

# REAUTHORIZATION OF THE HIGHER EDUCATION ACT, 1985

---

## HEARINGS

BEFORE THE

SUBCOMMITTEE ON EDUCATION,  
ARTS AND HUMANITIES

OF THE

COMMITTEE ON  
LABOR AND HUMAN RESOURCES  
UNITED STATES SENATE

NINETY-NINTH CONGRESS

FIRST SESSION

ON

EXAMINATION OF RECOMMENDATIONS AND PROPOSALS OF THE AD-  
MINISTRATION AND OTHER EDUCATIONAL COUNCILS REGARDING  
THE REAUTHORIZATION OF THE HIGHER EDUCATION ACT

---

SEPTEMBER 26 AND OCTOBER 10, 1985  
WASHINGTON, DC

---

### PART 5



Printed for the use of the Committee on Labor and Human Resources

---

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

58-265 O

WASHINGTON : 1986

---

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, Congressional Sales Office  
U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, DC 20402

Senator STAFFORD. Thank you very much, sir.

Mr. Vivian, we will be glad to hear from you.

Mr. VIVIAN. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate and welcome this opportunity to summarize for the committee some of the reasons why I think that Senator Bumpers' bill is so precisely in the national interest, and so urgently required at the present time.

We face today a growing crisis in the preparation of our Nation's 2½ million public schoolteachers.

After 9 years of working precisely in the vein of the institutes that this bill would establish, I am convinced that only a Federal initiative of this magnitude, and with this purpose, can create the conditions for the systematic and widespread improvement of teaching and learning in the humanities in our Nation's schools.

After the many reports on our schools, there has been a rediscovery of the fact that whether or not the changes envisioned in the reports, enacted by State legislatures, mandated by State boards and local school districts, can be made will depend on the support, involvement and preparation of schoolteachers.

Last year this body and the other body passed legislation providing for a similar initiative with respect to the sciences and mathematics. The present bill complements that legislation by providing assistance to teachers of the other core subjects in schools. Furthermore, as Senator Bumpers has mentioned, Senate bill 204 builds upon and extends the highly valuable work of the National Endowment for the Humanities with schoolteachers, which Secretary William Bennett fostered, I should say "championed," during his tenure as its chairman.

The prepared testimony that I am providing to the committee describes and documents the concept, operation, and results of the Yale-New Haven Teachers Institute.

I offer this information as a preview or case study of the kind of activity that this bill would support, and to give the committee some indication of the results the Senators might expect to achieve by its passage.

I underscore three points from my testimony. First, with respect to the purpose of the bill \* \* \* the purpose of the bill [section 1.b], "the enhancement of subject matter skills" of school teachers.

Mr. Chairman, the needs of teachers in our Nation's schools, in terms of their previous preparation to teach the subjects they are assigned—or misassigned—to teach, are compelling.

In New Haven, as nationally, a high proportion of teachers in the humanities, more than 40 percent in New Haven, did not major in college or graduate school in the subjects they teach.

This is more than ever the case with reassignments in times of low teacher turnover. Moreover, teachers obviously need to stay abreast of the developments in their fields.

It is ironic, then, at a time when lifelong learning is becoming increasingly a reality in our society, that we have yet fully to appreciate the fact that teachers themselves are the largest white-collar group in this country in need of professional development and continuing education.

This current state of teacher preparation will not be readily improved as a result of new teachers entering the profession and

may, in fact, worsen because of the shortage of qualified teachers that, analysts project, will only increase in coming years.

From our experience in New Haven, I am convinced that continuing study and writing, and discussion with colleagues, about one's subject is no less important to teachers in schools than it is to teachers in the university.

Mr. Chairman, from our educational experiment in New Haven, we know that collaborative programs emphasizing subject matter, if they are conducted with teacher leadership, and on a collegial basis, can further prepare teachers in the subjects they teach, heighten their morale, increase their expectations of their students' ability to learn, encourage them to remain in teaching, and can in turn improve student learning. That is why, my second point, I believe that the provision of stipends to participants under this bill [section 2.b.6] is so important. This would, in my view, indicate legislative intent to promote in the proposed institutes the work of university and schoolteachers on a collegial basis. The stipends should be as generous as possible in order to make these institutes both demanding and professionally important.

My prepared testimony describes, at some length, the operation of collegiality in our own program and the benefits that accrue when teachers from universities and schools come together, on an equal basis, as members of the same profession, to discuss the common problems of teaching their disciplines.

Third, I am convinced that efforts at school improvement will not succeed without teacher leadership. We have too long held teachers responsible for the condition of our schools, without giving them responsibility, empowering them, to improve our schools.

Mr. Chairman, I believe we are in fact emerging, once again, from a crisis in confidence in our Nation's teachers, and I am therefore encouraged to find in this bill provision for involving the participating teachers "in the planning and design" of these institutes [section 2.b.1].

From our experience, I believe the most effective projects must invest real authority in teacher leadership and under that leadership develop organically, based on the needs that teachers themselves identify.

In short, I conclude that the institutes to be established under this bill, with its emphasis on subject matter, collegiality and teacher leadership, would help to renew and revitalize the profession, the professional life of teachers, and would thereby help both to attract and to retain those individuals whom we now wish to enter and to remain in teaching.

Because of the massiveness of the problem, only a bill like the one Senator Bumpers has introduced, could have a realistic chance of strengthening, in this way, teaching of those subjects which, as Senator Bumpers has said, are fundamental to the informed and humane citizenry on which our form of government depends. Speaking practically, congressional leadership through this legislation might stimulate States and local districts to develop similar initiatives that would augment the resources that this bill would provide.

Three caveats: First, the bill makes reference to "summer" institutes. I would hope that final legislation would allow for institutes

of longer duration so that they might be more continuous, more demanding, and less isolated from school experience. Second, for reasons outlined in my testimony, I urge the inclusion, under section 2.b, of a provision that applicants be required to describe the ways in which they will emphasize through their institutes the classroom application of teachers' new learning. Third, I would hope that this legislation might encourage, or at least allow for, local institutes, because of the intensity, continuity of relationship, and ease of access to human and physical resources that local programs provide.

Mr. Chairman, teaching is central to the educational process and to the vitality of our schools, in and through which we develop our capacity as a people, and as a nation.

Based on our experience with the Yale-New Haven Teachers Institute, I think of no step this committee might take which would hold greater promise, or is more necessary, for strengthening teaching and learning of the humanities in our schools. Thank you.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Vivian follows:]

Testimony of  
James R. Vivian, Director

THE YALE-NEW HAVEN TEACHERS INSTITUTE

Before the United States Senate  
Subcommittee on Education, Arts, and Humanities  
October 10, 1985

## Topics Covered

## Opening Statement

The Historic and Current Importance of Programs that Foster Teaching Excellence . . . . .	1
The Compelling Needs of Teachers . . . . .	3
The Partnership the Yale-New Haven Teachers Institute Represents. . .	6
Principles and Operation of the Institute . . . . .	8
Collegiality . . . . .	8
Teacher Leadership . . . . .	9
Long-term Collaboration . . . . .	11
Emphasis on Classroom Application . . . . .	12
The Institute's Concentration and Offerings in the Humanities . . . .	14
The Demonstrated Value of the Institute to Teachers and Their Students in the New Haven Public Schools . . . . .	17
The Value of the Program to Yale University . . . . .	23
National Implications of the Teachers Institute . . . . .	25
Financial Support . . . . .	29
The Significance of the Institute for Community Development . . . . .	29
Recommendations for the Establishment of Similar Programs . . . . .	31
Conclusion: The Promise S.204 Holds . . . . .	33
References . . . . .	35
Appendix . . . . .	37

## Opening Statement

Testimony of James R. Vivian, Director

Yale-New Haven Teachers Institute

October 10, 1985

Senate Subcommittee on Education, Arts, and Humanities

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate and welcome this opportunity to summarize for the Committee the reasons I believe that S.204, which would provide a major national program to assist teachers in the humanities in order to improve the quality of instruction in these disciplines in our nation's elementary and secondary schools, is so precisely in the national interest and so urgently required.

