

# EDUCATION *and* URBAN SOCIETY

November 1986  
Volume 19 Number 1



THIS ISSUE IS DEVOTED TO:  
COLLABORATION



SAGE PUBLICATIONS

# *ISSUES IN ESTABLISHING AND DEVELOPING AN EDUCATIONAL COLLABORATION The Yale-New Haven Experience*

JAMES R. VIVIAN

*Yale-New Haven Teachers Institute*

**Participants in the Yale-New Haven Teachers Institute** and I have had the opportunity to describe the concept, operation, and some of the results of our program elsewhere (Vivian, 1985, forthcoming; Vivian et al., 1985; U.S. Congress, 1985). We have spoken about the four principles that have guided the program since its inception: (1) our belief in the fundamental importance of teaching to learning in schools and our emphasis on the classroom application of our collaborative work; (2) our insistence that teachers of students at different levels interact as colleagues addressing the common problems of teaching their disciplines; (3) our conviction that teacher leadership is indispensable to educational reform; and (4) our certainty that collaborative programs will be truly effective only if they are long term. University and school teachers in the Institute have written about what they have gained from the program. We have described the significance of the Institute to Yale as an institution. We also have presented the preliminary results of evaluations of the Institute, which indicate that the program has increased teachers' knowledge of their disciplines, heightened their expectations of their students' ability to learn, raised their morale, and encouraged them to remain in teaching in our local public schools; and that, in turn, this has improved student learning.

For several years, we have been discussing our program with colleagues in other communities who have been pursuing the establishment of similar programs to benefit the schools and universities mutually in their own communities, precisely the audience Dean Gifford has in mind for the present issue. During the course of those conversations, I have usually found ready agreement with the tenets of our approach; discussion turns quickly to how over time we have put

these principles into practice in New Haven. The present article affords me an opportunity to speak more practically and anecdotally about how, in 1977, we planned the Teachers Institute and since then have developed our program. In reflecting on the past eight years, I draw on our conversations with colleagues from other communities. I describe some, although certainly not all, of the issues that are often raised by individuals who are considering how they might adapt our program to their own educational setting.

The scope of the present article does not permit me to treat many other important issues in the initial and ongoing development of the program: for example, the relationship of the Institute's administrative structure to the existing structures of the university and the schools; the relationship of Institute seminars to course credit policies of the university and in-service credit policies of the schools; or the role that the university, the schools, and numerous national and local corporations, foundations, and agencies have played in financing the program. Neither can I describe the complexity of evaluating a program like the Institute, the evaluations we have undertaken and planned, or the ways we have sought to balance the imperatives of evaluation and national dissemination with the operation of the Institute. I have chosen instead to focus on some of the main issues schoolteachers themselves have addressed while shaping the program. Although much of what I describe about the program was determined at its beginning, we have since made many adjustments and refinements that space does not permit me to describe more historically. We presently are preparing a longer version of the Institute's history, and many of the issues that I cannot include here will be the subject of a national meeting of collaborative programs that we will hold at Yale in 1986.

### THE NEW HAVEN SETTING

I should initially comment on our own setting—on New Haven, Yale University, and the New Haven Public Schools—so the reader can consider the bearing of local circumstances on our particular approach to collaboration. A caveat, however: During the course of our work with other communities, I have become increasingly convinced that there are greater similarities than differences in the opportunities for educational collaboration in cities across the country.

In terms of the proportion of the population living below the federally established poverty line, New Haven, a city with a population of about 125,000, is the seventh-poorest city in the nation (Rae, 1983). In our low-income areas, 38.7% of residents are 18 years of age or younger. Of the students attending New Haven's public secondary schools, more than 60% come from families receiving public assistance. The percentage of minority students enrolled in the New Haven Public Schools is higher than in 39 of the 46 major urban school districts surveyed recently by the National School Boards Association. At 83% (mostly black and Hispanic), the rate of minority student enrollment is approximately the same as that in Chicago and is higher than in Baltimore, Miami, Philadelphia, Birmingham, Cleveland, and St. Louis (National School Boards Association, 1983). 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 do not complete high school (National Coalition of Advocates for Students, 1985). In New Haven, 45% of individuals entering the ninth grade do not graduate.

