. The computers delivered to the newer Centers have this system pre-installed. The Institute also inventoried all Institute resources in the Centers—curriculum units, center manuals, books, videos, etc.—and replenished them when possible. All of the high school Centers have now received new and more powerful computers.
Schools interested in becoming a Center site must apply to the Institute’s Steering Committee. An application, which requires the involvement of the school’s principal and management team, must contain an Academic Plan for the calendar year, describing how the teachers in the Center will take full advantage of Institute resources while working on school plans that address the goals of the District. If a school is selected as a Center site, its Academic Plan must be updated and renewed each year.

Schools selected as Center sites become eligible to receive special resources and incentives from the Institute. These incentives, which are outlined in the Center manual, assist with the Center’s development as well as the implementation of its Academic Plan. The Centers or Institute Fellows at Center schools may apply for mini-grants from the Institute to implement approved aspects of their Center Academic Plan. During 2001 the Centers continued to be supported by a second grant for high school Centers from the Arthur Vining Davis Foundations, received in 1999.

The Centers document their activities through periodic reports. The Steering Committee has established a Coordinating Team at each Center, and a Center Coordinator exercises leadership within that Team. A member of the Steering Committee (at the same school level) is assigned to work with each Center’s Coordinating Team. The members of the Coordinating Team share responsibilities for leading certain efforts within the Center, including documentation. They complete the required reports and are encouraged to document their Center’s work in a variety of ways, including video and audio tapes, photographs, and minutes of meetings.
During the spring semester three very different meetings provided detailed communication among the Steering Committee and the various Centers. The sequence began with a meeting of the Steering Committee and the Center Coordinators. There followed for the Center Coordinating Teams an after-school Forum on Exemplary Practices and Plans, which enabled lively discussion among the teachers and staff members and fuller exchange of ideas among the Centers. Finally, a Retreat enabled the Centers to give more in-depth reports on their successes and problems and to share written material and hold workshops where teachers might learn from one another about curriculum planning in one school that might be used in another. It also provided an opportunity for exploration of additional ways for Centers to work together on alignment of Institute-developed curriculum units with district standards and goals and on mentoring first-year and other new teachers.

For the Forum on Exemplary Center Practices and plans, held on April 5, 2001, each Center selected a topic to highlight and share with colleagues from other Centers. Joseph H. Lewis, East Rock Global Studies Magnet School, spoke on “Enhancing Global Studies through the Center”; Peter N. Herndon and Sheldon A. Ayers, Cooperative Arts and Humanities High School, on “Planning Black History Month Using Center Resources”; Waltrina D. Kirkland-Mullins, Davis Street Magnet School, on “Holding On: Continuing Work with Curriculum Units”; Mary E. Jones, Roberto Clemente Middle School, on “Forging More Collaboration Among a Diverse Staff”; Val-Jean Belton, James T. Hillhouse High School, on “Starting Over: A Center in Progress”; Gail Hall, Wilbur Cross High School, on “Running a Center from the Library Media Center”; Anthony Solli, Hill Regional Career Magnet High
School, on “Using a Center for Teacher Recruitment”; and Jean E. Sutherland, L. W. Beecher Elementary School, on “Recovering from Transfers.” There was also discussion of possible uses of the new Reference Lists that show the relationship of many Institute-developed curriculum units to school curricula and academic standards.

The Retreat on June 15-16 began with a working dinner on Friday evening, at which James R. Vivian gave some remarks on “Following Through on Connections between Institute Resources and District Priorities,” a topic discussed at the last Retreat; Peter N. Herndon and Jean E. Sutherland gave previews of the Institute Reference Lists for High Schools and Elementary Schools; and Carolyn N. Kinder gave a charge to the group about “Disseminating the Lists.” Each dinner table group then discussed Center accomplishments since the November Retreat and the process of Reference List dissemination, and then reported to the session at large. The all-day session on Saturday then focused in two workshops on the Reference List for Elementary School Grades and the Reference List for High School Grades. Reports to the session as a whole and general discussion followed.

An important effort by the Centers was the Summer Academy, the sixth year in which the New Haven Public Schools and the Yale-New Haven Teachers Institute have collaborated to offer a two-week summer session for New Haven students. For four of those six years, the Academy enrolled students from grades three through twelve; in one year an Academy for students in grade five going into grade six was held at East Rock Magnet School. This year’s Academy, which ran from July 23 to August 3, primarily targeted eighth

There was discussion of possible uses of the new Reference Lists that show the relationship of many Institute-developed curriculum units to school curricula and academic standards.
The project clearly demonstrated once again the adaptability of units, or selected portions of units, to classroom situations different from those taught by the authors.

grade middle school students who were about to move on to high school. It was expected that this experience would support their transition in the fall. A few students leaving ninth grade were also included, since another goal was to help prepare students for the Connecticut Academic Performance Test administered to ninth graders in the spring. Held at the Cooperative Arts and Humanities Magnet High School, the Academy enrolled 30 students from fifteen different schools. Since Coop is a regional magnet school, students came from six different towns outside the city.

The project director, a teacher at Coop, was assisted by two co-directors, one an assistant principal at Sheridan Middle School and the other a grade four teacher at L. W. Beecher Elementary School. This year’s program aimed to improve student literacy through a curriculum that focused on subject matter relating to law and architecture. All students participated in both classes. The law class was led by two high school teachers who had taught the subject in other settings; the architecture class was also led by two high school teachers, one in English/history and one in visual arts. Each course was developed by Academy teachers using Yale-New Haven Teachers Institute units written by other New Haven teachers. In the law course three units and in the architecture course seven units were consulted, none of them written by the Academy teachers. The project clearly demonstrated once again the adaptability of units, or selected portions of units, to classroom situations different from those taught by the authors. This is a point that we have emphasized several times in this Annual Report because many people continue to assume erroneously that curriculum units, whether written in New Haven or at other sites, could be of value only to their authors.
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Although the Academy did not draw its faculty or students from as many Center schools as had been hoped, it was a successful instance of Center collaboration. Those teachers involved planned to follow through with the Summer Academy by continuing to work with Academy students and by introducing Academy themes in their courses. Three of them have received mini-grants that will assist them in carrying out this purpose.

Teachers in the Centers may also receive mini-grants to expand Institute curriculum units and relate them further to school themes and district goals. Mini-grants awarded this year include: a project for elementary school children on school violence that involved three teachers; a project for adolescents on cardiac health; a project for high school students on acoustics; an interdisciplinary project for high school that would relate opera, musical theater, and literary form; a high school project relating art instruction to the history of pre-Columbian cultures; and a high school project on the architecture and history of New Haven.

The Institute seeks not only to institutionalize the Centers' work in New Haven but also to integrate the Center concept in its work with demonstration sites in other cities. Again this year, the New Haven teachers on the implementation team for the National Demonstration Project were either Steering Committee members or Coordinators for the Center in their own school.

Preparation for the Program in 2002

From June through August the Institute identified and approached the 61 teachers who would serve during the 2001-2002 school year as the 22 Representatives and 39 Contacts for their schools. During 2000-2001, fifty teachers had served in these ways, 19 as Representatives and 31 as Contacts. Representatives were selected according to recommendations of the teachers who served as seminar Coordinators and conversations they had with persons who had served as Representatives in the past, with other Institute Fellows, and with some school principals. Because the Coordinators had become acquainted with all current Fellows, this mode of selection assures that all Fellows receive consideration for leadership positions. Because the Representatives who had served in 2000-2001 were widely regarded as effective, we sought a high degree of continuity of Representatives.

In 2000-2001 the Representatives and Contacts were well distributed across New Haven schools, with 19 (38 percent) representing elementary schools, 8 (16 percent) representing K-8 schools, 7 (14 percent) representing middle schools, 3 (6 percent) representing transitional schools, and 13 (26 percent) representing high schools. For 2001-2002, there was a rather similar distribution, with 24 (40 percent) representing elementary schools, 9 (15 percent) representing K-8 schools, 12 (19 percent) representing middle schools, 5 (9 percent) representing transitional schools, and 11 (18 percent) representing high schools. Whether or not they had a Representative, all schools had one or more Contacts to serve as a conduit for information to and from the Institute.
Through the Representatives and Contacts, the Institute ensures that all teachers throughout the school district may have an effective voice in shaping a program of curricular and staff development in which they will then have the opportunity to take part.

The attack on the World Trade Center led to the establishment of several seminars of topical importance.

Throughout the school year. (Some Contacts served more than one school.) Of the Representatives and Contacts, 31 percent were Black Non-Hispanic, 60 percent were White, and 6 percent were Hispanic. Representatives attend meetings every other week from September to March. They receive an honorarium for this work and agree in advance to participate in the program they are planning, whereas Contacts perform many of the same functions but are not required to participate in bi-weekly meetings or to commit themselves to Institute participation. Through the Representatives and Contacts, the Institute ensures that all teachers throughout the school district may have an effective voice in shaping a program of curricular and staff development in which they will then have the opportunity to take part.

The first meeting of the Representatives for the new school year was scheduled for September 11, 2001. Because of the tragic events of that date, the meeting was not held, and indeed the Representatives got together for the first time on September 25, at the Institute’s reception for Representatives and Contacts. After that meeting, at which they discussed plans for 2001-2002, the Representatives met twice monthly with the Director. The attack on the World Trade Center shaped to some degree the nature of their conversations and led to the establishment of several seminars of topical importance. Between meetings, the Representatives communicate by phone and through school visits with the Contacts for whom they serve as liaison to the Representatives’ committee. In these ways, their meetings compile information from, and distribute information to, teachers throughout the New Haven elementary, middle, and high schools.

By the end of December the Representatives had approved the following five seminars for 2002: “The Middle East in Film and Literature” (Ellen Lust-Okar, Assistant Professor of Political Science); “Survival Stories” (Amy
Hungerford, Assistant Professor of English and American Studies); "War and Peace in the Twentieth Century" (Bruce Russett, Professor of Political Science); "Environmental Health" (John Wargo, Associate Professor of Environmental Risk Analysis and Policy, and Associate Professor of Political Science); and "Biology and History of Ethnic Violence and Sexual Oppression" (Robert Wyman, Professor of Molecular, Cellular, and Developmental Biology). In January 2002 a sixth seminar would be approved: "The Craft of Writing" (Thomas R. Whitaker, Frederick W. Hilles Professor Emeritus of English).

Moving the Institute Offices to 195 Church Street

Twenty-four years ago, when the Yale-New Haven Teachers Institute was created out of the History Project, the Director and a half-time administrative assistant were allowed to use the History offices in the Hall of Graduate Studies. When A. Bartlett Giamatti became President of the University, he wanted to find a place where administrative programs in the Humanities could be together. He therefore established, in the former Trinity Church Parish Hall that the University had purchased, the Whitney Center for the Humanities. That seemed a fitting place for the Teachers Institute, which became one of the original occupants of the Center.

As the Institute staff grew over the years, especially with the inauguration of the National Demonstration Project, that space became inadequate to house its operations. Looking ahead toward what would be required for the continuing Yale National Initiative, the Institute saw the need to move to an office space that could house a staff that would continue to grow. It also needed to place many historical records in the Yale archives and to find off-site stor-
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age for its file of earlier publications, which could than be recalled as needed to replenish sets in the schools.

The new quarters on the eleventh floor of 195 Church Street are both spacious and appropriate. Overlooking both the Yale campus and the New Haven Green, those quarters recall the Institute logo, which represents Yale as a field of blue and New Haven as a field of green. New furniture was delivered in August; the staff moved in September; files were moved in November; and the final delivery of Institute property occurred in December. At that time, Institute files were placed in the Yale archives, and Institute publications were sent to off-site storage. The academic functions of the Teachers Institute—its seminars and talks, and some other meetings—will continue, as always, to take place on the Yale University campus.

Local Advisory Groups

Steering Committee

The Steering Committee, composed of school teachers who have played leading roles in the Institute at various times since its inception, has responsibility for long-range planning and the implementation of pilot and other new activities of the Institute. Members of the Steering Committee are selected by the Institute Director. A Steering Committee member must be—and must intend to continue as—a teacher in one of New Haven’s public schools. By agreeing to serve as a Steering Committee member, a teacher accepts the following responsibilities. Each member:

1. Exerts leadership and participates actively in one or more of the following areas: establishment and development of Institute Centers for Professional and Curriculum Development in specific schools; preparation of system-wide curricula drawing on Institute curriculum units; development and use of electronic resources and communications; planning and conduct of after-school, Saturday, and summer Academies for teaching Institute units to New Haven students; conduct of interdisciplinary or inter-grade teamwork in specific schools; and organization and provision of technical assistance to Teacher Institute demonstration sites in other cities.

2. Attends and comes prepared to meetings twice monthly and takes professional days when needed to carry out these responsibilities.

3. Participates as an Institute Fellow in the spring and summer following selection as a Steering Committee member.

During 2001 the Steering Committee consisted of Jean E. Sutherland, Peter N. Herndon, Carolyn N. Kinder, and Dina K. Secchiaroli. The Steering Committee operates as teacher leaders for each sphere of Teachers Institute work. It has also assumed responsibility for leadership and assessment of the
Centers, and this provided its main work for 2001. It dealt with the documentation of Center use and activity, the relations with the school district and with principals, the awarding of eight mini-grants to advance Academic Plans in the high school Centers, and the process of renewing Institute Centers and establishing new ones. In the spring it conducted a meeting with Center Coordinators and planned the Forum for the Centers and the Retreat for Center Leaders. It began to consider how, without continuing grant support, the Centers could become more systemic and self-sustaining.