We face today a growing crisis in the preparation of our nation's 2 1/2 million school teachers. After nine years of working precisely in the vein of the institutes that this Bill would establish, I am convinced that only a Federal initiative of this magnitude and with this purpose can create the conditions for the widespread and systematic improvement of teaching and learning of the humanities in our nation's schools.

After the many reports on our schools, there has been a rediscovery of the fact that whether or not the changes envisioned in the reports, enacted by state legislatures, and mandated by state boards and local school districts, can be made will depend on the support, involvement, and preparation of school teachers.

<sup>last</sup> ~~Two~~ years ago this body and the other body passed legislation providing for a similar initiative with respect to the sciences, mathematics, and foreign languages. The present Bill complements that legislation by providing assistance to teachers of the other core subjects in schools. Furthermore, S.204 builds upon and extends the valuable work of the National Endowment for

the Humanities with school teachers, which Secretary William Bennett fostered during his tenure as its Chairman.

The prepared testimony that I am providing to the Committee describes and documents the concept, operation, and results of the Yale-New Haven Teachers Institute. I offer this information as a preview or case study of the kind of activity this bill would support--and to give the Committee some indication of the results the Senators might expect to achieve by its passage.

I underscore three points from my prepared testimony, by commenting on three provisions of the bill.

First, with respect to purpose (Section 1.b), "the enhancement of subject matter skills" of school teachers:

Mr. Chairman, the needs of teachers in our nation's schools, in terms of their previous preparation to teach the subjects they are assigned--or misassigned--to teach, are compelling. Nationally, as in New Haven, a high proportion of teachers in the humanities did not major in college or graduate school in their subjects, and many teachers, especially in times of low turnover, are reassigned to teach subjects that they have not taught recently, or have never taught before. Moreover, teachers need to stay abreast of their rapidly changing fields.

It is ironic, then, at a time when life-long learning is increasingly a reality in our society, that we have yet fully to appreciate the fact that teachers themselves are the largest white-collar group in need of professional development or continuing education.

This current state of teacher preparation will not be improved readily as a result of new teachers entering the profession, and may, in fact, worsen



because of the shortages of qualified teachers that, analysts project, will increase in coming years.

From our experience in New Haven, I am convinced that continuing study and writing, and discussion with colleagues, about one's subject is no less important to teachers in schools than it is to teachers in the university. Mr. Chairman, from our educational experiment we know that collaborative programs emphasizing the subject matter preparation of teachers, if they are conducted with teacher leadership and on a collegial basis, can further prepare teachers in the subjects they teach, heighten their morale, increase their expectations of their students' ability to learn, encourage them to remain in teaching, and can, in turn, improve student learning.

That is--my second point--why I believe that the provision of stipends to participants under this Bill (Section 2.b.6) is so important. This would, in my view, indicate legislative intent to promote, in the proposed institutes, the work of university and school teachers together, on a collegial basis. The stipends should be as generous as possible in order to make these institutes both demanding and professionally important. My prepared testimony describes the operation of collegiality in our own program and the benefits that accrue when teachers from universities and schools come together on an equal basis, and as members of the same profession, to discuss the common problems of teaching their disciplines.

Third, I am convinced that efforts at school improvement will not succeed unless they have teacher leadership. In this country we have too often held teachers responsible for the condition of our schools without giving them responsibility and empowering them to improve our schools.

Mr. Chairman, I believe we are once again emerging from a crisis in confidence in our nation's teachers, and I am therefore encouraged to find in this Bill a provision for involving the participating teachers "in the planning and design" of these institutes (Section 2.b.1). From our experience, I believe the most effective projects invest real authority in teacher leadership and under that leadership develop organically, based on the needs that teachers themselves identify.

In short, I conclude that the institutes established under this Bill--with its emphasis on subject matter, collegiality, and teacher leadership--would help to renew and revitalize the profession, the professional life of teachers, and would therefore help both to attract and to retain those individuals whom we now wish to enter and to remain in teaching.

Because of the massiveness of the problem, only a Federal initiative like S.204 could have a realistic chance of strengthening, in this way, teaching of those subjects which are fundamental to the informed and humane citizenry on which our form of government depends. Speaking practically, Congressional leadership through this legislation might stimulate states and local districts to develop similar initiatives that would augment the resources that this Bill would provide.

Three caveats: First, the Bill makes reference to "summer" institutes. I would hope that final legislation would allow for institutes of longer duration so that they might be more continuous, more demanding, and less isolated from school experience. Second, for reasons outlined in my testimony, I urge the inclusion, under Section 2.b, of a provision that

applicants be required to describe the ways in which they will emphasize through their institutes the classroom application of teachers' new learning. Third, I would hope that this legislation might encourage, or at least allow for, local institutes, because of the intensity, continuity of relationship, and ease of access to human and physical resources that local programs provide.

Mr. Chairman, teaching is central to the educational process and to the vitality of our schools, in and through which we develop our capacity as a people and as a nation. Based on our experience with the Yale-New Haven Teachers Institute, I think of no step this body might take which would hold greater promise, or is more necessary, for strengthening teaching and learning of the humanities in our schools.

Again, thank you for this opportunity.

The Historic and Current Importance of Programs  
that Foster Teaching Excellence

During the past two years our nation's public schools have received unprecedented national attention. Much of what has been said about the condition of public education has been highly critical, grimly portraying the quality of our country's 84,000 public schools. However, an encouraging result of this intensified scrutiny of schools has been a renewed appreciation of the ways in which communities can develop partnerships to improve their schools. In particular, the spotlight has been focused on the growing movement for university-school collaboration. One of the highest educational priorities for the 1980s and beyond, many analysts agree, is for schools and colleges to work together at the local level to improve the quality of elementary and secondary education.

Of all the ways schools and colleges might collaborate, there are no programs more important than those that concentrate on excellence in teaching. Many observers of our schools single out the present "crisis" in teaching as foremost among the problems of secondary schools. Based upon our experience with the Yale-New Haven Teachers Institute, I believe that the means for addressing some, though certainly not all, of these problems are in our hands and within our power. School-college collaboration, though not a panacea, can improve teaching in our schools.

The interrelation of schools and colleges has, of course, been a theme in the history of American education. During the rise of "universal" secondary education and the growth of higher education in America, colleges have had an increasing vested interest in the prior education of their own students. Higher education has served to shape secondary school curricula through admissions requirements, and college faculty have written curricula and

textbooks for use directly in schools. Schools have sought to know the content of college courses so that they might prepare their students for college studies. Some colleges have muted the distinction between secondary and higher education by the early enrollment of high school students in college offerings, sometimes for credit, either on campus or in schools. Most important, higher education has provided the initial preparation, and often continuing education, for the individuals who teach in our schools.