The total enrollment in the New Haven Public Schools is 17,000, with 8,200 students attending middle and high schools. Whereas the school system is therefore "manageably sized" when compared with many of the larger school districts in the country, it nonetheless has the demographic features that will increasingly characterize urban public education in the United States.

Out of a total of 1,200 teachers in the school system, about 420 teach subjects in the humanities and the sciences at the secondary level. The annual turnover of these secondary school teachers, those potentially eligible to participate in the Institute, is less than 2% and will remain at this comparatively low level for at least the next several years. Only 58.8% of these teachers in the humanities, 38.6% in the sciences, and 34.4% in mathematics majored in college or graduate schools in the subjects they teach. A high proportion of teachers, particularly those in middle schools, majored in education.

In contrast, Yale has no school or department of education. With about 10,700 undergraduate, graduate, and professional students, a full-time faculty of 670 in the arts and sciences, and an endowment of more than \$1.3 billion, Yale has tremendous resources for an institution its size. Yale faculty are leading scholars in their fields, and Yale students are among the best prepared in the country. Turnover of faculty, particularly the tenured faculty, is low. Among the 5,250 undergradu-

ates, 55% attended public schools; 17% are minorities; 82.5% graduate within four years of matriculation. Only 24 current undergraduates are from New Haven. As Ernest L. Boyer, president of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, wrote in his evaluation of the Institute (1981: 4), "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." To put the matter in general terms, the question in New Haven was how a major cultural institution located in an urban area might become more constructively involved in the community where it resides and upon which it depends.

### CONDITIONS FOR BEGINNING

A recognition and articulation of mutual self-interest was, of course, a necessary first step in establishing the Institute. The role of altruism, of a sense of social and civic purpose, should not, however, be underestimated. Discussions proceeded simultaneously with two groups, the teachers of the university and the schools and their administrations. That schoolteachers be centrally involved from the outset in shaping the program was of fundamental importance, if the program was to address how we might strengthen teaching and learning in the classroom.

There was a coincidence of several favorable circumstances. Since 1969, teachers from New Haven secondary schools had worked with members of the Yale History Department to develop new teaching materials in American history, world area studies, and urban history. Although involving fewer than 20 teachers each year, the History Education Project (HEP), forerunner of the present Institute, enjoyed a good reputation among schoolteachers and with the administrations of the university and the schools. In 1977, the secretary of the university, who had responsibility for Yale's community relations, called HEP "the most solid, the most vital" educational link between Yale and New Haven. It provided, in fact, one of the few opportunities for the administrations to meet about a joint undertaking. HEP had been begun with a grant from the American Historical Association (AHA), which until 1973 funded a number of projects across the country concerned with improving the teaching of history in schools. The New Haven project was continued with local and state support. By 1977, the project was the only one the AHA had helped establish that was still in

existence, its \$10,000 annual budget provided in equal shares by the university, the schools, and our community foundation. This was an example of how, when a program is in the budget, and when there is a financial commitment of the institutions involved, it gets attention and is taken seriously. There was, thus, an eight-year record of a well-regarded relationship among university and schoolteachers to which both institutions had a financial commitment, albeit small.

Perhaps most important, the participating schoolteachers and members of the Yale History Department had discovered what they stood to gain from working with each other. They became the nucleus of the groups that planned the present Institute. They were instrumental, within the university and the schools, in enlisting administrative support. They also solicited the interest and enlisted the support of their colleagues in their own and other university and school departments. Because of their previous collaborative experience, they were credible in convincing their administrations and teaching colleagues that such an undertaking would be worthwhile and mutually advantageous.