The Steering Committee also handled the preliminary planning for the Summer Academy, and it helped to plan the Yale-New Haven Teachers Institute’s participation in the Third Annual Conference of the National Demonstration Project on October 19-20. Late in the year it undertook a re-examination of the Institute’s leadership structure. It considered expanding the teacher leadership to include the Steering Committee, Implementation Team, Anniversary Planning Committee, and Contacts. It also re-examined the other leadership roles that had existed, in their relationship to each other. In doing so, it also rethought the positions that should exist within each Center school.

The Steering Committee also followed through concerning the new Reference Lists that show the relationship of many Institute-developed curriculum units to school curricula and academic standards. It conferred with the Associate Superintendent concerning communications with principals, arranged presentations to staff developers and library-media specialists, and arranged for presentations at the curriculum meetings attended by those teachers working within each subject-matter area.
University Advisory Council

Yale faculty members advise and assist the Institute through the University Advisory Council and its Executive Committee, both appointed by the Yale President. (For members of these bodies, see Appendix.) The Advisory Council guides the general direction of the program and acts as a course-of-study committee so that the Institute can certify Fellows' work to institutions where they may be pursuing advanced degrees. The Council also advises the Yale President on the Institute and, more generally, on matters concerning the University's involvement with the schools locally and with public elementary and secondary education nationally.

The University Advisory Council meets once each year; the Executive Committee ordinarily meets twice or more each semester. The co-chairs of the Council meet and communicate frequently with the Director between meetings. Members of the Executive Committee and the Steering Committee meet jointly from time to time to share information about their respective activities and to explore appropriate ways of working together. During 2001 Mary E. Miller and then Roberto González-Echevarría became co-chairs of the Executive Committee, and Robin W. Winks joined the Executive Committee.

During 2001 the Executive Committee met in March, September, and October. At the March meeting James Vivian announced that the current and former co-chairs, acting in the stead of the Executive Committee as the Institute's course-of-study committee, had formally approved the Institute's offerings for 2001. The Executive Committee proceeded to plan the spring meeting of the University Advisory Council with President Levin. At the
September meeting the Executive Committee helped to plan the Yale-New Haven Teachers Institute's participation in the Third Annual Conference of the National Demonstration Project. A Search Committee, composed of current and former Co-chairs, is beginning to discuss individuals who have applied or been referred for the positions of Associate Director and Assistant Director. At the October meeting, the Executive Committee discussed the results of the Third Annual Conference and the plans for a continuing National Initiative.

On April 4 the full University Advisory Council held its eighth annual meeting with President Levin. Co-chair Rogers M. Smith opened the meeting by welcoming the members and announcing that, beginning in this second semester, Mary E. Miller had assumed a position as co-chair, replacing Sabatino Sofia. Mary E. Miller then set forth briefly the purpose of the meeting: to consider certain questions about the organizational structure, during the next phase of the Institute's national initiative, of the Yale-New Haven Teachers Institute and a proposed national association of Teachers Institutes.

Director James R. Vivian then described the successful balancing during the past year of the demands of the Institute's local and national commitments. He summarized the seminars offered during 2000 and the range of teachers who participated. He outlined the planning that began last fall for the 2002 program, noting that the Teachers Representatives were able to devise offerings that encompassed the great majority of interests and needs expressed by the prospective applicants. He listed the six seminars now being offered, and sum-
marized the range of schools from which the participants come. He also noted that the Institute's offerings in the Humanities are supported by income from its endowment, whereas the seminars in the sciences are supported by a new two-year grant from the Sherman Fairchild Foundation and in part also by funds from the Howard Hughes Medical Institute Grant to Yale. This is a short-term remedy for the Institute's long-term need for secure funding for its work in the sciences. He observed that the greater-than-usual participation of high school teachers is attributable largely to the special initiative undertaken through the Institute Centers for Curriculum and Professional Development in high schools, which has been made possible by a two-year grant from the Arthur Vining Davis Foundations.

Vivian then summarized the accomplishments of the national initiative. He was now guardedly optimistic that each of the four new Teachers Institutes will be self-sustaining after the ending of the support provided through the grant from the DeWitt Wallace-Reader's Digest fund. He described the new fourteen-year, $63.8 million initiative that had been developed during the past year, which is designed to help sustain the existing Institutes including our own, and create a network of similar Institutes in states across the nation. The proposal envisions that, during the first two years, the four new Teachers Institutes will intensify their efforts, conduct research to document their effectiveness, and discover how to have the most important systemic effects within their districts, regions, or states. The Yale-New Haven Teachers Institute, while conducting similar research, will establish a national association of Teachers Institutes, which will assist in the expansion of the network of Teachers Institutes. It may also be able during these first two years to establish one or two additional Institutes at nationally important sites. (For more complete details, see below, "The Continuing National Initiative.")

Thomas R. Whitaker expanded on Vivian's report, emphasizing the Executive Committee's earlier development of a Draft Proposal for the establishment over a twelve-year period of 27-45 new Institutes in many states. That Draft Proposal, which was shared with President Levin, was then the basis for discussions on November 28, 2000, by the National Advisory Committee and a meeting of University and School District Administrators from the National Demonstration Project with President Levin (as has been reported in the Annual Report for 2000). Whitaker summarized the suggestions made by members of the National Advisory Committee about the kinds of preliminary work that should probably be carried out before launching upon this ambitious plan. It was urged that the Proposal be modified to include a two-year preparation phase, during which all five of the existing Teachers Institutes would be engaged in a process of consolidation, intensification, and preparation. Each new Institute would engage in research on its own kinds of effectiveness and investigate the best ways to have systemic effects within its city, state, or region. At the same time, the Yale-New Haven Teachers Institute would engage in similar research into its own accomplishments, would reflect on what it has learned during the National Demonstration Project, and would gear up for
work on the next major effort. Additional advice was now being sought from the University Advisory Council about that modified Proposal.

Rogers M. Smith presented for discussion this question: In the next phase of the Institute’s national initiative, what should be the organizational structure of the Yale-New Haven Teachers Institute and the national association of Teachers Institutes? He presented three options: 1) Administer the next phase and the National Association as a program within the Yale-New Haven Teachers Institute; 2) create in New Haven a relatively autonomous office for the national association, with the local Institute as a separate activity administered by a Director or Deputy Director; or 3) look for some national educational body that might serve as a partner in this initiative.

Mary E. Miller then presented a second question, inextricable from the first: Should the new phase and the national association both be led by Yale and Yale people, or should the national association be an independent body with the Yale-New Haven Teachers Institute as one member?

James Vivian listed possible national partners, noting that their attractiveness would depend on their constituency and those in charge at any moment. President Levin saw no advantage in finding a partner. He thought that, if we obtained funds for the grant, we could support the necessary staff. Another member added that any national partner would have its own agenda, and we should take that possibility off the table. There was soon a consensus in support of this position.

In discussing the possibility of an autonomous national association, it was noted that there would continue to be problems of "quality control" in a
"franchising operation." President Levin warned that our partners understandably would like to contribute to the effort, and we should capitalize on that desire when possible. He thought we should be open to adaptations, for some might be better adapted to their contexts than the original model. He urged that Yale be a leader in this project but be prepared to use the initiatives of others. Indeed, he said, Yale must be a major presence in any initiative supported by a grant to Yale.

Several members then suggested a Yale National Project that would bring into being a National Association of which the Yale-New Haven Teachers Institute would be a member. There emerged a consensus for a separate office for this National Project in New Haven, with it remaining a Yale-led project at least for the foreseeable future. President Levin said that we should not precommit to the size of the structure until we see what the funding might be. If the funding could be found, he said, a separate building for a national project office, and appropriate administrative staff, could be provided. As the meeting was being adjourned, he called to James Vivian's attention as a possible strategy the structure through which the Yale-New Haven Hospital carried out its expansion to several other cities. The corporation in charge of that expansion and the Yale-New Haven Hospital have a single director, and the two entities have strongly allied deputy directors.

Local Program Documentation and Evaluation

Many evaluations of the Teachers Institute demonstrate that it assists schools in specific ways, and that the results are cumulative. (See especially A Progress Report on Surveys Administered to New Haven Teachers, 1982-1990 [New Haven: Yale-New Haven Teachers Institute, 1992].) In the fall of 2001, the Institute updated its ongoing study of New Haven teachers who have been Fellows. This study notes the proportion of eligible teachers from each New Haven school and department who have participated, the number of times Fellows have completed the program, and whether Fellows have remained in teaching in New Haven. It showed that of the 503 surviving New Haven teachers who have completed the program successfully at least once between 1978 and 1999, almost half (48 percent) are currently teaching in New Haven. An additional 42 (8 percent) have assumed full-time administrative posts in the school system. Thus more than half (56 percent) of all surviving Fellows since 1978 are currently working in New Haven Public Schools. These statistics are particularly encouraging because of the Institute's determination to involve individuals who will continue to serve students in our urban school district. As we noted earlier, the increasing presence of former Fellows in administrative positions has rendered the Institute more visible and has encouraged other teachers to participate in its program.

As Table 2 (facing page) shows, a considerable number of current elementary school teachers in New Haven (13 percent) have completed successfully at least one year of the Institute. (Elementary school teachers were first
admitted in 1990.) As Table 3 (below) shows, 33 percent of New Haven high school teachers of subjects in the humanities and sciences, 30 percent of transitional school teachers, and 28 percent of middle school teachers have also

Table 2
Institute Fellows as a Percentage of Eligible New Haven Elementary School Teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Kindergarten</th>
<th>Grade 1</th>
<th>Grade 2</th>
<th>Grade 3</th>
<th>Grade 4</th>
<th>Grade 5</th>
<th>Total K - 5*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*K-5 teachers in K-8 schools are included here. This table also includes all other subjects, for example non-graded art and special education teachers, librarians, and curriculum coordinators.

Table 3
Institute Fellows as a Percentage of Eligible New Haven Secondary School Teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Middle Schools**</th>
<th>High Schools</th>
<th>Transitional Schools</th>
<th>Overall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Languages</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 5*</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 6</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 7</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 8</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total***</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Grade 5 teachers are included here for middle schools only; grade 5 teachers in elementary schools and K-8 schools are reported in Table 2.

**All K-8 school teachers of the subjects listed here count as Middle School teachers. K-5 teachers in K-8 schools count in Table 2.

***Includes teachers of interdisciplinary and other subjects. Art teachers from K-8 schools are placed based on the grades which they teach most often.

n/a = not applicable
The Institute has worked in the most sustained way with those who have chosen to remain in teaching in the New Haven Public Schools.

The Annual Report is itself a massive compilation of information and statistics.
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done so. A number of teachers have participated for two to twenty-one years. Of those Fellows still teaching in New Haven 40 percent have participated in the Institute once, 30 percent either two or three times, and 30 percent between four and twelve times. On the other hand, of those Institute Fellows who have left the New Haven school system, 50 percent completed the program only once, and 34 percent took part two or three times. Only 36 Fellows who have left (16 percent) completed the program four or more times. Thus the Institute’s cumulative influence in the New Haven school system and its likely effects upon retaining teachers are indicated by the fact that it has worked in the most sustained way with those who have chosen to remain in teaching in the New Haven Public Schools.

In 1996 members of the National Advisory Committee suggested that the Institute engage in fuller documentation of its work beyond the seminars themselves, and of the wider effects of its program in the school system. They believed they were hearing from teachers and staff about many valuable results of the Institute’s work that should be documented in forms that could be made more widely available. The Institute is therefore now documenting more fully the work of teams in the schools, the activities of the Centers and Academies, and the development of electronic resources. This documentation has been summarized in earlier sections of this report.

In addition to their worldwide circulation in electronic form, the curriculum units, the current guide to the units, and the cumulative index to the units are given annual circulation in print. They are supplied to current Fellows and Seminar Leaders, and to New Haven Public School supervisors and administrators, and are deposited in all school libraries in the New Haven district. They remain in print so that sets in the schools can be restocked when necessary.

The Annual Report is itself a massive compilation of information and statistics drawn from a variety of sources, including the questionnaires completed by Fellows and seminar leaders, the tracking of all previous Fellows, statistics pertaining to the New Haven Public Schools, demographic analyses, minutes of meetings, reports from the Centers, reports from the new Institutes in the National Demonstration Project, reports to funders, and so forth. The work that provides material for its preparation extends over the entire year. The Annual Report is available online at the Institute’s Web-site.
NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

A National Advisory Committee, composed of Americans distinguished in the fields of education, private philanthropy, and public policy, assists the Teachers Institute with the dissemination, evaluation, and development of both the program in New Haven and the National Demonstration Project. New members are invited to serve, from time to time, by the President of Yale University. In advance of National Advisory Committee meetings, members of the University Advisory Council and the Steering Committee meet separately and together to discuss program development and evaluation, national dissemination, and finance. On each of these and any other timely topics they prepare papers that are circulated to brief the Committee before the meetings.

As the Teachers Institute plays a leading role in the national movement for university-school partnerships the National Advisory Committee assists in determining how to make the most effective contribution to institutions and schools in other communities. The Committee provides a variety of perspectives that aid in examining what each constituency for such partnerships would regard as the best evidence of their effectiveness.

The Committee last met on November 28, 2000, in conjunction with a meeting with President Levin of the presidents and superintendents (or their delegates) from the sites participating in the National Demonstration Project. Meeting separately at first, the Committee and the presidents and superintendents...
They were convinced of the value of working together on a national scale and looked forward to an expansion of the group of Teachers Institutes.

Annual Report: National Advisory Committee

Those in attendance had great interest in the draft Proposal. They were convinced of the value of working together on a national scale and looked forward to an expansion of the group of Teachers Institutes. Several members of the committee spoke of the timeliness of this proposal and the boldness of its vision. Superintendents and their delegates, including Superintendent John Thompson from Pittsburgh and Superintendent Rod Paige from Houston (now U. S. Secretary of Education), looked forward to expansion of the work in their cities and collaboration with other Institutes on a national scale.