Over the past century many of the most influential analysts of our schools have emphasized the fundamental importance of teaching to schools, and of the continuing engagement of teachers with the subjects they teach. In a series of widely-read essays published in 1893, Joseph M. Rice argued that "teachers must constantly endeavor to grow both in professional and in general intellectual strength" (Rice, 1893, p. 15). Having observed schools in thirty-six cities, Rice concluded that "by far the most progress has been made in those cities where the teachers themselves are the most earnest students.... [I]t is, after all, the teacher that makes the school." That same year, under President Charles W. Eliot, Harvard University instituted free courses for Cambridge teachers in new subjects in the sciences (Powell, 1950, p. 22). The following year, writing for the Committee of Ten, Eliot asserted that the changes the Committee recommended depended on teachers more highly trained during their initial preparation and while in service (Committee of Ten, 1893, pp. 17-18). The Carnegie Report of 1920 on The Professional Preparation of Teachers spoke of the importance of "regular periods of uninterrupted study" for teachers because "the present vitality of the school is directly involved" (Learned, 1920, p. 281). In 1945 the authors of the Harvard Report, General Education in a Free Society, stated that "there is no educational reform so important as the improvement of teaching," and

that the greatest of the schools' needs was "a more rounded, longer, more continuing education of teachers" (Harvard Committee, 1945, pp. 90, 104). In 1963 James B. Conant's The Education of American Teachers recommended especially continuing study and in-service education for teachers (Conant, 1963, pp. 207-8).

In 1983, in the Carnegie Report on High School, Ernest L. Boyer called for greater emphasis on subject matter in the initial preparation of the teacher, and for "a planned continuing education program...[as] part of every teacher's professional life" (Boyer, 1983, p. 178). As Boyer later wrote in commenting on the numerous education studies and reports issued in 1983, "we are beginning to see that whatever is wrong with America's schools cannot be fixed without the help of those teachers already in the classrooms. Most of them will be there for years to come, and teachers must be viewed as part of the solution, not as part of the problem" (Boyer, 1984, p. 526).

The Yale-New Haven Teachers Institute and the bill this body is considering, then, are following precisely the course that educational leaders have repeatedly urged.

#### The Compelling Needs of Teachers.

The needs of teachers in our schools are compelling and must be addressed. As is the case nationally, a high percentage of teachers in New Haven have minimal formal preparation in their subjects. Only 58.8 percent of New Haven secondary school teachers in the humanities majored in college or graduate school in the subjects they are teaching. Moreover, because scholarship in these fields is constantly changing, even those teachers who majored in the subjects they teach need to stay abreast of the developments in their fields.

In New Haven the current rate of teacher turnover is only about 2 percent. In so stable a teaching force many individuals are reassigned to teach subjects they either have not taught recently, or have never taught before. The magnitude of this problem nationally is only now, in the past two weeks, being publicized. Certainly, even though we need much better statistics, hundreds of thousands of teachers are currently teaching subjects in which they are neither trained nor certified. Furthermore, even in times of higher turnover of teachers, teaching assignments (or misassignments)--and therefore teachers' needs for further preparation and new classroom materials--change frequently in response to shifting priorities of schools, which are so influenced by social and political change.

This present state of teacher preparation in the humanities will not be readily improved as a result of new teachers entering the profession. Nationally, in 1981, the latest year for which we have these statistics, only 61.9 percent of newly graduated teachers in the arts and humanities were certified or eligible for certification in the field they were currently teaching (National Center for Education Statistics, 1983, p. 206). There are already well-publicized shortages of qualified teachers in some subjects and some areas of the country, even though the National Center for Education Statistics projects that the total demand nationally for secondary school teachers will continue to decline through 1988 (NCES, 1984, p. 36). These shortages are likely to become more widespread and severe at the secondary level as the children of the "baby boomlet," who began this year to increase total elementary school enrollment, begin in the mid-1990s to enter secondary schools (McCarthy, 1984, pp. 7-8).

In short, to strengthen teaching in public schools we must provide for the ongoing preparation of individuals already in, and those now entering, the profession.

Not only the demographics I have cited, but also current findings in education research underscore the importance of this work. I mention only four points:

1. We know that one of the most serious problems facing the profession is its inability to retain the individuals we especially wish to remain in teaching--the fact, for example, that those who do remain in teaching are disproportionately from the lower quintiles on standardized tests.
2. We know also that a principal reason for the loss of these people from teaching is the lack of intellectual stimulation, collegial relationships, and serious discourse with adults--all of which should, but do not, characterize the profession.
3. We know that there is little correlation between length of experience in teaching and effectiveness as a teacher, and
4. We know that the recency of the teacher's own learning is a most important factor in student learning.

In sum, and this I find ironic, at a time when life-long learning is increasingly a reality in our society, we have yet fully to appreciate the fact that teachers themselves are the largest white collar group in need of professional development and continuing education.

When we seek to foster university-school collaboration, therefore, it is not only a most natural, logical, and fruitful alliance, but also timely: The present vitality of our schools is, in fact, at stake.



Perhaps most important, collaborative work in this vein can begin to create the profession, the professional life, the conditions for teaching, that will help both to attract and to retain those individuals whom we now wish to enter the profession and whose initial preparation is also of such great concern to us.

All of this argues for the critical importance of S.204, which would, in my view, support collaborative programs that provide a collegial relationship among humanities teachers from schools and colleges so that they can address together, as colleagues, the common problems of teaching their disciplines.

#### The Partnership the Yale-New Haven Teachers Institute Represents

From the beginning, the administrations and teachers of Yale University and the New Haven Public Schools have worked in partnership in planning and guiding the Teachers Institute. In 1969, the Yale History Department and teachers from Lee High School began the History Education Project (HEP), which assisted a number of New Haven social studies teachers in developing improved curricula for courses in American history, world area studies, and urban studies. The success of HEP led to discussions about organizing a more ambitious and demanding program that would include additional disciplines. This was a specific response to the general question: How can institutions located in center-city areas become constructively involved in addressing problems of the communities where they reside, and on which they depend? The way that Yale and New Haven answered this question, we believed, might be of value to universities and school systems elsewhere.

In response to the request of the Superintendent of Schools and the Board of Education, the expansion of the earlier joint program in history began with

the addition of seminars in English, the subject in which the Schools then saw the greatest need. In 1977, the Superintendent of Schools and the New Haven Board of Education joined with their counterparts from Yale to determine the philosophy and design of the new program.

Teachers and administrators from the University and the Schools quickly reached a consensus: The relationship between the University and the Schools must be both prominent and permanent within any viable larger relationship between Yale and New Haven, and, of the many ways Yale might aid New Haven, none is more logical than a program that shares Yale's educational resources with the Schools. Because of changing student needs, changing objectives set by the school system and each level of government, and changing scholarship, school curricula undergo constant revision. Because of Yale's strength in the academic disciplines, all agreed that developing curricula, further preparing teachers in the subjects they teach, and assisting teachers to keep abreast of changes in their fields are the ways that Yale can most readily assist the Schools.