At the risk of making the Institute's history appear merely serendipitous, I should mention three additional points. A. Bartlett Giamatti, who was to lead the Institute's first seminar in student writing, became, in 1978, Yale's president; Howard R. Lamar, who as chairman of the history department had been particularly instrumental in HEP and its evolution into the Institute, became the dean of Yale College; and Keith S. Thomson, who first assisted with the Institute's later expansion into the sciences, became the dean of the Yale graduate school. Also, the Institute had been developed since 1978, a time of unusual harmony between the university, school, and city administrations. Moreover, the Institute was begun well before the widespread public attention that, since 1983, has been paid to our nation's public schools. Far from being subjected to intense public scrutiny before we could begin to have evidence of the results of the program, our problem, especially in the early years, was one of gaining any public recognition at all for teachers' work in the Institute.

These are among the reasons that I often observe to colleagues from other institutions that successful collaborative 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. From our experience, I also believe that clear and visible support from the highest levels of university and school administrations

is critical, particularly if the collaboration is to be more than short term. Tangible evidence of that commitment is essential.

### **ASSESSING NEEDS AND RESOURCES: DEFINING BOUNDARIES**

For the administrations of Yale and the schools, the early questions focused on which of the schools' many needs might be most usefully addressed by the university's resources. In what areas did the schools have significant needs and the university complementary strengths? What was central enough to the mission of both institutions to enable us to construct a real partnership of allies in league to improve our community's public schools? Which problems of the schools were recurring, and which university resources enduring, so that the program might be of benefit to the schools over the longer term? These questions were addressed at a time of enormous pressures on the budgets of Yale, the city, and the schools. Even in better times, financial resources would never fully match our ambition to construct a highly productive partnership. In sum, the overriding question was how we might together apply limited resources in an intensive way where the need was greatest.

We explored these questions in the context of developing a proposal to the National Endowment for the Humanities (NEH) to expand the history project, to include additional disciplines in the humanities, and to make the new program more demanding. The NEH did not fund that initial proposal, but has since provided strong support for the Institute. The development of the first and subsequent proposals has demonstrated the advantages of proposal writing in terms of creating an immediate need to determine objectives and in imposing a timetable and deadline for reaching decisions.

Teachers and administrators from the university and the schools quickly reached a consensus: The relationships 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 the university'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 to 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. That year, the president of Yale, the superintendent of schools, the mayor of New Haven, and the Institute director held a news conference on the program. This was the first news conference held by the president and the mayor in over a decade, and the only one in memory ever held jointly by the president and the superintendent of schools. Mayor Frank Logue commented that the Institute represents “a combined activity that is in the mainstream of both our enterprises,” not something made “out of whole cloth.”

The Teachers Institute has since become by far the most comprehensive, intensive, and sustained collaboration of Yale faculty members with public school teachers. Between 1978 and 1985, the Institute offered 51 different seminars in the arts and humanities, the social sciences, mathematics, and the physical and life sciences. The Institute has been fortunate in the number of distinguished Yale faculty members who have become involved with the program; 57 Yale faculty members have given Institute talks and led one or more seminars. More than 200 teachers have completed the program successfully from one to eight times. Through the program, Fellows have developed 432 individual curriculum units that were taught in 1984-1985 in more than 1,500 school classes. Much, however, remains to be done. Two-thirds of New Haven secondary school teachers in the humanities and the sciences have never participated in the program; of those who have taken part, two-thirds have participated only once or twice.

Still, one of the most persistent issues for the Institute is keeping our work sharply focused where the need is compelling, where we have annually renewable resources to address that need, and where successfully addressing that need is demonstrably in the self-interest of both the

university and the schools. We periodically resurvey the boundaries that we fixed in 1978. To give some sense of both the centrifugal pressures and our limitations, I mention four examples. They illustrate some of the reasons we have retained the Institute's original focus on assisting teachers of the humanities and the sciences in New Haven's public secondary schools.

First, some have suggested that Yale should, either instead of or in addition to the Institute, work directly with school students, perhaps with the most academically capable who themselves might later enter Yale. Supplementary programs such as the national Upward Bound program have demonstrated the ways in which university and school teachers can work together effectively with students "at risk," and the high rates at which these students can enter and graduate from college. At present, in fact, hundreds of Yale faculty members, staff, and students are involved, mostly on a volunteer basis, in a score of supplementary programs for students from New Haven and other area schools. I stress the value of such programs, while at the same time distinguishing them from what the Institute represents.