Members of the National Advisory Committee offered suggestions about the kinds of preliminary work that should probably be carried out before launching upon this ambitious plan. They suggested that more research be done on the actual accomplishments of the Institutes now in existence. They suggested also that we consider more fully what has been learned in New Haven about the best strategies for implementing the process of establishing new Institutes. They also anticipated that it would be necessary in one or more ways to demonstrate the direct or indirect results of the Institutes with regard to increases in student learning. They were also clear that such a proposal must indicate how it will have systemic influence on education in this country. One might begin, they suggested, by dealing now with the question of the systemic

They were convinced of the value of working together on a national scale and looked forward to an expansion of the group of Teachers Institutes.

National Advisory Committee meeting with university and school officials from the demonstration sites, November 2000. (Left to right: Esther L. Barazzone, Theodore R. Sizer, Ilene Mack, and Ted Estess.)
influence at each demonstration site. The issue, as Superintendent Rod Paige said, is not just a numerical scaling up in a larger city; it is rather finding ways to have a systemic effect that goes beyond the small numbers of seminars that can be fielded at this time.

It was strongly suggested, therefore, that the Proposal be modified to include a two-year preparation phase, during which the participating Teachers Institutes would engage in a process of consolidation, intensification, and preparation. The new Institutes would do research on their effectiveness and investigate how to have significant systemic effects. At the same time, the Yale-New Haven Teachers Institute would engage in similar research into its own accomplishments, would reflect on what it has learned during the National Demonstration Project, and would gear up for work on the next major effort.

As we have indicated above, under “The University Advisory Council,” and as we shall develop more fully under “The Continuing National Initiative,” this draft Proposal was therefore modified to include the preparation phase that the National Advisory Committee had recommended.

There was no meeting of the National Advisory Committee during 2001.
The four sites represent quite different urban challenges. All have school systems considerably larger than that of New Haven.

Aims and Scope

The National Demonstration Project, supported by a four-year grant of $2.5 million from the DeWitt Wallace-Reader’s Digest Fund (now the Wallace-Reader’s Digest Funds), has aimed to demonstrate the feasibility of adaptations of the Institute approach at several other sites. It has directed its attention to sites where school systems serve a significant number of students from low-income communities, but where the pattern and magnitude of needs and resources are different from those that obtain in New Haven, and where significant opportunities exist, without varying from our approach, for devising local strategies in meeting those needs. During the period from March 1998 through January 1999 the Teachers Institute had invited fourteen sites to submit proposals for 8-month Planning Grants, had supervised the awarding of those Grants on recommendation of a National Panel to five of the seven applicants, and had provided for the recipients a “July Intensive” that enabled a practical immersion in the processes of the Institute, and then, on recommendation of the National Panel, awarded 3-year Implementation Grants to four applicants. Those receiving the Implementation Grants were: Chatham College, Carnegie Mellon University, and the Pittsburgh Public Schools; the University of Houston and the Houston Independent School District; the University of New Mexico and the Albuquerque Public Schools; and the University of California at Irvine and the Santa Ana Unified School District.

The four sites represent quite different urban challenges. All have school systems considerably larger than that of New Haven, and all must deal with serious problems associated with low-income communities and a high proportion of racial and ethnic diversity. But they also illustrate a variety of institutional arrangements and different strategies in approaching those problems. The institutions of higher education include: in Pittsburgh a partnership between a private university focused upon the sciences and a small liberal arts college; in Houston a state-supported urban university; in Albuquerque a flagship state university; and in Irvine a university that is part of a larger state system and is collaborating with the nearby school district of Santa Ana.

During 1999 the Yale-New Haven Teachers Institute began, in part through a second July Intensive Session and the First Annual Conference, to work with the new Teachers Institutes on their plans, provide technical assistance, and encourage their collaboration. It also began to work with the newly established National Steering Committee and National University Advisory Council, and with the external evaluator for the Project, Policy Studies Associates. These efforts continued in 2000, in part through a second
series of site visits and the Second Annual Conference, in which each of the five Teachers Institutes helped to present the challenges and accomplishments of the National Demonstration Project thus far. In November, at a meeting of the National Advisory Committee jointly with senior administrators from the partnerships collaborating in the new Teachers Institutes, those present enthusiastically supported a Draft Proposal for the next phase of the continuing National Initiative, which would seek to establish additional Teachers Institutes across the country. In response to suggestions made at that meeting, the Yale-New Haven Teachers Institute revised and expanded that Proposal during 2001.

During 2001, the last year of the Implementation Grants under the National Demonstration Project, the Yale-New Haven Teachers Institute continued its work with the newly established Teachers Institutes, in part through a third series of site visits and the Third Annual Conference in October. On this occasion the members of teams from all five Teachers Institutes were distributed throughout the panels and discussion groups, as the Conference sought to sum up the accomplishments of the Demonstration Project. The four newly established Institutes submitted their third annual reports in November, 2001. They will be submitting their final reports early in 2002, at which time they may apply for research and planning grants as part of the Preparation Phase of the Yale National Initiative. The Preparation Phase is being partially funded by a one-year extension of the National Demonstration Project under the Wallace-Reader’s Digest Funds. (See below, “The Continuing National Initiative.”)
The Roles of the Yale-New Haven Teachers Institute

During the Grant from the Fund, the Yale-New Haven Teachers Institute has had a dual relationship to the four other Teachers Institutes. It has been both the monitor of the Re-Grants to those Institutes and a senior colleague. It has been responsible for offering technical assistance, for convening the January Orientation Session and the July Intensive Session in 1999, Directors’ meetings in 2000 and 2001, and the Annual Conferences in 1999, 2000, and 2001. It has maintained the National Steering Committee and the National University Advisory Council, sponsored the national periodical On Common Ground, and helped in other ways to further the aims of this network of Teachers Institutes and to disseminate their accomplishments. It has conducted site visits each year to offer assistance and to gain information about the progress of each new Institute. It has received reports from the new Teachers Institutes and compiled its own report to the Wallace-Reader’s Digest Funds. It has collaborated with Policy Studies Associates in providing information for their external evaluation. At the same time, it has encouraged the other Teachers Institutes to develop both a necessary independence and a collaborative spirit. Its aim has been to assist in transforming the group of five Teachers Institutes into a network that might in the future be extended to include Institutes at yet other sites.

These roles have required a continuing reassessment of this Institute’s appropriate emphases. During the planning phase, we mainly provided infor-
mation and experience that might enable the demonstration sites to apprehend and internalize the basic principles of this Institute. By the January Orientation in 1999, the four demonstration sites had begun to work in the spirit of those principles and discover their own collaborative relationships. During the July Intensive Session in that year, the plenary meetings were held about a pentagonal table in order to signal the fundamental equality of the five collaborating Institutes. We planned the First Annual Conference as an occasion for the demonstration sites to step forward with their own best accomplishments and experiences, while we stepped back somewhat to the position of observers. We joined the other Institutes, however, in sending a team to the Second Annual Conference in 2000, and the national planning committee shaped a program that would ensure that the various topics were presented by representation from all Institutes. And for the Third Annual Conference in 2001, the teams from all five Institutes were distributed among the various panels and discussion groups.

During 2001 the Implementation Team of Yale faculty members and New Haven Teachers again assisted with planning, carrying out, and assessing the site visits to the four new Institutes. As in earlier years a Protocol was established to guide the members of the site visit teams. (For members of the Implementation Team, see Appendix.) Supplementary Protocols highlighted the issues specific to each site that had emerged in monitoring by Institute staff and members of the Implementation Team. In two instances Director James Vivian also made an individual visit to a site. This year our main emphasis was on gaining an impression of the Institutes’ first three years of operation, their prospects for continuation, and their plans for systematic impact in subsequent years. The visit to Houston was made on April 16-18 by James Vivian, Thomas Whitaker (Yale faculty member) and Jean Sutherland (New Haven teacher). The visit to Irvine-Santa Ana was made on April 24-26 by Thomas Whitaker, Peter Herndon (New Haven teacher), and Dina Secchiaroli (New Haven teacher). A visit to Pittsburgh was made on April 30-May 2 by Thomas Whitaker and Steven Broker (New Haven teacher). James Vivian then visited Pittsburgh on May 17. A visit to Albuquerque was made on June 20-22 by James Vivian, Thomas Whitaker, Steven Broker, and Mary Miller (Yale faculty member). James Vivian had also made an earlier visit to Albuquerque on January 11.

The Common Work of the Five Teachers Institutes

The Directors’ Meeting: A Directors’ Meeting of the five Institutes was held on March 19, 2001, in New York City. The Directors reported on the programs that each of the five Teachers Institutes had planned for 2001 and commented on any significant developments at their sites, and any changes being adopted or considered. They decided that the survey on curriculum use at each demonstration site would be made during December of 2001 or in January of 2002 and that the results would be reported not in the third Annual Narrative Report but in the Final Report.
James Vivian noted that the site visits this year would spend less time in visiting schools than in previous years. They would seek to include meetings with university and district people who were thinking with an Institute about prospects for sustainability after this year and plans for achieving significant systemic impact within the district. He also stated that the contractual specification of size for an Institute had been somewhat underestimated, given the need to expand over the period of three years, and he assured the Directors that they might well add other schools within their partnering district if that seemed appropriate. (In a later communication, he reminded the Directors that we need a current table of demographic characteristics of teachers and students in all the schools presently targeted.)

The group agreed on a planning process for the Third Annual Conference, to be held in New Haven on October 19-20. It was agreed that for this Conference the members of the participating teams would be distributed among different groups according to topic discussed or function performed. It was also agreed that the number of teachers and seminar leaders attending from each Institute would be increased. And it was further agreed that each Institute might recommend inviting a few persons from the following categories: a university or college president or chancellor or his representative; a school superintendent or his representative; principals from schools with concentrations of Fellows; officers of foundations and corporations that have funded the Institute, or are considering future funding; and the state commissioner or superintendent of public education. The National Steering Committee and the University Advisory Committee, joined by Helen Faison, Director of the Pittsburgh Teachers Institute, as the representative of the Directors, would establish the Conference agenda. Directors would then name the teachers and seminar leaders who would attend the Conference and nominate people from other categories who might be invited, and they would also nominate those who volunteered to lead or participate in the various discussion groups.

In conclusion, there was some discussion of the meeting of university and school officials with Yale President Levin and the Institute’s National Advisory Committee (described above) concerning the proposal for the establishing of Teachers Institutes across the nation. A draft revised to incorporate their recommendations had been enclosed in the mailing that announced the Directors’ meeting.

The National Steering Committee and the National University Advisory Council: Separate and joint meetings of this Committee and this Council were held in Chicago on May 18-19. A separate meeting of the Steering Committee discussed, in the light of suggestions made by the Directors, the design of the survey on curriculum units. They will be conducted at all demonstration sites in December 2001 or January 2002 and will request information regarding the use of curriculum units from 1999 through
the end of the first semester or term of the 2000-2001 school year. They will be administered to all Fellows who have participated in seminars during the life of the project (1999, 2000, and 2001) and to non-Fellows in the participating schools in which at least five percent of the faculty currently eligible for participation have been Fellows. A second separate meeting of the Steering Committee agreed upon a plan for the members to communicate with each other via e-mail and arrange to conduct monthly virtual meetings via Yahoo Messenger. A separate meeting of the Council discussed the progress made in establishing faculty councils at each Institute and explored further means that might exist for strengthening communication among seminar leaders from all the Institutes. Both meetings also provided opportunities to give advice on the possible plans for deepening the four new Institutes’ work and establishing additional Institutes in cities across the country. The joint meeting, which Helen Faison attended as a representative of the Directors, was then devoted to planning the agenda for the Third Annual Conference.

The Third Annual Conference: The Third Annual Conference, the culminating event in the National Demonstration Project, was held in New Haven on October 19-20. Each site was asked to send four current or former seminar leaders, eight current Fellows, and its Director. Each site could also recommend that a few individuals be invited from the following categories: university or college president or chancellor or his representative; school superintendent or his representative; principals from schools with concentrations of Fellows; officers of foundations and corporations that have funded the Institute, or are considering future funding; and state commissioner or superintendent of public education. The Conference was designed to afford the participants and their invited guests an opportunity to discuss their experience and to talk about the future of their own educational partnerships and of their collaborative work across the country.
The Conference, the culminating event in the National Demonstration Project, was held in New Haven.

Concern about airline safety only slightly reduced attendance, indicating the importance of this Conference in the minds of the participants. The five teams of Directors, university faculty, and Fellows were augmented by invited guests that included: the Counsel to the Secretary, U.S. Department of Education; the President of Yale University; the Vice President for Academic Affairs, Chatham College; the Associate Dean, College of Arts & Sciences, University of New Mexico; the Associate Superintendent, New Haven Public Schools; the Chief Academic Officer, Houston Independent School District; the Chief of Staff, Pittsburgh Board of Education; a Principal from Houston; a Principal from Pittsburgh; the Dean of Instruction, Sharpstown Middle School, Houston; a Homebound Teacher, Community Services, Houston; the Director of Foundation Relations and a Development Officer, Yale University; the Senior Program Officer, William Randolph Hearst Foundation; and a Grant Officer, Houston Endowment.

The Conference program was designed by the National Steering Committee, composed of a Fellow from each site; the National University Advisory Council, composed of a seminar leader from each site; and the Pittsburgh Teachers Institute Director, who represented all the site directors when these groups met in Chicago in May with the National Project Director to plan the meeting.

The Opening Plenary Session was chaired by Mary E. Miller, Co-Chair of the University Advisory Council for the Yale-New Haven Teachers Institute. She introduced Helen Faison, Director of the Pittsburgh Teachers Institute, who reported for the Conference Planning Committee. "Now that we have demonstrated that the approach to professional development that has been so
successful in New Haven can be tailored to establish similar university-school partnerships under different circumstances, in different places,” she said, “we need now to exchange ideas, to cross-fertilize the thinking of each of our groups in order that we may move forward.”