The intent was not to create new resources at Yale; rather, it was to make available in a planned way Yale's existing strength, that is, to expand and institutionalize the work of University faculty members with their colleagues in the Schools. Even at this early stage, both Yale and the Schools sought a course of action that might have a substantial impact. The Teachers Institute was established, then, in 1978, as a joint program of Yale University and the New Haven Public Schools designed to strengthen teaching and thereby to improve student learning in our community's middle and high schools. The Teachers Institute has since become by far the most comprehensive, intensive, and sustained collaboration of Yale faculty members with public school teachers.

### Principles and Operation of the Institute

Four principles guide the program and constitute much of its distinctiveness: First, teachers of students at different levels can and must interact as colleagues to address the common problems of teaching their disciplines. Second, teacher leadership is crucial in efforts to revitalize public education. Third, teaching is central to the educational process, and teacher-developed materials are essential for student learning. Fourth, university-school collaboration must be long-term if it is to be truly effective.

I believe that the enactment of S.204 would enable schools and universities in many other places to establish programs with these features.

Collegiality. Each year about eighty New Haven school teachers, or almost 25 percent of all secondary school teachers in the humanities and the sciences, become Fellows of the Institute to work as colleagues with Yale faculty members on topics the teachers themselves have identified. The Institute is organized to foster collegiality. Through the Institute, teachers become full members of the Yale community and are listed in the University directory of faculty and staff. This has symbolic meaning in recognizing them as colleagues and practical value in making the human and physical resources of the University accessible to them. Teachers who complete the program successfully receive a stipend, as well as certification of their course of study, if they are pursuing an advanced degree.

The Institute's rigorous five-month program of talks, workshops, and seminars incorporates the Fellows' preparation of new curricular materials that they and other teachers will use in the coming school year. The

materials Fellows write are compiled into a volume for each seminar and distributed to all New Haven teachers who might use them. Institute Representatives in each school promote widespread use of these materials by their colleagues.

A number of the University's most distinguished faculty members have given talks and led seminars in the program. The seminars, which are not regular courses, have the related and equally important purposes of increasing Fellows' background and developing new curricular materials on the seminar subjects. As a group, Fellows study the seminar subject generally by discussing common readings; individually, each Fellow selects a more limited aspect of the subject, and researches and develops it in depth for classroom use. Each seminar must balance these complementary, but in some ways distinct, activities.

Teacher Leadership. In order to practice collegiality in the day-to-day workings of the Institute, we devised an administrative structure that reflects the primacy of teachers. We did not wish the program to be something concocted by Yale and imposed upon the Fellows, nor did we wish to create different classes of Fellows by involving New Haven school administrators in administrative roles in the Institute. At the most practical level, we hoped to use peers to solve problems of absence or lateness, in order to avoid placing the Yale faculty members in authoritarian roles. Teachers serving as Institute Coordinators and Representatives have provided a solution to all these potential difficulties.

Through the Coordinators, the Institute seeks to ensure that its activities meet the needs of teachers and their students. Coordinators must be, and must intend to continue as, teachers in New Haven's public schools and \

must participate as Institute Fellows. Their major responsibilities include coordinating the activities of the School Representatives; taking major responsibility for the admissions process; and assisting with the long-range planning, evaluation, and national dissemination of the program.

In addition, in each middle and high school, one or two teachers represent their colleagues to assist with planning, organizing, and conducting Institute activities. Collectively the School Representatives represent every middle and high school teacher in the sciences, mathematics, and the humanities. They promote the Institute to other teachers in their school and enable them to have a direct role each year in designing the program. Specifically, they are responsible for maintaining frequent contact with, and soliciting the views of, all teachers in their school; promoting the use of Institute-developed curricular materials by their colleagues; and urging teachers who are not Institute Fellows to attend all activities open to them. School Representatives must intend to continue as teachers in New Haven's public middle or high schools, and must participate as Institute Fellows.

Through the Coordinators and School Representatives we have developed and maintained both rigorous expectations and an accommodating schedule so that there has been a high level of participation by New Haven teachers.

Our evaluator in 1980, Professor Robert Kellogg, Dean of the College at the University of Virginia, puts the matter well:

In order that the "managerial" aspect of the school administration not be reflected in the operation of the Institute, a small group of teachers, the Institute Coordinators, serves to "represent" both the schools in the Institute and the Institute in the schools. The conception is ingenious, and the individuals who serve as Coordinators are, more than any other single element, crucial to the Institute's successful operation. The Coordinators I met were thoughtful

and intelligent men and women who understood the purpose of the Institute and were effective representatives of the two institutions of which they were members.

To participate in so demanding a program, teachers must believe that the Institute can assist them in their own teaching and that, by extension, it can over time improve teaching and learning throughout the schools. Our evaluator in 1981, Ernest L. Boyer, wrote in his report:

The project has teacher-coordinators in each participating school who clearly are committed and who pass on their enthusiasm to colleagues. One of the most impressive features of my visit was the after school session I had with these Coordinators from the New Haven schools. Arriving after a fatiguing day, the teachers turned, with enthusiasm, to key issues. How can the Institute best help us meet our goals? How can we improve our work?...The dedication and optimism of these teachers was impressive, almost touching....The significance of teacher leadership cannot be overstated.

Long-term Collaboration. The objective of the Teachers Institute is to involve annually as many school teachers as possible and to provide a range of seminar subjects that span the humanities and the sciences, so that the program can address school curricula, and thus students' education, broadly. More than 200 individual teachers have completed the program successfully from one to eight times, and 57 Yale faculty members have given Institute talks or led one or more seminars. Since 1978, the Institute has offered 51 different seminars in the arts and humanities, the social sciences, mathematics, and the physical and life sciences. Through these Institute seminars Fellows have developed more than 430 individual curriculum units for use in school courses.

The impact of the Institute over time will, we believe, be roughly proportional to the number of teachers who participate on a recurring basis. The influence of the program on teachers' preparation and curricula is cumulative; we must annually involve a large enough proportion of New Haven

teachers to be credible in claiming that their participation can improve the public schools. Each curriculum unit a teacher writes represents only a fraction of all he or she teaches, and the very nature of the academic disciplines and their teaching is not static, but continually changing--in the humanities as well as in the sciences. Should the Institute ever become so limited in scope or duration as to appear trivial, it would cease to attract a sizable percentage of New Haven teachers and would become ineffectual. In one of its principal recommendations, the Rockefeller Commission on the Humanities concluded:

Because schools change slowly, we endorse models of school-college collaboration that emphasize long-term cooperation. We recommend that more colleges or universities and school districts adopt such programs for their mutual benefit, and that funding sources sustain programs and administrative costs on a continuing basis. Programs of school-college collaboration offer the best opportunity to strengthen instruction in the schools while providing intellectual renewal for teachers. (Commission on the Humanities, 1980, p. 56)

After five years of developing the Teachers Institute as a model of university-school collaboration, Yale and New Haven therefore decided to seek a \$4 million endowment to give the program a secure future. As our evaluator in 1983, Theodore R.Sizer, wrote:

The Institute's work now reaches virtually every New Haven public middle or high school student. Over a third of the city's teachers have been directly involved, and more wish to join. A significant number will continue to stay involved, enjoying "intellectual renewal" as well as "curriculum development," as the National Commission on the Humanities expressed it. Such renewal does not come quickly. It benefits from sustained contact, from supportive conditions, from simmering.