Through the Institute we have chosen, in effect, to affirm the respective missions of the university and the schools in terms of the students each enrolls, and to attend to something more intrinsic to teaching and learning in schools. We have decided against having teachers from the university attempt to change place with those in the schools. Also—and this is hard to say judiciously—it has sometimes seemed not only presumptuous, but also potentially demeaning of schoolteachers, to seek to replace rather than to assist them with their own students. Most of all, we have had in mind achieving the greatest impact with available financial resources and with the limited number of faculty members who in any particular year might be involved. For example, the same budget might support a given number of faculty members working either with 80 students, or with 80 teachers and through them the several thousand students in their present classes, not to mention their future students.

Second, some have urged that we also involve elementary school teachers. Our focus on secondary school teachers arises from the fact that they specialize in one or two academic disciplines. This provides the common ground for their work with university faculty members. That we have chosen not to involve elementary school teachers underscores, then, the centrality of subject matter to our collaboration.

Third, some have wanted us to expand the geographic boundaries of the Institute to encompass, at a minimum, the schools in neighboring communities, schools that many university faculty members' children attend. Others would describe a perimeter that is statewide, regional, or national, more corresponding to the geographic range from which Yale draws its own students. Here again we admit our limitations, in terms of faculty and finance, and are concerned also about how, by attempting too much, we would dilute what can be accomplished by concentrating on the schools in our own community, whose future is so intertwined with that of the university. To expand the program's geography would also alter its schedule, making it of necessity a summer and weekend program for only a few teachers from any given school. As described below, we believe that the present year-round schedule has distinct advantages, and that the program's impact on schools is directly related to the proportion of their teachers we can involve.

Fourth, there are the pressures for evaluation and national dissemination of the program, both of which we accept as important obligations, but neither of which will we allow to detract from our central purpose of assisting teachers in our community's secondary schools. As mentioned above, these obligations pose numerous issues that are beyond the scope of the present article.

In short, we try to keep in mind that truisms are among other things true, and that school reform efforts often are too ambitious, not to mention ephemeral. Theodore R. Sizer, of the Education Department of Brown University, who evaluated our program (1983: 3), wrote that

the claims for increased scale for the Institute are not persuasive. Indeed, the arguments for the current scale are powerful. All too few school reform efforts get the scale right. By remaining small, focused and uncomplicated, the Institute will serve its purpose admirably.

### **DETERMINING AIMS, ACTIVITIES, AND SCHEDULE, AND INVENTING TERMINOLOGY**

From the beginning, the teachers in the leadership of the Institute have been adamant advocates for making the program academically serious, demanding of participants, attractive to a significant proportion

of their colleagues, and directed at improving the learning of New Haven students. We therefore had to determine the activities that would best assist teachers not only in studying a subject but also in developing practical approaches for applying their new learning in school courses. We had to arrive at a schedule that would be manageable for the largest number of teachers, a schedule that also would be possible for the university faculty members whom we wished to involve. To make the program as demanding as feasible, and still to achieve a high level of participation by New Haven teachers, we had to consider questions of time and money and other rewards—how to balance the rigor of the program with sufficient incentives that we might realistically make available to participating teachers.

Most of all, I think, teachers wanted to make the Institute something that would be both professionally and personally important, in terms of their own intellectual growth and rejuvenation and their capacity and effectiveness as teachers. I recall two themes, in particular, from the early conversations—that many of the courses in their preservice preparation had done little to prepare them for the realities of the classroom; and that many of the curriculum development projects and in-service opportunities in which they had been engaged since entering teaching had been insubstantial. To people who talk with teachers, I suspect these are familiar themes. Teachers spoke of not wanting to invest a lot of time and effort in yet another project that would come to have little or no bearing on their own or other teachers' classrooms. They were, in short, seasoned but still sanguine, dedicated, and optimistic, even in spite of past experience. This was reflected in many long, at times heated, planning sessions.