President Richard C. Levin, President of Yale University, then welcomed the group and made some opening remarks about the Yale-New Haven Teachers Institute and the National Demonstration Project. “The Yale-New Haven Teachers Institute,” he said,

is a remarkable, successful experiment. It’s taken root here; it’s really very much a part of the fabric of the life of the New Haven schools. It is an important component of professional development for the teachers in this city and an extraordinary opportunity for our faculty to participate in a collegial way with school teachers whose work is so important in the future of this nation. I am a great enthusiast for the National Demonstration Project. And I do want to encourage all of you to sustain the programs in each of your cities. Even though the National Demonstration Project comes to an end, the mission carries on, and we do hope that the programs in Santa Ana, and Albuquerque, and Pittsburgh, and Houston will take root in your communities in the same way that the Yale-New Haven Teachers Institute has taken root in New Haven.
“Even though the National Demonstration Project comes to an end, the mission carries on, and we do hope that the programs . . . will take root in your communities in the same way that the Yale-New Haven Teachers Institute has taken root in New Haven.”

—Richard C. Levin

He vigorously endorsed the aim of expanding “the number of cities and universities and colleges who are engaged in this kind of enterprise,” noting that this idea has received a ringing endorsement from Secretary Rod Paige in the current issue of On Common Ground. And he expressed thanks to the people from the Wallace Reader’s Digest Funds, “who have made it possible for all of this to happen.”

Mary E. Miller then moderated a panel on the topic: “What Have We Accomplished?” Brief comments were offered by Ninfa Sepúlveda, a Fellow from the Houston Teachers Institute, Rene Tolliver, a Fellow from the Pittsburgh Teachers Institute, and Kate Krause, a seminar leader from the Albuquerque Teachers Institute. They spoke of the growth of the Institutes over three years, the increasing impacts they have had on the teachers’ lives and teaching and so on the learning of many more students, the financial challenges and successes, and the teachers’ work in recruiting for an Institute, monitoring its processes, and shaping its direction. These points were amplified by various members of the group in the discussion that followed.

After a break for examining Institute displays, those in attendance moved to Breakout Sessions on the topic: “From Institute Seminar to School Classroom.” Four concurrent roundtable discussions were held on the impact of Institute participation on teaching and learning in urban schools, each led by two Fellows from different sites. Among the topics considered were the impact on the teaching experience and on the students; possible enduring effects of the bridge built between the classroom or school and the host university; specific components of curriculum units that would have been impossible or unlikely without the seminar experience; ways in which the Institute experience has opened doors for the Fellows’ students at the host university; and suggestions
for strengthening the impact of the Institutes on teaching and learning. In one session, for example, the participants emphasized the need for Institutes to be "institutionalized" in order for them to be sustained in the long term. They urged the development of portfolios and other means of assessing the outcomes of student endeavor. And they suggested that, because of the evident value of the seminars, an Institute should work to make them more visible to parents, to other schools, and to other segments of the community.

At the luncheon, then, the whole group received reports on these Breakout Sessions and James R. Vivian gave a charge to the Caucuses on Past Accomplishments and Future Plans. He reviewed the planning for the expansion of the Institute’s national initiative and the strong support given to the proposal by site representatives and the National Advisory Committee last November. He said:

We also heard a consensus in favor of adding an initial phase in which we concentrate on strengthening the existing Institutes and documenting the contributions of the Institute approach, followed by a steady pursuit of the national expansion the proposal described. Now that they have implemented the Institute approach under diverse circumstances, each new Institute, they thought, should intensify its local efforts and devise its own strategy for systemic impact. This, it appeared . . . might be a highly creative next phase of the national project.

He then announced the extension of support from the Wallace-Reader’s Digest Funds into 2003 and a new grant from the Jessie Ball duPont Fund that would make possible the Preparation Phase of the Yale National Initiative. And he stated that we therefore need the Caucuses’ advice, to help us shape that Preparation Phase, on three questions in particular:

• What are the most promising ways for assessing and demonstrating what you believe the Demonstration Project has accomplished locally and nationally?

• How best can we study our collaborative work over the past four years to identify those strategies for working together—whether through conferences such as this one, Summer Intensives such as those conducted in 1999 and 2000, site visits, or in other ways—for developing new Teachers Institutes?

• How can each of the Institutes now achieve a systemic impact in the school district?

The Caucus of Fellows was led by Ninfa A. Sepúlveda of the Houston Teachers Institute; the Caucus of Seminar Leaders was led by Jules D. Prown of the Yale-New Haven Teachers Institute; the Caucus of School and

"Now that they have implemented the Institute approach under diverse circumstances, each new Institute . . . should intensify its local efforts and devise its own strategy for systemic impact."

—James R. Vivian
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There was a consensus that there have been successful transplants of the Yale-New Haven program; that successful collaborations have been developed, not only between teachers and university faculty members, but also among teachers; that these are successful teacher-driven programs.

In the very large Caucus of Fellows, four groups reported on their responses to the key questions. There was a consensus that there have been successful transplants of the Yale-New Haven program; that successful collaborations have been developed, not only between teachers and university faculty members, but also among teachers; that these are successful teacher-driven programs; that many well-developed curriculum units have been written; that the teaching of these units has encouraged higher level questioning and thinking and increased mastery of content areas; that there are successful interdisciplinary programs; that there has been significant development of teacher leadership; that the Institute are being incorporated into district infrastructures; and that a basis for a national network has been established. With regard to a research agenda and future developments, however, the responses were various. It was agreed that much data collection takes place now and should be continued. It was felt, however, that in some respects the autonomy of the Institutes and the teacher-driven nature of the programs might best be served by not integrating the Institutes too deeply with district infrastructures. It was noted that in larger districts it would be difficult or impossible to reach a large percentage of the teacher population. All agreed that each Institute should continue to be active with a national network of Institutes, that July Intensive Programs have been valuable, and that it will be useful to have further annual conferences.

In the Caucus of Seminar Leaders, much emphasis was placed on the achievement of a bridge between the university and the community in which it
exists. It is a mode for institutional outreach and a way in which to keep the focus on issues of diversity. An Institute is also valuable, members of this Caucus said, in strengthening the “educational continuum,” the continuity of the educational experience, and helping people at different stages of their academic career. Another accomplishment is the development within each university of a core of senior faculty who remain in contact with each other and have an influence within the institution that they can exercise on behalf of the Teachers Institute and related issues. Seminar leaders also spoke of the advantages of visiting the schools in which their Fellows have taught. They felt that new Institutes should visit the existing sites as part of their developing their own proposals. They also felt that the new sites should, if possible, be K-12 sites and should arrive at a clear understanding of the degree of support that can be expected from their school district or districts and from the university. The seminar leaders also thought that the July Intensives were valuable but in future should led by faculty from other institutions in addition to Yale. The annual conferences, too, in future, should move around from site to site. The seminar leaders thought that the National Project office should be a center for communication and have a role in developing national funding. Some felt that it should also have an important role in establishing standards and assessing the progress and the operation of the various Institutes.

Those attending the Caucus of School and University Administrators and Foundation Officials testified to the professional growth of public school teachers, a decrease in teacher isolation and an increase in collaboration, a growth of high quality, content-rich curriculum in direct correlation with the participation of colleges of arts and sciences, a mutual respect among institutions, and a reinvigorated interest in the joy of learning in both teachers and university professors. The group proposed that there be studies of the impact of the curriculum units on student learning, the impact of the Institutes’ programs on teacher progress and professional development (specific skill-related outcomes), and the ways in which teaching teachers to become inquiry-based learners has improved styles and strategies of teaching and so improved the learning in the classroom. It also wanted to add communicative skills as an integral part of the Institute program, and then conduct research to determine whether an increase of communicative skills would improve teaching and learning. And it felt that Institutes should become a line item in the professional development budgets of school districts. The National Project office, in the view of this group, might coordinate a research agenda, help all the sites network with each other, establish priorities for grant applications, promote a national legislative agenda, disseminate strong outcomes, and assist local sites with public relations and publicity.

The Caucus of Directors covered many of these same points. They also spoke of the development of a national organization for rigorous professional development of teachers on both school and university levels. They noted that an Institute can provide an unusual opportunity for university faculty members to analyze their own teaching methods. Institutes have also moved the profes-
Institutes have strengthened the professional morale for teachers and faculty, and have involved teachers in addressing standards.

"That is one of the challenges that is so exciting about this project: that the same topic that you engage in, on an adult level, can be presented at so many different levels to the young people that you teach." —Susan K. Sclafani, Counsel to the Secretary of Education
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sional development of public school teachers outside the exclusive province of colleges of education, have strengthened the professional morale for teachers and faculty, and have involved teachers in addressing standards. And the Directors also cited the importance of using the Teachers Institutes to meet outreach requirements for grants, and the desirability of a national group to assist in providing rigorous planning and benefits for institutions.

The Plenary Session that followed, moderated by Roberto González-Echevarría, Co-Chair of the University Advisory Council of the Yale-New Haven Teachers Institute, received reports from these four Caucuses.

After a reception at the Yale Center for British Art, during which Jules D. Prown presented some remarks on the Center and current exhibitions, those in attendance had dinner at the Sterling Memorial Library. James Vivian then introduced Susan Sclafani, Counsel to the Secretary of Education. "No one," he said, "has provided more strategic or more timely leadership and support for the establishment of the Houston Teachers Institute than our speaker this evening has done."

Susan Sclafani addressed the group on “Teacher Development, Critical to Leaving No Child Behind.” After speaking of the necessity of both standards and an assessment system, she said: "We’ve got to change the way in which we prepare our young people.” And she amplified:

Part of the reason that you are working in this Institute is because you have understood that you weren’t getting all of your children engaged; that there had to be better ways to develop curriculum, there had to be better ways to learn. You needed yourself to learn new strategies that could be effective with the young people you teach—and to do that in a way that you had some say about.

Most professional development offered in America, she said, is not first rate. It is an attempt to focus on those areas that we think are most important, but to do it the same way for everybody. That ends up not being much better than our trying to teach all of our students the same way; it doesn’t work. What appealed to us in Houston—and what appealed to you in Albuquerque and Pittsburgh and Santa Ana—was that there was a different way of doing it. There was a way to change your way of thinking about how you might approach a topic, how to engage yourselves in an experience that got you excited about a topic that you thought you might have some interest in, and then to figure out, among you, how do you take this back—some of you to elementary-school children, others of your to middle-school children, others of you to high-school children. That is one of the challenges that is so exciting about this project: that the same topic that you engage in,
on an adult level, can be presented at so many different levels to the young people that you teach.

Sclafani spoke of “teacher quality” as “the most important factor in whether our children learn.” And that, she said, “is what this project is all about.”

It is taking teachers who sometimes get disheartened by what large systems do to them, who don’t believe that people really believe that they are very good or that they are important or that they can make real contributions, because sometimes administrations don’t act that way. Instead, it says, “Take this opportunity, create for yourselves a seminar that will excite you, that will give you an opportunity to look at a topic in a different way, and then figure out how to take this back to your students in a way that will engage them as they haven’t been engaged before.”

She challenged the group “to figure out how to expand and grow” the number of teachers involved in Teachers Institutes, within the cities represented now by such Institutes and within other cities when they want to join in this process. “How do we turn district-wide professional development into this? . . . How do you start having an influence on the way in which all teachers are engaged in intellectual pursuits? Because that really is the great issue.”

On the following morning there were five concurrent Breakout Sessions on Institute practices: “Handling Seminar Dynamics,” led by Amelia Regan,
A principal and school district official praised the institutes as "a new wave of professional development" and "invaluable." An associate superintendent urged "a national teachers institute of some kind."

UCI-Santa Ana Teachers Institute, and Lynn W. Marsico, Pittsburgh Teachers Institute; “Writing Syllabi and Helping Teachers Write Curriculum Units,” led by Thomas R. Whitaker, Yale-New Haven Teachers Institute; “Challenges of Leading and Coordinating a Seminar,” led by Janet E. Stocks, Pittsburgh Teachers Institute, and Jean Sutherland, Yale-New Haven Teachers Institute; “Disseminating Curriculum Units,” led by Douglas Earick, Albuquerque Teachers Institute, and Marilyn Frenz, UCI-Santa Ana Teachers Institute; and “Implementing and Influencing District and State Standards,” led by Helen S. Faison, Pittsburgh Teachers Institute. The session on “Writing Syllabi and Helping Teachers Write Curriculum Units,” for example, dealt to a large extent with the need for seminar leaders to meet at the outset with the directors and with experienced Fellows to get a better sense of the nature of this kind of seminar. The session on “Handling Seminar Dynamics” dealt with several problems that might be met by a seminar leader. It suggested some techniques that seminar leaders and coordinators might use in such instances and two institute-wide measures that should be maintained or inaugurated—a strong commitment to equity, inclusion, and respect for diversity, and training sessions for leaders and coordinators.

The session on “Implementing and Influencing District and State Standards,” in contrast, began with a review by Helen Faison of the history of the movement toward standards, and it then addressed questions concerning the advantages and the dangers in standards-based education, the special problems related to such education in urban school districts, the role of the Institute
in the standards-based movement in those districts, the future role of the Institute as the model expands. At the end of the session a principal and school district official praised the institutes as “a new wave of professional development” and “invaluable.” An associate superintendent urged “a national teachers institute of some kind.” And teachers said: “The Institutes give teachers a chance to be responsible for their own teaching,” and “It’s the best professional development I’ve ever had.”