Emphasis on Classroom Application. The Institute's approach differs from conventional modes of curriculum development. Classroom teachers, who best

know their students' needs, work collegially and intensively with Yale faculty members, who are leading scholars in their fields. The Institute does not develop curricula on certain topics only because they are important in terms of recent scholarship; rather, it brings this current knowledge of a field to the assistance of teachers in the areas they identify as their main concerns. The Institute involves no "curriculum experts" in the usual sense, who would themselves prepare new materials, train teachers in short-term workshops to use these materials, and then expect the materials significantly to improve classroom teaching. Instead, the Institute demonstrates that long-term collaboration between school teachers and university scholars can produce curriculum materials of high quality pertinent to student needs, and can have a real influence on teaching and learning in schools.

What Fellows write, then, is not "curriculum" in the usual sense. They are not developing content and skill objectives for each course and grade level, nor are they preparing day-by-day lesson plans for their courses. Institute units also differ from traditional curricula in form; they are not composed mainly of lists and outlines of topics to be covered. Rather, teachers research and write in prose on a manageable topic within the seminar subject and strategies for introducing that topic in their own teaching.

By writing a curriculum unit, teachers think formally about the ways in which what they are learning can be applied in their own teaching; we emphasize that the Institute experience must have direct bearing on their own classes. This balance between academic preparation and practical, classroom application--as well as the depth and duration of our local collaborative relationship--are central features of the Yale-New Haven Teachers Institute.



The Institute's Concentration and Offerings in the Humanities

Through the Teachers Institute, the academic resources of a major institution are focused in a concentrated way on the school system in our own community. The Institute makes available the principal resources of the University, the faculty, to assist teachers in meeting their students' educational needs.

Each year about 50 middle and high school teachers in the humanities, more than half of whom are active throughout the year in the leadership of the program, take part as Fellows in the most intensive phase of the Institute, the five-month program of talks, workshops, and seminars that culminates with the Fellows' preparation of new curricular materials. The talks are intended to stimulate thinking and discussion and to point up interdisciplinary relationships in scholarship and teaching. Presenting Institute unit guidelines, the workshops explore the Fellows' own approaches to writing a curriculum unit and stress the audience for whom Fellows are writing: other teachers.

Each fall, the School Representatives canvass the teachers in their schools to determine the subjects that prospective Fellows would like the Institute to treat. The Institute then circulates descriptions of seminars that address teachers' interests, and the Institute Coordinators, after several meetings with the Representatives, ultimately select which seminars will be offered. In effect, New Haven teachers determine the subject matter for the program each year. In applying to the Institute, teachers describe curriculum unit topics on which they propose to work and the relationship of these topics both to Institute seminars and to courses they will teach in the coming school year. In this way, the seminar leaders can tailor the readings

and discussions of the seminars to Fellows' specific interests and teaching needs.

The Institute's past offerings in the humanities have been concentrated in the disciplines of literature, history, and classical civilization. Many of the University's distinguished senior faculty members in the humanities, including the former Dean of Yale College and the Chairmen of the Departments of English, History, American Studies, and Spanish and Portuguese, have led Institute seminars. Several faculty members have led two, three, or four seminars in the program.

Seminars in literature have emphasized close textual analysis of and critical writing on major works of the American, European, and South American literary traditions. The Teachers Institute has offered a series of seminars which explored particular literary genres, including a survey of major literary genres, as well as concentrated studies in poetry, the short story, drama, biography, and autobiography. Thomas R. Whitaker, Professor and Chairman of English, for example, has led three seminars in drama. In each of the seminars concentrating on a particular genre, there has been an emphasis on how best to introduce middle and high school students to the genre, how to relate what students would study to their own experiences, and how, simultaneously, to teach analytical reading and composition skills.

Additional seminars in literature have taken a thematic approach. Michael G. Cooke, Professor of English and past Chairman of the University Advisory Council for the Teachers Institute, has led two such seminars. One considered the theme of the stranger in modern fiction, and a second explored the relationship between the oral tradition and the civilization in which it

developed in three literary environments: classical Greek poetry and drama, British poetry and German folktales, and Black American fiction.

Several seminars have explored literature and history together. For example, Robin W. Winks, Randolph W. Townsend Jr. Professor of History and Master of Berkeley College, has led three seminars in the program in British history and literature, and American history and literature. Henry A. Turner, Professor and past Chairman of History and Master of Davenport College, led a seminar with two other colleagues on twentieth-century American history and literature. Alan Trachtenberg, Professor and Chairman of American Studies and Professor of English, also led a seminar in American literature and culture. In 1985, offerings in history and literature included a seminar on Central and South American history and literature led by Roberto Gonzalez-Echevarria, Professor of Spanish and Chairman of Spanish and Portuguese, and a seminar led by Jean-Christophe Agnew, Associate Professor of American Studies and History, on autobiography and nineteenth-century American history.

In history, the Institute's seminar offerings have included studies in American history; studies of state and local history; and approaches to history which pursue a particular methodology. One of several Institute seminars which have concentrated on American history, was, for example, a seminar led by Robert M. Cover, Chancellor Kent Professor of Law and Legal History, on the Constitution in American History and American Life.

Seminars on state and local history have offered the pedagogical advantages of teaching a subject where abundant primary resources are easily available and have also aided teachers in the presentation of major aspects of United States history. In this area, for example, Howard R. Lamar, former Dean of Yale College, William Robertson Coe Professor of American History,

former Director of the Division of the Humanities, and Chairman of the University Advisory Council for the Teachers Institute, led a seminar on nineteenth-century industrial New Haven and the United States.

Among our offerings which have explored the usefulness of a particular methodology in the teaching of history, literature, and culture, were, for example, two seminars led by Jules D. Prown, Professor of History of Art, on art, artifacts, and material culture. Professor Prown's seminars investigated ways of discovering the cultural evidence found in objects in order to understand the culture that produced them.

The Institute has also offered seminars in classical civilization. For example, William G. Thalmann, Associate Professor of Classics and Director of Undergraduate Studies for Directed Studies Special Programs in the Humanities, led a seminar on Greek and Roman mythology from Homer through Virgil. Victor Bers, Associate Professor and Director of Graduate Studies in Classics, also led a seminar on Greek civilization which incorporated Greek literature, art, history, political thought, and philosophy.

When we started the Institute, some were skeptical that our project would attract distinguished Yale scholars and teachers. This kind of senior faculty participation is precisely what we intend to continue and what, with the enactment of S.204, might become more widespread throughout the nation.

#### The Demonstrated Value of the Institute to

##### New Haven Teachers and Their Students

The results of the numerous evaluations of the Teachers Institute offer real encouragement that such collaborative programs can assist our schools in specific ways. The results are cumulative and growing: about one-third of

all New Haven secondary school teachers in the humanities have completed successfully at least one year of the Institute. Many have participated from two to eight years.

Annual evaluations by outside consultants have been particularly encouraging. In his report in 1981, Ernest L. Boyer, former U.S. Commissioner of Education and current President of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, wrote: "The impact of the Yale-New Haven Institute far exceeded my expectations....Rarely does [school-college collaboration] get to the heart of the matter--helping teachers and advancing the quality of education. The Yale-New Haven teacher project is a dramatic exception to this rule." Theodore R.Sizer, former Dean of the Harvard Graduate School of Education and Chairman of the national Study of High Schools, wrote in his report in 1983:

I share the view of my predecessor "visitors" that yours is a remarkable program, for its clear and useful focus, for its simplicity and--above all else--for the atmosphere of constructive collegiality between Yale and New Haven teachers that has been created....The arguments for the current scale are powerful. All too few school "reform" efforts get the scale right; almost universally they are too ambitious.

He concluded that "the healthy mixture of respect and realism among the participants in the Institute is as refreshing as it is striking. Many universities would not dare to attempt such a program, much less seek to endow it. Yale is notable for its commitment."

In 1981 we developed lengthy questionnaires for a more comprehensive examination of the influence of the Institute on teaching and learning in New Haven middle and high schools. At the same time, we began more systematically to examine literature in the field of education related to our program. The aim was to search the literature so that we might formulate questions for our

study based upon current research findings. The following statements illustrate some of the areas where we found a reasonable degree of agreement in the education literature and which we therefore probed through the questionnaires.

--There is widespread agreement that much of pre-service teacher education lacks relevance to, and does not adequately prepare teachers for, teaching. Often associated with this view is criticism of an over-emphasis on "education" courses, and of too little emphasis on subject matter in the initial preparation of the teacher.

--There is an extensive literature critical of traditional in-service education for teachers, particularly of intensive, short-term in-service offerings, especially those which teachers have not first requested.

--There are numerous findings concerning teacher morale, "burn-out," and the stressfulness of teaching, particularly in urban school districts.

--A consistent body of research has indicated that teachers' expectations for their students affect students' performance in schools.

--Some literature points to the severe limitations of the traditional manner through which "experts" prepare curricula for teacher use, try to acquaint teachers with these new materials in short-term workshops, and then expect the curriculum materials somehow to affect student learning. This research suggests that it is essential that teachers using curricular materials have a prominent role in their development.

--A growing body of literature maintains that schools cannot be reformed from above or from outside, and that change will occur only with teacher leadership.

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

Overall, this analysis of the program showed that the Institute has significantly increased teachers' knowledge of their disciplines, raised their morale, heightened their expectations of their students' ability to learn, encouraged them to remain in teaching, and has in turn improved student learning.

Consistent with a central aim of the program, the materials that teachers develop appear to serve all students, not only those who are most successful in school. Both participants and teachers who have not been Fellows compared these curriculum units very favorably with commercially available materials and with materials they have prepared in other projects or on their own.

In light of the well-publicized frustrations of the teaching profession, it is especially heartening that so many teachers wish to participate on a recurring basis in so demanding a program. Considering that the proportion of teachers who say they would not choose teaching as a career if they could choose again has more than tripled between 1971 and 1981, and that research shows that the most academically capable teachers are most likely to leave teaching (Darling-Hammond, 1984, p.11), it is particularly encouraging that

about half of the participating teachers reported that the Institute contributed to their decision to continue teaching in our public schools.

Some of the specific findings of the study were as follows: With respect to teacher morale, Institute Fellows in the humanities were about twice as likely as non-Fellows to report an increase in their satisfaction as teachers during the previous five years. In addition to the revitalizing effect that Institute participation has on teachers, the process of actually teaching Institute units may be similarly rewarding. Over half of the Fellows reported that Institute units are more enjoyable to teach than curricula they have prepared in other programs or on their own. Also, over half of the Fellows and almost half of the non-Fellows reported that Institute units developed by other teachers are more enjoyable to teach than commercially prepared curriculum materials.

The study confirmed that Fellows were twice as likely as non-participants to report an increase in their expectations of their students. This is particularly noteworthy because of the relationship between teacher expectations and student performance. The results of the study further substantiate the positive impact the Institute has had on student performance. Approximately half of the Fellows reported that their Institute units resulted in higher student attention, interest, motivation, and mastery than have other curricula they have prepared. Two-thirds of the Fellows stated that the Teachers Institute has led to an increase in student learning. Teachers also reported that Institute units are successful with students at all levels. In fact, more than half of the Fellows indicated that the curriculum units they prepared in the Institute have been successful with their least advanced students.



The results of the study highlight the benefits teachers believe they have received when they have participated more than once. The more times teachers had participated in the Institute, the more likely they were to report a large increase in their knowledge of their subject; more enjoyment teaching units by other Fellows; and higher student attention, motivation, and mastery resulting from their own Institute units and from units by other Fellows. They were also more likely to say that the process of writing an Institute unit improved both their teaching of writing and their own writing, and more likely to agree strongly that the Institute has had a large impact on, and has broadened, their teaching curriculum.

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

With respect to the future, less than 10 percent of Fellows have said they do not intend to participate again in the Institute. About 80 percent of teachers who have not been Fellows have said they would take part, or would consider participating, in the future. This confirms our belief that the Institute will continue annually to attract first-time participants together

with former participants on a recurring basis, and that the institutes established by S.204 would be not only beneficial, but also exceedingly well-received by teachers in other communities.

#### The Value of the Program to Yale University

The Institute also benefits Yale. As President A. Bartlett Giamatti pointed out in an interview on the December 7, 1980, David Susskind television program, "it is profoundly in our self interest to have coherent, well-taught, well-thought-out curricula" in our local schools and in secondary schools throughout the country. The Institute is important to Yale in terms of future students, and also in terms of what faculty members who lead Institute seminars gain from the program. They increase their knowledge about public schools and the background of many of their own students. Many faculty members speak also about how their experience in the Institute has influenced their own teaching and scholarship.

The Institute is the most logical and natural way for the University to be involved with pre-college education,--drawing on the University's existing strength and tradition of academic excellence. In the absence of a school or department of Education, the Institute serves, in effect, as a center for faculty in the humanities from throughout the institution who care deeply about both public education and the New Haven community and who wish to have a practical and constructive involvement. In the past, the Institute has drawn its faculty from both Yale College and the Graduate School, including the Departments of American Studies, Classics, English, History, and Spanish and Portuguese; and the Schools of Architecture, Art, Divinity, and Law.

The Institute is also of unquestioned value with respect to the

University's relationship with New Haven. Yale's future and New Haven's are bound together in important ways. The Institute represents what Yale as an educational institution most has to offer New Haven. It has become a principal bridge between the University and the City, part of the educational and human infrastructure of our community. The program, then, is a natural alliance of the University and Schools, together with the City Administration, business, and labor in our community.

As Dr. Boyer wrote in his 1981 evaluation of the program:

The Institute is an educational venture and when measured on this yardstick it has been a great success. However, I cannot avoid observing that the project is a political success as well. It's no secret that the University and New Haven are two separate worlds. The challenge is to find a way for these worlds to meet. From my observation the Institute offers dramatic promise. It has put a human face on the University, opened doors, and focused resources where they are needed most. The University has gained enormously from the Institute and I conclude that for both educational and community reasons the program should be nurtured and sustained.