After a break for informal discussion, there were four concurrent Breakout Sessions on Core Values. Each participant was assigned to one of the four sessions. They were led by Colston Chandler, Albuquerque Teachers Institute; Daniel Addis, Houston Teachers Institute; James Davidson, Pittsburgh Teachers Institute; and Connie Weiss, Pittsburgh Teachers Institute. Those in one session felt emphatically that the most important thing that Teachers Institutes do is to improve the quality of teaching in the schools by infusing rigorous academic content knowledge. The seminars, they also felt, provide an opportunity to participate in the joy of learning, which allows the participants to appear to their students as role models of life-long learners. The Fellows in that session felt that the ability to write an academically solid curriculum unit was a more important achievement than the unit itself—though they believed the units to be valuable, especially as the basis for modification in later years. They found that collegiality is an essential feature of the Institutes, they urged that all seminars should be open to all grade levels. With regard to assessment, they urged that, in addition to devising portfolios and other means of assessing the performance of students taught by both Fellows and non-Fellows, there should be some effort to discover evidence that a well-trained teacher leads to better student performance.

Those in another session found the core values of an Institute to be: intellectual rigor (interpreted broadly to include access to resources, real immersion in serious knowledge, fostering the love of learning, and sharing teacher experience with students); professionalism (as fostered by the university, involving seminars based on teacher needs and interests, including adequate compensation, and dictating reciprocal openness of the schools to the university); collegiality (involving equity, openness of seminars to all teachers, respect for diversity, a sense of community, and collaboration); and creation of a curriculum (research-based, designed for specific students, demonstrating professionalism, with narrative guidelines allowing some flexibility).

Those in a third session stressed as core values: teacher leadership (as articulated through the Institute’s structure); the curriculum units (substantive, including an appropriate form of assessment, written to be implemented in the classroom, and making a contribution to the educational community); the Director (chosen through collaboration between the partners of the Institute); and compensation (for Director, seminar leaders, teacher representatives, and Fellows).
At the top of our list, we are teacher-driven and collegial. That's the source of where these seminars come from.

—Caucus Chair

The Third Annual Conference showed that the five Institutes are prepared to collaborate in many ways, through formal and informal meetings and other communications. All participants welcomed the fact that the Yale-New Haven Teachers Institute had now assumed a position of equality with the others in both the planning and the carrying out of the Conference.

Responses from team-members to the questionnaire distributed by the Yale-New Haven Teachers Institute were even more uniformly positive than after the Second Annual Conference. There were repeated calls for the continuation of Annual Conferences and for a new series of July Intensives. There were many suggestions as to ways of assessing student outcomes and providing demonstrations of an Institute's effectiveness. One Director said:

Overall, I think this year’s Conference was the most organized and best run of all the Annual Conferences. In particular, I think the discussions on Future Plans and on ways for the National Teachers Institute Association to work together hold the most promise and should be developed more fully.

Another Director said:

It is my hope that the new Institutes will continue to exist and will remain in touch with each other and with the Yale-New Haven Teachers Institute. It is my hope that the Institute will be expanded to accommodate more of the schools and teachers in the district and that the School District will encourage teacher participation in the Institute and their use of the curriculum units that they and other teachers develop. It is also my hope that the Institute will be able to respond successfully to the local district's need to offer seminar experiences for teachers in academic disciplines that are undergoing significant change to prepare students to achieve the new academic standards that are being implemented nationwide, such as in reading, mathematics, and writing. This, I hope,
the Institute will be able to do without abandoning the salient features of the teacher professional development model that has been developed in New Haven.

For the local research effort, this Director indicated an interest in discovering if there is a difference in the performance of teachers after they participate in the Institute and a difference in the learning outcomes of the students enrolled in their classes, and also discovering if the instructional competence of teachers who participate in Institute seminars of their choice exceeds that of teachers who participate in mandatory professional development offered by their school districts. A university administrator said on this topic:

There's a growing body of research on teacher effectiveness, and growing interest in sustaining teacher professional growth, building on the call from the National Commission on Teaching and America's Future for a qualified teacher in every classroom and the observed need to retain qualified teachers in a time of teacher shortage. And research on learning has pretty clearly established that active, inquiry-based learning is more effective than learning by lecture, rote, or drill. The Institutes should build a research agenda around these observations by systematically studying teachers' professional lives to understand how participating in Institutes affects Fellows' longevity in the classroom, their motivation to engage in other professional development, and their approaches to teaching. While "teacher testimonials" won't be persuasive, systematic study of the quality of teacher professional lives can be.

A school district administrator agreed that "We need to articulate the professional development research that has linked student achievement with quality teachers and teaching. It is available." The university administrator also suggested, with regard to "systemic impact," that

We should study the schools in which concentrations of Fellows teach to understand how colleagues can influence the professional community within those walls, what difference Fellowship makes to those communities, and how participation spreads. Studies that compare the professional communities in schools with Institute Fellows and those without them may help to establish the value of the Institutes.

Looking toward the future, a university faculty member said: "There can be no impact unless the school system wants it. The substantial commitment of the school system in the preparation of the proposals should be carefully verified." He added: "I feel that the most important thing prospective new sites can do is to develop strategies for long-term financial stability, at least to the extent that local political uncertainties allow." And he concluded:

"Research on learning has pretty clearly established that active, inquiry-based learning is more effective than learning by lecture, rote, or drill. The Institutes should build a research agenda around these observations."

—University Administrator
I was extremely pleased to see how well each program was developing.... Because I lean naturally toward cynicism, it was especially useful in boosting my belief that a collection of these programs can really make a difference.

The responses of school teachers were generally in accord with the views expressed by directors, administrators, and university faculty members. Several urged the use of pre- and post-testing as part of curriculum units. Such data, said one, “can be collected and put into a format that can be meaningful.” Another stated that “it is necessary to establish greater district level involvement without diminishing the significance of the seminars being teacher driven.” Another said: “I think the Yale model is a good one and that new Teachers Institutes should adhere as closely to the model as is practical. We received a lot of help from Yale and the new Institutes will also need this same sort of guidance.”

Another teacher said: “I think we should have a national office or a national organization that will allow the various Institutes to retain the same core values and original mission of the Yale-New Haven Institute as a unifying theme.” And yet another teacher said that the continued collaboration of the new Teachers Institutes is “crucial.” Commenting on the value of such an Annual Conference as this, she said: “I only wish we had more time to discuss curriculum units, problems in writing, teaching conditions, and strengths and weaknesses of site practices.” And she recalled with approval the process by which the Urban Sites Network (under the National Writing Project) took on new sites as cohorts, adding more each year, the new sites working with the existing sites.

As it prepares for the continuing of the National Initiative, the Yale-New Haven Teachers Institute will be paying close attention to the suggestions offered during this Third Annual Conference.

The Work of the Four New Teachers Institutes

Throughout this year, as last year, the Yale-New Haven Teachers Institute has been working with the four new Institutes in a variety of ways. Patricia Lydon, Liaison to the sites, has been monitoring and advising on budgetary and organizational matters. Director Vivian has been responsive to many questions and difficulties of a more wide-ranging character. Contacts have continued between teachers and faculty members on the Implementation Team with their counterparts at various sites. Site visits have provided first-hand information from university and school administrators as well as teachers and faculty members. And the annual narrative and financial reports of the four new Institutes have set forth their challenges and accomplishments during this second year of implementing the National Demonstration Project. In its third Annual Report
Annual Report: The Work of the Four New Teachers Institutes

to what is now the Wallace-Reader's Digest Funds, the Yale-New Haven Teachers Institute has described its monitoring and technical assistance in considerable detail. Here we offer a condensed account of the continuing experiences of the new Institutes.

**Pittsburgh Teachers Institute:** This Institute, bringing the resources of Chatham College and Carnegie Mellon University to a selected portion of a school district that now has 95 schools serving 39,000 students, began working with 20 elementary, middle, and high schools, representing the three regions of the district. In 2001 it reached out to several other schools, and in 2002 it intends to open its program yet more widely across the School District. The Director, Helen Faison, an experienced teacher and school administrator and former chair of the Education Department at Chatham College, had been relieved of her duties from July 1999 until June 2000 in order to assume the position of interim-Superintendent of Schools in Pittsburgh. During that period John Groch, Assistant Professor of Communications at Chatham College, served as Acting Director. Helen Faison, who stayed in close touch with Institute matters and who retains the title of Distinguished Professor of Education at Chatham College, has now returned to the directorship.

Despite a number of administrative changes at both of the sponsoring institutions of higher education and the Pittsburgh Public Schools, their support of the Pittsburgh Teachers Institute has not lessened. In 2001, the Institute offered eight seminars, one of which was cancelled because of insufficient enrollment. Thirty-six Fellows completed curriculum units for the following seven seminars: “Media Revolutions” (James Davidson, Adjunct Professor of English, Carnegie Mellon University); “Pittsburgh’s Environmental History” (Steffi Domike, Visiting Professor of Art, Chatham College); “Contemporary Latin America: Culture and Civilization” (Karen S. Goldman, Associate Professor of Spanish, Chatham College); “Kitchen Chemistry” (John Hagen, Assistant Professor of Chemistry, Chatham College); “The Math Connection” (Richard Holman, Professor of Physics, Carnegie Mellon University); “The Twenties (The Lost Generation)” (Alan Kennedy, Professor of English, Carnegie Mellon University); “Diversity and Resistance” (Janet Stocks, Director, Undergraduate Research Initiative, Carnegie Mellon University).

There continues to be an effort to relate the curriculum units explicitly to the national, state, and local standards that all Pittsburgh Public School curricula must meet. To be eligible for increment credit from the Pittsburgh Public Schools a unit was required to meet some or all of the student achievement standards that have been established by the Pennsylvania Department of Education and the Pittsburgh Public Schools for the content area in which it will be taught. The Fellows found the Fellows' Handbook, which had been revised by a subcommittee of the Steering Committee, to be helpful in preparing their units. Indeed, the curriculum units written in Pittsburgh now indicate one way in which, without limiting intellectual diversity or creativity, the format of a unit can be usefully standardized. Instead of a single narrative,
Faculty members from both of the sponsoring institutions of higher education have begun to accept the Institute as an extension of their campuses and as a means by which to meet the outreach mission of their institutions.
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most of the units now divide the sustained prose into titled subsections: Overview, Rationale, Objectives, and Strategies—followed by Narrative or Classroom Activities. Most units also include the relevant district standards in an appendix.

A College/University Advisory Council provides advice to the Director. Among the issues it is discussing are whatever modifications need to be made in the Institute after the demonstration period if the Institute is to become institutionalized. There also now exists a Chatham College Faculty Advisory Council, formed by President Esther Barazzone of Chatham College.

There continues to be a vigorous core of teacher-leaders. The school representatives who constitute the Steering Committee exercise, with minimal direction from the Director, most of the responsibility for Institute-sponsored activities. They will function as a committee of the whole for the recruitment of Fellows for the 2002 seminars. Eager to continue the Institute beyond the expiration of the original grant, they will assist the Director in recruiting new schools into participation, assist in the distribution of Institute literature, and accompany the Director on visits to schools and to meetings as necessary.

Faculty members from both of the sponsoring institutions of higher education have begun to accept the Institute as an extension of their campuses and as a means by which to meet the outreach mission of their institutions. During the Fall 2001 term, a Carnegie University Professor in the English Department assigned one of the students in her class to the Institute as an intern. A professor of Sociology at Carnegie Mellon has included the Institute in a recent proposal submitted to a local foundation. As a result of her experience as a semi-

Doris Z. Braun’s students at the Mifflin School in Pittsburgh studying her curriculum unit on “Revisiting the Fabulous 50s.”
narrator, she became interested in obtaining support for an activity to involve students enrolled in her classes being taught by Fellows enrolled in her seminars. The retention rate of seminar leaders, two of whom from Carnegie Mellon have led seminars for three years in succession, is further evidence of the high regard with which the Institute is held by those faculty members who have been directly involved.

Although the Pittsburgh Federation of Teachers is not a sponsor of the Institute, its officers and members continue to support the project. The union makes its facilities available for large group sessions of the Institute and adjusts its own schedule of research and development programs to accommodate the Institute’s seminar schedule whenever possible to reduce the number of schedule conflicts facing teachers who wish to participate in the seminars.

Steps had been taken in 2000 to restore the number of participating schools to the original number approved in the implementation grant. In 2001 the Director began conferring with principals about the Institute’s desire to open its seminars to schools citywide.

In developing the seminars for 2002, the Institute can now count on funds to support three seminars in which the School District has a special interest, limited to teachers of a specific subject. One in middle grade science and one in secondary school mini-courses in mathematics are being funded by a local foundation whose three-year grant will support all expenses except stipends for the teachers. The School district will provide the stipends from its National Science Foundation grant. The third seminar is an American History seminar for teachers of 8th grade American History. Funds for this seminar, including stipends for the teachers, will be provided by the School District from a three-year grant by the United States Department of Education. (Both the Pittsburgh Teachers Institute and the Houston Teachers Institute were recipients of such a grant.) There is still a possibility that funds will become available to support a project on signage for students of Fellows who completed seminars offered in the past by a professor of sociology at Carnegie Mellon.

School Representatives and Contacts solicited their colleagues to develop a list of other topics in which teachers were interested. The tentative list for 2002 includes:

Funded Seminars for Specific Participants:
Learning Science through Doing Science (Middle School Science Teachers)
Developing Mathematics Mini-Courses (Secondary Mathematics Teachers)
Explanatoids: Signage to Seed Science Talk in Pittsburgh Public Places (primarily for Elementary and Middle School Teachers)
Immigration and American History (Teachers of 8th Grade History)
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Teacher Choices, First Tier, as Funding and Interest Permit:
- Comedy: From Aristophanes to the Present
- Everyday Physics on the Athletic Field
- Latin America and U. S. Popular Culture
- Mythology, Fairy Tales, and Folklore in Children’s Literature
- Survey of African-American History by Way of African-American Literature and Art

Teacher Choices, Second Tier, as Funding and Interest Permit:
- Famous Figures in American History: Inventors and their Inventions
- Genetics and DNA Identification

This Institute has become an approved provider of in-service courses for the district, and the public school community continues to think of it as a permanent opportunity that will be available to teachers in the Pittsburgh Public Schools. This desire leads to the need to find the support necessary to continue the Institute beyond the expiration of the Demonstration Project. In 2001 the Pittsburgh Teachers Institute continued to use funds from a grant of 1999 from the Grable Foundation; it also received a grant of $50,000 from the Heinz Foundation and a grant from the Pittsburgh Foundation of $196,000 for use in 2001-2003.