These are among the reasons the partnership also became an institutional priority for Yale. In 1984, President Giamatti commissioned the University Council on Priorities and Planning to examine Yale's relations with the City of New Haven. The Council chose to address three areas of the "town-gown" relationship; the dominant of these was public education. The Council wrote:

Yale's principal mission is education. Thus, it seems only natural that Yale concentrate its community efforts upon helping the local public schools meet the enormous challenge of preparing a significantly poor and undereducated population to compete successfully in America's increasingly technical job market. The benefits of a stronger school system extend, moreover, beyond the students assisted directly. Improved public schools provide greater neighborhood stability, make the community a more attractive place to live and create a positive environment for business investment. Both the City and Yale gain appreciably once this process has set in. (Council on Priorities and Planning, 1984, pp. 26-27)

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

#### National Implications of the Teachers Institute

In part because the demographic characteristics of the New Haven Public Schools mirror urban public education in the United States, the Institute's work has national implications. According to Department of Labor statistics, and in terms of the proportion of the population living below the Federally established poverty line, New Haven is the seventh poorest city in the nation. In our low income areas, 38.7 percent of residents are 18 years of age or younger. Of the students in New Haven's public secondary schools, more than 60 percent come from families receiving public assistance.

The percentage of minority students enrolled in New Haven's public schools is higher than in 39 of the 46 major urban school districts surveyed recently by the National School Boards Association. At 83 percent (mostly Black and Hispanic), the rate of minority student enrollment is approximately the same as in Chicago and higher than in Baltimore, Miami, Philadelphia, Birmingham, Cleveland, and St. Louis (National School Boards Association, 1983, p. 3). Nationally, the percentage of Black and Hispanic students entering the ninth

grade who do not graduate is about twice as great as the proportion of White students who complete high school (National Coalition of Advocates for Students, 1985, p. 9). In New Haven, 45 percent of those individuals entering the ninth grade do not graduate.

As Adrienne Y. Bailey, Vice President for Academic Affairs of the College Board, points out:

Since this demographic pattern [in New Haven] will become increasingly characteristic of public school enrollment throughout the United States, the Yale-New Haven Teachers Institute has chosen, in a sense, to wrestle with the nation's educational future. And yet, although the reputation and influence of Yale University extend far beyond the precincts of New Haven, the Institute has chosen to limit its work to the public schools of that city. This sharply focused effort increases the likelihood of achieving significant progress toward the goals of educational quality and equality. (Vivian, 1985, p. vii)

During its first seven years in operation, the Teachers Institute has, in fact, become a nationally recognized leader in the growing movement for university-school collaboration.

As early as 1980, the national Commission on the Humanities cited the Institute as a promising model of university-school collaboration that "integrates curriculum development with intellectual renewal for teachers." In 1982, the National Endowment for the Humanities awarded an unsolicited grant to encourage us to disseminate our model nationally, and they revised NEH guidelines to encourage other communities to develop programs similar to ours. In 1983 the College Board asked the Institute to join the Educational Equality Project's Models Program to serve as a resource for other institutions and schools. In 1984, the American Association for Higher Education, Council of Chief State School Officers, National Association of Secondary School Principals, and the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement

of Teaching singled out the Institute as a "pioneering and nationally significant program with an exemplary approach for improving public education." Former Secretary of Education Terrel Bell chaired the jury that selected the Teachers Institute to receive an award in October, 1984 from the Council for the Advancement and Support of Education as one of the five best collaborative programs in the nation. In 1985 we presented our program at the second National Symposium on Private Sector Initiatives, sponsored by the White House.

As a result of the attention the Institute has received, we have had hundreds of inquiries from across the country. We feel a special responsibility to assist other communities that wish to establish similar programs. During the past three years, Institute participants and staff have made numerous consulting visits to other institutions and have made presentations at conferences in many states. As a result, programs patterned on the Institute have been established at diverse universities and colleges throughout the country, for example, at the University of New Mexico, Lehigh University, Canisius College, the University of Hartford, the University of California at Santa Cruz, and Duke University. The continuing operation of the Teachers Institute as a visible model of university-school partnerships can, we believe, contribute to the national movement for partnerships in education and to the participation of colleges and universities within the movement. This is one of the reasons we established a National Advisory Committee, composed of fifteen Americans distinguished in the fields of education, private philanthropy, and public policy, to develop new plans for the further national dissemination of the program. This is also to say that we have been in the fortunate position to learn about the large number of

institutions and schools across the country who would wish to undertake this work in an intensive way if the passage of S.204 made available the funds for them to do so. In this way S.204 would be of enormous efficacy in assisting this national movement which, in our view, is crucial to the future of public education.

Norman Francis, President of Xavier University, a member of both the National Commission on Excellence in Education and the Carnegie Panel on the High School, wrote in his 1984 evaluation of the Teachers Institute:

Academic change does not come quickly or easily. Perhaps that is how it should be. When these changes involve cooperative ventures between like educational institutions or departments within institutions, such movement is additionally slow, and often it is strapped with personal interventions by some to avoid losing cherished privileges. It is known as "protecting turf." To achieve what is considered, nationally, as important for public schools, namely, college and university cooperative efforts with public school systems, one must scale all the traditional barriers, and cross one, on the higher education side, namely, the "it's none of our business" attitude.

The Yale-New Haven Institute has traversed all of these "burning sands" and has done so prior to the recent national interests. Its experience and current presence as a cooperative venture in and of itself argues for the absolute need for it to continue to be an example of how these difficult change ventures between colleges and universities and schools can be developed and nurtured. Its efforts have inestimable value for a number of local school districts, colleges and universities, all of which are talking about the need to work together, but are uncertain about how and where to start.

Aside from the current and future educational value the Institute has for the New Haven school system, if anything happened to it, the loss would have national impact and not be simply a local loss. Such a demise would be the self-fulfilling prophecy for those who say it can't be done, and a serious blow to those who know it can and are making efforts in their local districts. And as it happens much too frequently, others would bumble about trying to invent a wheel that has already been perfected, and, in not knowing, spend precious funds on form that could best be used on substance.

The above is offered to affirm that the Institute should be maintained in its present concept, and that resources must be sought to place it on stable and appropriate funding levels. Present use of funds is prudent and well managed. This may be one of the highest rates of return on funds invested in an educational project.

These are among the reasons I believe the expenditures envisioned by S.204 are warranted, even at the present time fiscally.

#### Financial Support

The cost of the Institute stems from our belief that the program is, for University and School participants, a vital professional activity for which they should be remunerated accordingly. Yale and the New Haven Schools together support a major share of the total cost of the program. A considerable portion of the remaining need has been met for the past seven years through strong support from the National Endowment for the Humanities. We have been pleased also to receive operating funds from numerous foundations and corporations--including Aetna Life and Casualty Foundation, The Harlan E. Anderson Foundation, The Bay Foundation, The College Board, The Ford Foundation, The New Haven Foundation, The Anne S. Richardson Fund, Atlantic Richfield Foundation, The Rockefeller Foundation, the New York Times Company Foundation, Xerox Foundation and more than fifty local businesses which see our efforts to improve the public schools as important to the economic development of our city and region.

#### The Significance of the Institute for Community Development

In 1981 the Teachers Institute began to conduct campaigns to enlist the support of local corporations. The first campaign was headed by the Chairman



of the New Haven Development Commission. Through these campaigns more than 50 local corporations, ranging from large lending institutions to manufacturing concerns to small businesses, joined in support of our effort to improve teaching of the central academic subjects in our public schools.

Many New Haven business executives recognize that a strong public school system fulfills a basic need for employees, their families, and the community generally. They see that the quality of our public schools is vitally important for attracting and retaining corporations in New Haven, that it is linked to economic development, to the tax base, and to the economic healthy of our community and region. They realize that the school system is a major factor in families' decisions about where to live, where they therefore pay taxes and purchase goods and services. Not only is the monetary support of these corporations for the Institute important, the corporate executives with whom we have worked have also become more knowledgeable about the positive developments in our schools. In that these individuals are leaders in our community, by involving them in improving our schools, we can foster greater public support for public education.

No single factor is more important to the economic and general well being of our community than a strong public school system. By supporting the Teachers Institute, local corporations participate in making available to our public school system one of our community's main educational resources, the faculty of Yale University. From meetings we have held recently with leaders from the New Haven community, we believe that local corporations will therefore be particularly responsive to our campaign to endow the Institute. The present endowment campaign underscores our deep belief in the long-term significance of the Teachers Institute to the University and to our

community's public schools. It also represents our determination to demonstrate that effective collaborative programs can be not only developed, but also sustained.

#### Recommendations for the Establishment of Similar Programs

There is, in my view, no more important recommendation in the Carnegie Foundation Special Report on School and College than the one that calls for universities and schools to develop genuine partnerships based on the needs of schools as determined by their principals and teachers (Maeroff, 1983, p. viii). Both aspects of this recommendation are essential: not only that universities and schools work together, but especially that those of us in higher education encourage our colleagues in schools to show us the ways we can marshal our resources to address their needs.

From our experience in New Haven, I would offer the following guidelines for the successful implementation of the Carnegie recommendation.

Definitions. "Collaboration" is a term currently used to describe quite varied activities. I mean by the term something specific. Collaboration arises from a recognition of mutual interest between school and college--between city and college--that must become more widespread if we are to improve our public schools. Within a partnership of institutions there should be a coequal relationship of colleagues, a volunteer association of individuals who choose to work together, of allies in league to improve our schools. An equal importance must be attached to what each partner brings to the relationship. The aim is to work together without everybody changing place.

Resources. Because institutional and other resources are never adequate, an early step in establishing a collaborative program is to assess the

resources that can be made available to meet the needs of teachers, and then to apply these resources in an intensive way where the need is greatest. Institutional support must come from both sides of the partnership; tangible and highly visible evidence of such commitment is essential. Participants should be compensated as generously as possible, in order to make their collaboration both demanding and professionally important.

Aims. We especially need to encourage partnership between schools and colleges and universities that concentrate on teaching and on the continuing engagement of teachers with their fields. Cooperative efforts should insist on a direct application in school classrooms, and not merely assume that their work together will somehow improve teaching and learning in the classroom.

Limitations. A tendency in establishing collaborative programs--as in school reform efforts generally--is to be too ambitious. Programs will succeed only if they have well-defined and manageable goals; they should avoid making impossible claims.

Evaluation. Precisely because collaborative projects can achieve only limited, though important, results, participants must be confident that their efforts are worthwhile. An ongoing evaluation process is therefore integral to a program's design and should be used perennially to refine both goals and activities. Because collaborative programs are often, unfortunately, seen as non-traditional--because they may not be regarded as central to the mission of either institutional partner--they have a special burden for providing sound evidence of their results.

Teacher Leadership. The most successful projects may well begin small, investing real authority in teacher leadership and developing organically based on the needs teachers identify. In that way, programs are not guided by

preconceptions, but grow from their own local experience. Efforts at school improvement will not succeed without teacher leadership. In this country we have too long held teachers responsible for the condition of our schools without giving them responsibility--empowering them--to improve our schools.

Duration. For these reasons, and for the benefits to be lasting, effective collaborative programs must be long-term.

Finally, an observation: In universities we assume that ongoing scholarship is indispensable to good teaching. The Yale New Haven Teachers Institute demonstrates the similar value to school teachers of ongoing study and writing about their discipline. Through collegueship with teachers from the University, this continuing engagement with their subjects becomes part of school teachers' professional lives. This is precisely what s.204 would make possible for thousands of teachers in the humanities in all of the States.

#### Conclusion

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

involving colleges and universities, the Teachers Institute has a prominent position.

The enactment of S.204 would contribute in a major way to sustaining the national movement for partnerships in education and would greatly increase the participation of colleges and universities within the movement. Based on my experience with the Teachers Institute, I think of no step this body might take which would hold greater promise, or is more urgently required, for strengthening teaching and learning of the humanities in the nation's schools.

## references

- Boyer, E. L. High School: A Report on Secondary Education in America. New York: Harper and Row, 1983.
- Boyer, E. L. "Reflections on the Great Debate of '83." Phi Delta Kappan, April 1984, pp. 525-530.
- Commission on the Humanities. The Humanities in American Life. Washington: 1893.
- Conant, J. B. The Education of American Teachers. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1963.
- Council on Priorities and Planning. Report of the Council on Priorities and Planning, 1983-1984. New Haven: Yale University, 1984.
- Darling-Hammond, Linda. "Beyond the Commission Reports: The Coming Crisis in Teaching." Santa Monica: The Rand Corporation, 1984.
- Harvard Committee. General Education in a Free Society: Report of the Harvard Committee. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1945.
- Learned, W. L., and Bagley, W. The Professional Preparation of Teachers 1920, Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, Bulletin 14.
- Maeroff, G. I. School and College: Partnerships in Education. Princeton: The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1983.
- McCarthy, K. F. "Q's and A's About the Future of the Three R's: A Demographer's Perspective." Santa Monica: The Rand Corporation, 1984.
- National Center for Education Statistics. The Condition of Education, 1983 Edition. Washington, D.C., 1983.
- National Center for Education Statistics. The Condition of Education, 1984 Edition. Washington, D.C., 1984.
- National Coalition of Advocates for Students. Barriers to Excellence: Our Children at Risk. Boston, 1985.
- National School Boards Association. A Survey of Public Education in the Nation's Urban School Districts. Washington, D.C., 1983.
- Powell, A. G. The Uncertain Profession. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1980.

Rice, J. M. The Public School System of the United States. New York: The Centurion Company, 1893.

United States Department of Education. "Partnerships in Education: Education Trends of the Future" Washington, D.C., 1985.

Vivian, J. R., and others. Teaching in America: The Common Ground, A Report of the Yale-New Haven Teachers Institute. New York: The College Entrance Examination Board, 1985.

## Appendix

### National Studies and Reports Citing the Teachers Institute

The Humanities in American Life: Report of the Commission on the Humanities (1980), pages 56-59.

School and College: Partnerships in Education; A Carnegie Foundation Special Report (1983), pages 36-42.

High School: A Report on Secondary Education in America by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching (1983), pages 260-262.

### Evaluations of the Teachers Institute by:

Robert Kellogg  
Ernest L. Boyer  
Theodore R.Sizer  
Norman C. Francis

Report on Questionnaires Administered in 1982 to New Haven Teachers in the Humanities

Transcript of the Presentation of the Yale-New Haven Teachers Institute as a Case Study, February 17, 1983, at the Yale Conference on Excellence in Teaching

### Selected Articles on the Teachers Institute