Houston Teachers Institute: This Teachers Institute brings the resources of the University of Houston to the Houston Independent School District, where 280 schools serve 212,000 students. It began working with 20 self-selected middle and high schools enrolling 31,300 students to establish a program that will address the needs of an ethnically mixed student-body, a large proportion of whom are non-English speaking. It then expanded its scope to include five elementary schools close to the University of Houston and a range of other schools in the district, for a total of more than thirty schools. These schools have the same demographic characteristics as those in the initial target scope. First opportunity for enrollment was given to the teachers from the 20 schools that were originally targeted, before turning to applicants from other schools. Paul Cooke, who had been a Visiting Assistant Professor of Political Science at the University of Houston, is the Director of this Institute.

In 2001 the Houston Teachers Institute accepted 75 Fellows from 27 schools into the five seminars it offered (a sixth seminar having been cancelled because of the illness of the seminar leader). Of those enrolled, 39 completed a curriculum unit. The seminars included: “Shakespeare Alive!” (Sidney Berger, Professor and Director, School of Theatre); “Multicultural Works: The Richness of the Drama of America” (Elizabeth Brown-Guillory, Professor of English and Associate Dean of the College of Liberal Arts and Social Sciences); “Figuring the Odds: Learning to Live with Life’s Uncertainty” (Michael Field, Professor of Mathematics); “Film and American Values over the Decades” (Cynthia Freeland, Professor of Philosophy); and “World Order:
What Current Events Tell Us About World Politics” (Joseph Nogee, Professor of Political Science).

The Institute continues to rely upon a vigorous but small group of Teacher Representatives, who meet regularly to carry forward its work. The Director has arranged for Teacher Representatives to receive professional development credit for their involvement in the Institute. Ted Estess, Dean of the Honors College, and Sam Lasseter, Director of Corporate and Foundation Relations, as well as a core of committed faculty members are offering assistance. Both the University of Houston, which is now pledged to provide the Director’s salary, and the Houston Independent School District, which from the outset has been making a comparable financial contribution, are strong supporters of the Institute.

The Houston Teachers Institute has recognized its on-going problem of attrition and is seeking to remedy that by fuller explanations to prospective applicants of the work entailed by writing a curriculum unit, and by planning for 2002 two Curriculum Writing Workshops. The growth of its Teacher Representative team will also help by providing more assistance to new applicants.

On the basis of polling teachers and refining their suggestions, the Teacher Representative committee settled on some fifteen possible seminar
The Institute continues to rely upon a vigorous but small group of Teacher Representatives, who meet regularly to carry forward its work.

The Director proposes that the Houston Institute "remain true to the vision for school-university partnerships provided by the Yale-New Haven Teachers Institute" and "maintain connections to what will become a league of teacher institutes started through the effort to duplicate the Yale program.”

director Cooke has been pursuing possibilities for funding in future years. In harmony with his emphasis on teacher leadership, he developed in collaboration with teachers, and with additional counsel from faculty members, a proposal to that end: “A Houston Teachers Institute Vision Paper: The Continuation of the Institute for a Second Three-Year Term, 2002-2004.” He proposes that the Houston Teachers Institute “remain true to the vision for school-university partnerships provided by the Yale-New Haven Teachers Institute” and “maintain connections to what will become a league of teacher institutes started through the effort to duplicate the Yale program.” The Houston Teachers Institute would seek to offer seven, eight, and nine seminars in the next three years. This plan also calls for increasing the number of schools involved with the Houston Teachers Institute to approximately 50. The Institute has already raised $627,150 to meet the cost of $965,346 for this next three-year period. This includes $80,000 from a grant of $150,000 in 2001 from the Arthur Vining Davis Foundations, $50,000 from a grant of $150,000 in 2000 from the Houston Endowment, and $10,000 from a grant of $30,000 in 2000 from the Powell Foundation. It also includes approximately $160,000 from an award by
the U. S. Department of Education for Project TEACH, jointly planned by the Institute and the Houston Independent School District, which will fund two seminars in the area of American history for each of these three years.

The Institute will also be requesting other kinds of funding but will emphasize "seminar sponsorship"—in effect expanding the kind of funding initiated by the grant from the U. S. Department of Education. It will ask potential supporters to undertake the funding of an Institute seminar at a cost of $25,000 per year.

Of this proposal Dean Ted Estess has written:

It is a strong proposal, well conceived, thoughtful, even provocative. From The Honors College here at the University of Houston, I can say that we hope very much that the proposal can be funded and enacted. The Houston Teachers Institute is already bearing good fruit in the Houston Independent School District and among faculty at the University of Houston. We want to build on that good foundation.

Albuquerque Teachers Institute: This Institute, bringing the resources of the College of Arts and Sciences at the University of New Mexico to a district that serves 85,800 students in 121 schools and enrolls a high percentage of Hispanic students from low-income families, had targeted 21 middle and high schools where the problem of a high attrition rate is most serious. Two new schools were added in 2000 to the service population: Sandia High School and the Career Enrichment Center. In coming years the Institute has expected to add elementary schools from within the clusters already served.

In 2001, the Albuquerque Teachers Institute offered eight seminars for 77 teachers (73 of whom completed a curriculum unit): "Gods, Heroes, Myths: The Legacy of Ancient Greece" (Monica S. Cyrino, Associate Professor of Classics and Chairperson, Foreign Languages and Literature); "When the Good Go Bad: Why Juveniles Become Delinquent" (Paul Steele, Associate Professor of Sociology); "Brach to Bach to Bohr: Physics and the Arts" (Colston Chandler, Professor of Physics and Astronomy); "Math and Reality—An Investigative Approach" (Adrianna Aceves, Lecturer in Mathematics and Statistics, and Cathy Gosler, Lecturer in Mathematics and Statistics); "Spirit of the Rio Grande/Rio Bravo: Culture, Environment and Bioregionalism" (Enrique Lamadrid, Associate Professor of Spanish and Portuguese); "The South Valley, the Environment and Future Development" (Teresa Cordova, Associate Professor, School of Architecture and Planning); "Media Literacy: An Examination of the Effects of the Media on Youth" (Michael McDevitt, Assistant Professor of Communication and Journalism and Bob Gassaway, Associate Professor of Communication and Journalism); and "Science, Technology, and Society: Forces of Change" (Timothy Moy, Associate Professor of History).
The new Dean of the College of Arts & Sciences, Reed Dasenbrock, has put the Albuquerque Teachers Institute as one of his top priorities for funding support and will assign a new development program officer to the task of securing long-term funding.

Since July 2000, Doug Earick, who has been a science teacher in the Albuquerque Public Schools, has directed the Albuquerque Teachers Institute. The support of the University of Mexico continues to be strong, with $100,000 pledged for operating costs in 2002. The new Dean of the College of Arts & Sciences, Reed Dasenbrock, has put the Albuquerque Teachers Institute as one of his top priorities for funding support and will assign a new development program officer to the task of securing long-term funding. In January 2001 Brad Allison, Superintendent of the Albuquerque Public Schools, wrote: “With the hiring of a new Director of Professional Development, we anticipate a closer and stronger tie between ATI and the district’s overall teacher training model. . . . APS is interested in continued work with the ATI. As we examine all professional development opportunities in APS, we would like to expand participation in the ATI and focus the seminars on district priorities.” The district’s recent restructuring process, in which leadership and programs have been consolidated into new departments and much of the work now delegated to individual schools and clusters of schools, may provide the Institute with new opportunities for service and funding. Among other things, Virginia Durán-Ginn, the new co-director of Teaching and Learning Systems, has suggested the possibility of focusing the seminars on district probationary schools, or “Superintendent Schools,” each of which has about $50,000 set aside for professional development.

The Institute continues to experiment with schedules that may meet the desires of the teachers and also provide adequate opportunity for reading and writing within the seminar period. Because of complaints that the compressed schedule makes it difficult to do the seminar reading and write a substantial curriculum unit, and also makes it difficult for Fellows to share their writing-in-progress, in 2000 the seminars were extended from three to four weeks. The Institute offered one seminar in 2001 that ran from March to May, primarily for teachers from Rio Grande High School. This experiment had only mixed success, but other options may be tried in the future. Because of the substantial attrition in 2000 between the admission of Fellows to the beginning of the seminars, there was a greater emphasis in 2001 to make certain that teachers understood the time and work commitment in advance of application. The increased rate of completion suggests that this effort has been successful. The Institute continues to focus on the difficulty of recruiting teachers into science seminars.

After surveying teachers about the topics in which they would be interested, the Teacher Steering Committee developed a rough list of seminar ideas for 2002. They include: Fairy Tales; Crime and Punishment: Criminal Justice in the American Legal System; Bioethics; Holy Wars: The Politics of War; Albuquerque: Its History, Its Culture; The Story of English: The Origins of the English Language; the History of Mathematics; New World Economics: The Global Economy; American in Music: Our Musical Heritage; Shakespeare; World Literature; and Fear in the Media. The final list of eight topics will depend largely on seminar leaders who can be recruited.
The Albuquerque Teachers Institute has received a grant of $150,000 from the Arthur Vining Davis Foundations for 2000-2002, a grant of $42,460 from the New Mexico Collaborative for Excellence in Teacher Preparation for 2001-2002, and an Eisenhower Grant from the New Mexico Commission on Higher Education of $35,424 that will provide major support for two seminars in 2002 in science and mathematics. The Director is also seeking support from the National Science Foundation and the National Endowment for the Humanities. Other funding may come in new collaborations between the district and the university in developing joint projects.

UCI-Santa Ana Teachers Institute: To Santa Ana, a city with 51 schools now serving over 60,000 students, a majority of whom have only a limited knowledge of English, the UCI-Santa Ana Teachers Institute has brought the resources of the nearby University of California at Irvine. The University has long worked with school systems in several neighboring districts, recently through its Center for Educational Partnerships. The UCI-Santa Ana Teachers Institute focused initially on a selected 26 elementary, middle, and high schools, representing all four areas of the Santa Ana system. The Director of this Institute is Barbara Kuhn Al-Bayati, who was formerly the Partnership Liaison in the Center for Educational Partnerships at the University.

The Institute has an opportunity to show that curriculum units work well in a mainly Hispanic environment where most students have limited fluency in English. This is of special importance because the California systems of education face serious problems as a result of the discontinuance of bilingual education in the schools and affirmative action admissions to higher education. The legislature has therefore provided the state universities additional funds to work on outreach. Most recently, however, it has appeared that some of these funds may be in jeopardy because of the energy crisis in the state.

In 2001 the UCI-Santa Ana Teachers Institute offered ten seminars—four more than this Institute had proposed for inclusion in its budget. Sixty-five teachers from the Santa Ana Unified School District applied and were admitted. There was some immediate attrition, resulting in an initial enrollment of 58 Fellows in the ten seminars. Because of anticipated under-enrollment from the target group of schools in the Santa Ana Unified School District, the Director decided to open the seminars to all Santa Ana teachers. Only one Santa Ana school not previously involved was gained and retained. The Director then decided to open the seminars to teachers from schools outside of the Santa Ana Unified School District. This was a departure from the approach of the National Demonstration Project, which cannot support expenses pertaining to people not part of the Teachers Institute partnership. James Vivian therefore ruled that only those Fellows from the Santa Ana Unified School District, and only the budgetary expenses pertaining to them, could be supported by the Project. The Santa Ana enrollment (62 Fellows) constituted about two-thirds of the enrollment (92 Fellows) in the ten seminars. At the end
of the seminar process, 39 of the 62 Santa Ana Fellows completed a total of 42 units. (Three Fellows were taking two seminars each.)

The six seminars supported by the National Demonstration Project were: “Music as Expressive Culture” (Robert Garfias, Professor of Anthropology); “Literature, History, Gender: Ancient Civilizations and their Afterlives” (Jane O. Newman, Professor of English and Comparative Literature and Director of the Program in Comparative Literature); “Law and Justice at the Millennium” (John Dombrink, Professor of Criminology, Law and Society, and Mark Petracca, Associate Professor and Chair of Political Science); Non-Canonical Writers from Mexico and Latin America (Jacobo Sefami, Associate Professor and Chair of Spanish and Portuguese); “Introduction to Bioethics” (Salme Taagepera, Lecturer and Academic Coordinator in Developmental and Cell Biology); and “The Natural History of Orange County” (Peter Bryant, Professor of Developmental and Cell Biology and Director, Developmental Biology Center). The four seminars not supported by the National Demonstration Project, which included some Fellows who were so supported, were: “Identity and Community: An Interdisciplinary Approach to the Humanities” (John H. Smith, Professor of German and Director of the Humanities Center); “What Are the Chances? Probability and Statistics in Everyday Life” (Amelia Regan, Assistant Professor of Civil and Environmental Engineering); “The Hardy Personality in Theory, Research, and Practice” (Salvatore Maddi, Professor of Psychology and Social Behavior, and Deborah Koshaba, Lecturer in Psychology and Social Behavior, and Director of Program Development and Training, the Hardiness Institute); and “Homer’s Odyssey” (Julia Lupton, Associate Professor of English and Comparative Literature and Director of Humanities Out There).

As at other Institutes, there has been here an increasing emphasis upon explicit linking of the curriculum units to State standards. But unlike other Institutes, this Institute has also placed an emphasis upon preparing students for matriculation at one of the State institutions. This is in accord with an aim of the Center for Educational Partnerships, with which the Institute retains very close links. The Institute intends to track from this point of view the progress of students in classes whose teachers have participated in the program.

The Institute has a committed group of seminar leaders and Coordinators, and a small group of teachers has also given advice and support to the Director. The faculty leadership is potentially very strong, and there has been administrative support in the University and the School District at the highest level. Former Vice Chancellor William Lillyman (who then became Advisor to the Chancellor) had stated that there should be no problem in obtaining necessary financial support from the University for this Teachers Institute over the long term. Superintendent Al Mijares of the Santa Ana Unified School District had also expressed great enthusiasm for the Institute. And both Lillyman and Assistant Vice Chancellor Juan Lara have spoken of the possibility of later expansion through the university system of California.
The UCI-Santa Ana Teachers Institute has decided, however, that, on completion of the grant for the current partnership between the University of California at Irvine and the Santa Ana Unified School District, it will become in 2002 "The UCI Teachers Institute," which will bring together UCI faculty and teachers from ten high schools in five school districts. This new initiative will increasingly focus on the articulation of college preparatory courses with University of California courses. This has for some time been, in fact, an aim of the Center for Educational Partnerships at the University. For 2002 the UCI Teachers Institute plans to offer some seminars according to the schedule established by the UCI-Santa Ana Teachers Institute; then, in the fall, it will begin a second set of seminars that will follow more or less an academic year schedule. The plan, as thus far outlined, centers in the University and does not constitute an actual partnership with any of the five districts being served.

National Accomplishments

The Annual Report for 1998 had given an account of the distinctive pattern of needs and resources at each of the four new Teachers Institutes. Each is at a somewhat different stage of development; and each in certain ways may serve as a model for the establishment of Teachers Institutes elsewhere in the United States. The Institutes also illustrate different patterns of relationship to state mandates, local resources, and institutional apparatus—and the state-funded universities will be especially interesting in this regard. Each site has also gone through a distinctive process in arranging for a director. The Annual Reports for 1999, 2000, and 2001 have updated the progress at each of these Institutes, noting some of the major challenges and accomplishments at each.

Here we summarize briefly the most important accomplishments of the National Demonstration Project as a whole and note some of their implications. After three years of implementation, the National Demonstration Project has demonstrated in four different cities larger than New Haven.

1) that a Teachers Institute serving approximately 20 schools at the outset can be rapidly inaugurated, can be sustained, and can begin to grow;

2) that it can sustain at the outset a program of 4-6 content-based seminars in the humanities and sciences, which increase teachers' knowledge, heighten their morale, and result in individually crafted curriculum units of substance for use in classrooms;

3) that such Institutes can arouse the enthusiasm and support of significant numbers of teachers and university faculty members;

4) that the experiences of those teachers and university faculty members, and the personal and professional rewards they cite, will resemble those in New Haven;
The National Demonstration Project has shown the importance of the principles upon which these Institutes are based. And it has shown that such Teachers Institutes can make a substantial contribution to the most important kind of school reform in this nation—the improvement of teaching itself.

With regard to the prospects for continuity and sustainability beyond the terms of the Grant, the signs are optimistic indeed. At all four sites, many teachers who have been Fellows are becoming enthusiastic recruiters of new Fellows. Substantial groups of faculty members are learning the importance of Institute procedures and are assisting in the operation of the Institutes. At all four sites, top-level administrators in institutions of higher education had pledged to assist in the seeking of funds. At three sites they had pledged university financial support in addition. At three sites, school districts have made a substantial financial commitment. And at two sites, school administrators are providing significant help in the seeking of additional funds.

All four Teachers Institutes have declared their intention to apply for Grants for Research and Planning in the Preparation Phase of the continuing Yale National Initiative. As outlined below ("The Continuing National Initiative") these Grants will support research into the results of Institute par-
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ticipation on teachers, their students, and schools in the school district that is a partner in establishing it, and planning for an Institute to attain a systemic impact in that school district.

The very stiff requirements of cost-sharing for the Grants under the National Demonstration Project were met in part through the help of district funds but in a variety of ways. At UCI-Santa Ana the University has been the major contributor; at Albuquerque the contributions of University and district were for a time roughly equal; at Houston the district has been of primary assistance; and at Pittsburgh outside funding has been of greatest importance.

At each Teachers Institute certain seminars have emphasized local history, literature, geography, architecture, ecology, or economics. All four Teachers Institutes have also paid close attention to the mandates, standards, and interests of local school districts and state educational systems. In Pittsburgh there has been a special effort to see that both seminars and curriculum units are in accord with the district academic standards. And Directors and Fellows at the other Teachers Institutes have increasingly emphasized the desirability of making explicit the ways in which each curriculum unit relates to district standards.

The prospects for longer-term scaling-up look very good at this point, and the four new Teachers Institutes have already pointed toward some ways in which this might be accomplished. In Pittsburgh, two institutions of higher education have established a consortium that can serve as a model for expansion elsewhere. In Albuquerque and Irvine-Santa Ana, top-level administrators have been thinking in different ways about expansion in other districts and elsewhere in the state. Rod Paige, Secretary of Education and formerly Superintendent of the Houston Independent School District, has noted that scaling-up within an urban area need not mean simply an increase in the number of seminars; it might be accomplished through various ways of assisting more fully the priorities of the district. The continuing National Initiative of the Yale-New Haven Teachers Institute calls for a two-year Preparation Phase during which newly established Institutes can assess their accomplishments and determine the most appropriate ways of scaling-up within their districts, regions, and states.

The dialogue among sites across the nation has been an important objective of the National Demonstration Project, and will continue to be so in the Yale National Initiative. The increasing collaboration evident in the First, Second, and Third Annual Conferences, and the establishment of web sites, indicate that this is also an important area of national accomplishment. University and school officials, not only teachers and faculty members, want ongoing opportunities to work together and to learn from each other.

The Yale National Initiative will take advantage of the substantial momentum established by the National Demonstration Project, as it invites Institutes now to work more closely as the nucleus of a nationwide network of Teachers Institutes.
We have come to appreciate more fully that the major elements of the Institute approach are intricately intertwined and that they all seem necessary.
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Institutes. The interest shown in the Request for Proposals for Research and Planning for the Preparation Phase of the National Initiative during 2002-2003 has been very heartening. In December 2001 all four of the newly established Teachers Institutes indicated their intention to apply for Grants for Research and Planning in the Preparatory Phase of the Yale National Initiative.

Learning in New Haven

We noted in the Annual Reports of 1998, 1999, and 2000 that we have become increasingly convinced of the necessity of direct observation and participation in the process of getting acquainted with the principles and practices of the Teachers Institute. We also noted that New Haven teachers and Yale University faculty members have been learning as individuals, gaining among other things a heightened sense of being part of a national community of concerned educators. The Third Annual Conference gave us as a group and as individuals a yet clearer sense of participating in a far-reaching collaborative endeavor.

We continue to recognize the need for some revisions in the Request for Proposals that will be made in connection with Implementation Grants for additional Institutes in the continuing Yale National Initiative. We have come to appreciate more fully that the major elements of the Institute approach are intricately intertwined and that they all seem necessary. Sites should probably be asked to adopt more of the structures for teacher leadership and faculty influence that we have developed in New Haven. This might include requirements for a body of Teacher Representatives, suggested schedule of meetings, the nature of the canvassing of teachers for seminar topics, and the establishment of a faculty advisory council. We may also have to spell out more fully the responsibilities and functions of the Director of an Institute, and the minimum length for the “long-term” seminars. At the same time, we think it might be well to indicate more specifically the areas in which local variations would be possible and perhaps advantageous.

In confronting transitions at several Teachers Institutes, we developed procedures that should be followed in naming a new Director. These procedures essentially mirror those that would be followed in New Haven, as set forth in our Policies and Procedures. We would require that teacher and faculty groups play a key role in identifying, interviewing, and selecting a new Director. This would be an open process that is advertised in some fashion. And the selection would ultimately have to be made by the individuals (President and Superintendent) to whom the Director must report.

We also discovered that we had needlessly limited the target scope of a new Institute and should provide more flexible guidelines here that permit expansion as necessary. And we realized more fully that the appropriate strategies for attaining systemic impact at the various demonstration sites may well differ from those in New Haven. We continue to believe, however, that the Centers for Curriculum and Professional Development in New Haven may
suggest a useful starting point for efforts in other Institutes to have an influence beyond the seminars themselves. We are heartened by the interest that has been shown in them by certain of the newly established Institutes.

Finally, we believe that we must devise additional ways to bring Directors, teachers, and faculty members into a working understanding of Institute procedures over the longer term. Despite the success of our orientation sessions and our July Intensives, we need yet other ways of reaching those who enter into an Institute’s activity after its inauguration, and we think that this need is especially apparent in the case of the expanding pools of faculty members.

**On Common Ground**

With support in part from the Carnegie Corporation of New York, the Institute had published Number 8 (Winter 1998) of its periodical, *On Common Ground*, which has a national circulation to policy-makers, educational leaders, and funders. This issue took stock of the entire movement of university-school partnerships over the past fifteen years. The Editorial surveyed the four years of publication of this periodical, noting the high points in each Number, and making clear the scope and sequence that had been planned and supervised by the Editorial Board. It summarized the Institute’s year of planning for the National Demonstration Project, and it concluded that *On Common Ground* has great potential as a means of disseminating the results of that Project to a wider readership of those interested in university-school partnership.

Although funds for the continuation of *On Common Ground* are still being sought, the Institute was able to publish a special issue—Number 9—in Fall 2001. This special issue dealt with the National Demonstration Project and the promise of this kind of work for the future. Leading off with a piece by the U.S. Secretary of Education, Rod Paige, it included articles from university, college, and school administrators.
"I applaud the Yale-New Haven Teachers Institute for supplying models for what universities should do. Its projects are not just inspiring, they are creating an environment in which partnerships will be the norm, not the exception."

—Rod Paige
U.S. Secretary of Education
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university faculty, school teachers, Institute directors, and a funder. (Contribution of such articles from the new Teachers Institutes had been specified in the Request for Proposals.)

The college and university administrators contributing to the issue included Esther L. Barazzone, President of Chatham College; William C. Gordon, President of the University of New Mexico; Arthur K. Smith, Chancellor of the University of Houston System and President of the University of Houston; and Michael Fischer, former Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences at the University of New Mexico, now the Vice President of Academic Affairs at Trinity University in San Antonio. University and college faculty members included Elisabeth Roark of Chatham College, Kate Krause of the University of New Mexico, John H. Smith of the University of California at Irvine, and Rogers M. Smith, formerly of Yale University and now at the University of Pennsylvania. The school teachers included Daniel Addis of the Houston Independent School District, Mel Sanchez of the Santa Ana Unified School District, and Jean Sutherland of the New Haven Public Schools. The article by a funder was provided by Owen M. Lopez, Executive Director of the McCune Charitable Foundation. And two directors—Helen Faison of the Pittsburgh Teachers Institute and Paul D. Cooke of the Houston Teachers Institute—provided their perspectives. In sum, this issue laid out all aspects of the process of establishing and maintaining a Teachers Institute, and it made clear in great detail the benefits of such Institutes, as perceived and experienced by the participants.

Secretary Paige led off by asking: “Does America know how to teach?” He was struck by the fact that in our major cities “world-class colleges and universities” are “sharing neighborhoods with many of our most dangerous and under-performing schools.” He therefore challenged more colleges and uni-
versities to establish partnerships with school districts. "They can help teachers develop curricula," he said, "offer schools access to their facilities, and help mismanaged schools improve their management."

Secretary Paige spoke from his experience as Dean of the College of Education at Texas Southern University and as the Superintendent of Schools in the Houston Independent School District during the time when the Houston Teachers Institute was being established. In concluding he said:

I applaud the Yale-New Haven Teachers Institute for supplying models for what universities should do. Its projects are not just inspiring, they are creating an environment in which partnerships will be the norm, not the exception. Every great university should be linked to its surrounding schools by a thriving and many-tiered partnership. Observers should not ask why a few universities have partnerships, but why the rest do not.

National Advisory Groups

National Steering Committee

The National Steering Committee, formed on the model of the Steering Committee that helps to guide the Yale-New Haven Teachers Institute, has been composed of one school teacher from each site participating in the National Demonstration Project. Members of the National Steering Committee have been selected by the Director of the National Demonstration Project for a one-year term from January through December. They have been teachers prepared to help guide the project, to help plan the conferences, and to suggest topics most in need of discussion. They have provided and received other advice and information, and have helped to ensure that teachers were playing a leading role in the demonstrations and in the common work. They have also provided feedback on the usefulness of each meeting and have furthered the communication among the sites. It has been required that a Steering Committee member be—and intend to continue as—a teacher in one of the public schools participating in the National Demonstration Project. In separate and joint meetings with the National University Advisory Council, they have provided a forum in which shared opportunities and problems could be discussed to the mutual benefit of all.

By agreeing to serve as a National Steering Committee member, a teacher accepted the following responsibilities. Each member:

1. Exerts leadership and participates actively in one or more of the major endeavors at a demonstration site.

2. Participates as an Institute Fellow in the seminar offerings at that site in the year during service as a National Steering Committee Member.
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3. Attends and comes prepared to meetings of the National Steering Committee.

4. Participates actively in the functions of the National Steering Committee.

Members of the Steering Committee for 2001 included Carol Petett of the Pittsburgh Teachers Institute, Dan Addis of the Houston Teachers Institute, Blake Learmonth of the Albuquerque Teachers Institute, and Mel Sanchez of the UCI-Santa Ana Teachers Institute. As described earlier, during 2001 the Committee met in May to discuss the design of the survey on curriculum units. It also agreed upon a plan for the members to communicate via e-mail and conduct monthly virtual meetings via Yahoo Messenger. And, with Helen Faison, Director of the Pittsburgh Teachers Institute, as representative of the Directors, it joined with the University Advisory Council to plan the agenda for the Third Annual Conference in October.

National University Advisory Council

The National University Advisory Council, formed on the model of the University Advisory Council that helps to guide the Yale-New Haven Teachers Institute, has been composed of one university faculty member from each site participating in the National Demonstration Project. The members of the National University Advisory Council are selected by the Director of the National Demonstration Project for a one-year term from January through December. They have been faculty members prepared to help guide the general direction of the project, to help plan the conferences, and to suggest topics most in need of discussion. They have provided and received other advice and information, and helped ensure that university faculty members play a leading role in the demonstrations and in the common work. They have also provided feedback on the usefulness of each meeting and furthered the communication among the sites. In separate and joint meetings with the National Steering Committee of teachers, they have provided a forum in which shared opportunities and problems can be discussed to the mutual benefit of all.

By agreeing to serve on the National University Advisory Council, a faculty member accepted the following responsibilities. Each member:

1. Exerts leadership and serves as an advisor at a demonstration site.

2. Attends and comes prepared to meetings of the national University Advisory Council in New Haven.

3. Participates actively in the functions of the National University Advisory Council.

Members of the National University Advisory Council for 2001 included James Davidson of the Pittsburgh Teachers Institute, Cynthia Freeland of
As described earlier, during 2001 this Advisory Council (joined by Rogers Smith of the Yale-New Haven Teachers Institute) met in May to discuss the progress made in establishing faculty councils at each Institute and to explore further means for strengthening communication among seminar leaders from all Institutes. It also met with the National Steering Committee to plan the agenda for the Third Annual Conference.

**National Program Documentation and Evaluation**

**Internal Documentation and Evaluation**

Extensive and complex processes of evaluation, with elaborate questionnaires for Fellows and seminar leaders, have always been included within the procedures of the Yale-New Haven Teachers Institute. Such evaluation has been extremely important in persuading funders, the University, and others of the value of this effort. It has also been important as a continual self-monitoring that helps the Teachers Institute to chart its course into the future. For these reasons the National Demonstration Project requires that each of the new Teachers Institutes engage in very similar kinds of internal evaluation. Each is committed to undertaking at its own cost, in cooperation with the Yale-New Haven Teachers Institute, an annual review of the progress of the project. Each partnership assumes responsibility for a continuing self-evaluation.

The internal documentation and evaluation at each site become part of a more comprehensive evaluation undertaken by the Yale-New Haven Teachers
The internal documentation and evaluation at each site become part of a more comprehensive evaluation undertaken by the Yale-New Haven Teachers Institute.

These annual reports have been designed to have great usefulness for each of the demonstration sites in their local management, planning, and fund-raising.
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Institute and embodied in its annual and final reports to the DeWitt Wallace-Reader's Digest Fund (now the Wallace-Reader's Digest Funds). The four new Teachers Institutes provide Institute staff, the Yale-New Haven Teachers Institute Implementation Team, and other documenters sent by that Institute with full access to their activities and their documentation, including school and university personnel and sites. Each Teachers Institute submits interim financial reports, annual narrative and financial reports, and a final narrative and financial report. The contracts with the several sites, which have been summarized in our Annual Report for 1999 and in the Brochure for the National Demonstration Project, spell out in detail the necessary contents of these reports.

The first report from each Institute, for 1999, explained how the new Institute is addressing certain concerns that were noted on the occasion of the awarding of the Grant. It also described the scope, the strategy, and the demonstration goals of the new Teachers Institute. It explained the process by which it has been established and maintained, the ways that it has adapted the New Haven approach, its current activities, and the progress made toward the specific goals of the site's demonstration. The reports for 2000 and 2001 include continuing description of the Institute's activities and progress. Each report also contains a summary of the accomplishments and impact of the demonstration thus far, the impediments encountered, the unanticipated outcomes, and the lessons learned.

These annual reports have been designed to have great usefulness for each of the demonstration sites in their local management, planning, and fund-raising. They have provided information for our own Annual Reports and for the annually revised Brochure for the National Demonstration Project. They have informed us in our daily work with the new Institutes by alerting us to significant accomplishments, issues to be faced, and the need for special visits. These reports have regularly provided background for our annual site visits, which focus (with varying emphasis from year to year) upon all aspects of the operation of the new Teachers Institutes, including their administration, their funding, their development of teacher leadership, their planning and carrying out of the seminar program, and the writing of the curriculum units.

The information gleaned from this documentation has also been used for annual conferences and directors' meetings, which provide continuing conversation among the sites and enable comparison and revision of the demonstrations in progress. And it has informed the dissemination by the Yale-New Haven Teachers Institute of the results of the project.

The contracts with the partnerships sponsoring the new Institutes specify that, at least once during the grant period, a report will include a survey of the use of curriculum units by Fellows and non-Fellows in the school system. It was agreed at the directors' meeting in 2001 that this survey would take place in 2001-2002 and would be included in the final narrative reports. Those
Annual Report: National Program Documentation and Evaluation

reports, due on 28 February 2002, will summarize the three-year demo­nstration in terms of the items covered by the annual narrative reports and will then answer the following questions:

1. What do you think are the most important outcomes, impacts, and lessons learned from this project?

2. How has it changed the way in which your institution or other institutions may address these issues?

3. What plans do you have for continuing the partnership at your site?

Are there any other observations or reflections that you would now like to make about your partnership’s work under this grant?

4. The information contained in these annual and final reports has been transmitted with the Yale-New Haven Teachers Institute’s annual and final reports to the Wallace-Reader’s Digest Funds. Those reports by the Yale-New Haven Teachers Institute have provided its own supplementary interpretation and assessment of the National Demonstration Project in accord with the criteria specified in the awarding of the Implementation Grants.

External Evaluation

The DeWitt Wallace-Reader’s Digest Fund contracted with Policy Studies Associates, a research and social policy firm based in Washington, D.C., to evaluate the National Demonstration Project. The evaluation has been exam­ining the implementation of Teachers Institutes participating in the project from 1999-2002. This evaluation is described in the Annual Report of 1999 and in the Brochure for the National Demonstration Project.

The Yale-New Haven Teachers Institute and the Institutes established at the partnership sites have been cooperating fully with this assessment of the National Demonstration Project by Policy Studies Associates. The new Teachers Institutes have provided the evaluators from Policy Study Associates with full access to their activities and their documentation, including school and university personnel and sites. Policy Studies Associates has made annual site visits to the new Institutes, and is providing reports on those visits to those Institutes and to the Yale-New Haven Teachers Institute. This external evaluation is not being used for grant-monitoring purposes, which are entirely in the province of the Yale-New Haven Teachers Institute. The external evaluation will complement the information-gathering activities of the Yale-New Haven Teachers Institute, and will use and incorporate the information that this Institute collects.
THE CONTINUING NATIONAL INITIATIVE

In early 2000, it was decided by the Executive Committee of the University Advisory Council to propose a fairly modest plan of further expansion, involving perhaps two additional sites per year for several years. Discussion with President Richard Levin and others, however, encouraged us to think that we should make a more ambitious plan. During the spring and summer of that year, therefore, the Executive Committee developed a Draft Proposal for the establishment over a twelve-year period of as many as 45 new Institutes. These would be located in as many of the fifty states as possible, so that they might have the maximum influence upon state and national policy. This Draft Proposal was the basis for discussions by the National Advisory Committee and the meeting of University and School District Administrators with President Levin in November 2000. The groups firmly endorsed the desirability of such an ambitious proposal, but they urged that the larger effort be preceded by two years of consolidation, intensification, and preparation on the part of all five of the existing Teachers Institutes.

A revised Proposal was therefore drawn up in 2001, which describes a fourteen-year initiative that includes a two-year Preparation Phase. During the first two years each of the four new Teachers Institutes would be invited to discover the most appropriate ways in which they could begin to have a larger systemic effect within their own districts. All of the participating Institutes would be conducting research into the results of their programs. And the Yale-New Haven Teachers Institute would be gearing up for the longer effort, to be supported by the other Teachers Institutes, to establish over the next twelve years as many as 45 new Institutes. President Levin and officers of the Yale University Development Office are currently seeking funds for all or parts of this initiative.

Sufficient funds have already been received to make possible the launching of the Preparation Phase of the Yale National Initiative. During this period we expect to

- assess the efficacy of National Demonstration Project activities and procedures for the establishment of new Teachers Institutes,
- evaluate the accomplishments of the Teachers Institutes,
- examine the patterns of financial support for the new Institutes and their plans for sustaining their programs,
- discover how they may have the greatest systemic impact in their own districts,
- and prepare for the establishment of a national association of Teachers Institutes.
A Request for Proposals has been sent to the four newly established Teachers Institutes, all four of which have now indicated their intention to apply for a Research and Planning Grant. The anticipated range of Grants is $25,000-100,000. The time-frame for activities will be April 2002-August 2003. During the period from April 2002 through March 2003, each Institute receiving a grant will, in collaboration with the partnering school district, engage in studies on the results of Institute participation on teachers, their students, and schools in that district, and will engage in planning for the Institute to attain a systemic impact in that district. Each Institute will also be committed to continuing conversations with other participants during the spring and summer of 2003 that will be directed toward the further development of the National Initiative. Applications for Research and Planning Grants during the Preparation Phase will be received on February 28, 2002. Grants will be awarded on April 1.

On the completion of this Preparation Phase, we hope to begin the process of organizing a national association of Teachers Institutes and moving toward the establishment of additional Teachers Institutes across the nation.
FINANCIAL PLANS

For the local program, the Yale-New Haven Teachers Institute is currently seeking funds that might be used for seminars in either the humanities or the sciences. Its major long-term need is for an endowment that would provide continuing support for seminars in the sciences. The existing endowment for the Teachers Institute is limited to support for seminars in the humanities, and the teachers' expressed need for seminars in the sciences has increased dramatically in the last few years.

On the national level, as we have said, the Teachers Institute has developed a plan for a fourteen-year continuing initiative that will establish as many as 45 additional Teachers Institutes across the nation. This plan includes the two-year Preparation Phase on which we have now embarked, followed by a twelve-year Implementation Phase. Support for the Preparation Phase has been made possible through an extension of the National Demonstration Project by the Wallace-Reader’s Digest Funds into 2003 and a new grant from the Jessie Ball duPont Fund.

During the Implementation Phase, funds will be needed to:

• establish a national association of Teachers Institutes, with a Director, appropriate staff and technical support;

• provide renewable Implementation Grants for the participating Teachers Institutes already established, in order to assure their viability, their scaling-up to serve their own urban sites, and their contribution to the process of establishing new Teachers Institutes;

• enable the Yale-New Haven Teachers Institute and, to some extent, the other participating Institutes, to make initial contacts, carry out visits to interested sites, establish an annual July Intensive in New Haven, and maintain Annual Conferences;

• sustain the publication of On Common Ground, which will serve as a means of disseminating information about the progress and results of the national initiative;

• and provide eight-month Planning Grants and three-year renewable Implementation Grants to the new Teachers Institutes being established.

Funds will also be needed to provide technological assistance for the national association of Teachers Institutes.
The funding described above might best be provided by a partnership between Yale University and one or more major foundations, which would work with us in accomplishing this plan. That funding might be supplemented as necessary by other major grants or lesser grants. The grants might be administered by the partnership, by individual foundations, or by the office of the Director of the national association of Teachers Institutes. The projected cost of the entire National Initiative is 63.8 million dollars. A detailed break-down of that figure is included in the document prepared by the Institute: “Strengthening Teaching in America’s Schools: A Proposal to Replicate Nationally the Successes of the Yale-New Haven Teachers Institute.”
CONCLUSION

During 2001, the Yale-New Haven Teachers Institute continued to make progress in its two complementary areas of activity: the local and the national.

In New Haven it conducted a program of six seminars for Fellows. It continued its work with the Centers for Professional and Curricular Development in the schools (with eleven Centers in operation for most of this year). It developed further the relationship of its resources to school curricula, establishing Reference Lists for High Schools and Elementary Schools that show the relationship of many Institute-developed curriculum units to school curricula and academic standards. And it pursued its fund-raising to ensure the continuation of its activity in New Haven and across the country in the longer term.

Progress on the national level has been most notably assisted by a four-year grant from the DeWitt Wallace-Reader’s Digest Fund, and a supplementary three-year grant from the McCune Charitable Foundation, for the establishment of a National Demonstration Project. The Yale-New Haven Teachers Institute has now completed the three-year process of working with four other Teachers Institutes. The National Demonstration Project has begun to create a network of Teachers Institutes across the country that can serve as a model for university-school collaboration.

The Institute is now seeking funds to continue the Yale National Initiative through this fourteen-year process, which might establish as many as 45 new...
Teachers Institutes across the nation. Support for the Preparation Phase of this Initiative has been received through an extension of the National Demonstration Project by the Wallace-Reader’s Digest Funds into 2003 and a grant from the Jessie Ball duPont Fund. All four newly established Institutes have declared their intention to apply for Research and Planning Grants during the Preparation Phase. During the Yale National Initiative, the periodical *On Common Ground*, which summed up the National Demonstration Project in its special issue, Number 9, may continue to be a vehicle for disseminating the progress and results of the Yale National Initiative.

The coming year, 2002, will be the Institute’s twenty-fifth year of operation. We are already laying plans to mark the twenty-fifth anniversary with one or more events that are intended to increase the Institute’s visibility and encourage further financial support. A dinner on November 13, 2002, will celebrate the anniversary and honor Howard R. Lamar, Honorary Chairman of the University Advisory Council of the Yale-New Haven Teachers Institute.
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