Our decision making from the outset has been largely by consensus, necessary for airing and hammering out solutions to the many real issues and for giving teachers a proprietary interest in the program. In this way, the teacher leaders gained the conviction and the enthusiasm that they later passed along to many of their colleagues. Through these discussions, teachers often had to suspend judgment, to set aside stereotypes and myths about schools and universities—in effect, to explore the assumptions and values that might come to be shared between the university and school “cultures,” described by Seymour Sarason (1971). Finally, through these discussions, we had to adopt terminology that would reflect their intentions.

Although none of the above issues is—or should be—firmly or finally resolved, I would describe something about how we have dealt with each

thus far. To make the program academically serious, it seemed clear from the outset that participating teachers should not passively receive knowledge, but actively engage together in its pursuit. In short, everyone would have to come prepared to discuss a subject and how it might be introduced in their own teaching. And everyone would have to come—regularly. Working together in small groups seemed the format most conducive to this kind of exchange and most likely to challenge and to engage each individual participant. The decision was to call these groups *seminars* to distinguish them from regular *courses*, a term banned from the Institute vocabulary because it connotes a hierarchical, student-teacher relationship. University faculty members were therefore described simply by their function in the program as *seminar leaders*. Participating teachers we decided to call *Fellows*, suggesting their affiliation with the institution as colleagues, not as students. (After debate about whether the term has sexist overtones, we decided always to capitalize the word.)

The specific terms we chose are less important than noting the terms we were avoiding: The point was to develop a language that would convey that teachers from the university and the schools were participating as colleagues in the same disciplines and within the same profession. We stressed that each group brought to the enterprise something equally important to our overall aim of strengthening teaching and learning in schools. With respect to that aim, the main expertise of university faculty members lies, we thought, in their knowledge of academic subjects, whereas schoolteachers' expertise lies especially in their pedagogical experience—their sense of what will work for students in their classrooms. Although the distinction is obviously somewhat arbitrary and artificial, it has served to highlight the respective strengths and contributions of each group within the context of the program, and to assign coequal importance to the participation of each. I will not here join the long-standing debate about subject matter versus pedagogy, but will only observe that the formulation we devised has enabled participants to pursue both, simultaneously, and has proved essential to the collegiality on which our program is founded.

Teachers decided that the annual program should also include a series of informal talks by university faculty members. These would acquaint teachers with faculty members who might later lead seminars on subjects addressed in the talks. The talks would also provide intellectual stimulation and point up interdisciplinary relationships in scholarship and teaching—they would set a tone for the program. By

bringing together Fellows from all of the seminars, they would give the program a sense of coherence and collective purpose. By placing the talks at the beginning of the program, we might determine in advance of the seminars which teachers were committed to participating fully in the program. The talks continue to serve these purposes, and the teachers in the leadership of the program are determined to retain them. Nonetheless, the talks are a matter of controversy each year, and the controversy surrounding them is instructive. Many teachers would prefer the Institute to schedule instead more seminar meetings because in these they are more actively engaged in studying a subject that is immediately applicable to their own teaching.

To emphasize the classroom application of participants' reading and their discussion of that reading in the seminars, we decided that each teacher would write a "curriculum unit," taking a manageable topic in the seminar subject and developing it for classroom use. Each seminar must face the challenge of balancing the teachers' further preparation in the seminar subject with their development of teaching materials for their classrooms. In this way, each seminar addresses the central educational issue of the connection between the teacher's preparation and student learning. Based on our experience with HEP, this was something too vital to be left to chance. We remain convinced that we cannot simply assume that the teacher's new knowledge will be effectively conveyed to students. By requiring the writing of a curriculum unit, we insist that teachers think deliberately and formally about how what they are learning can be applied in their own teaching.

Fellows prepare their curriculum units in a five-step process, beginning with a provisional statement of their unit topic on their application to the program, and continuing throughout the seminar period with a prospectus, two drafts, and the final writing of the unit. This process allows a gradual development and enlargement as Fellows think and rethink their units, and provides for various drafts so that the Fellows and seminar leader in each seminar can comment on and contribute to the work-in-progress. 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, and neither 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 about a topic within the seminar subject and about approaches for introducing that topic in their own teaching. We stress

the teacher's own mastery of a subject, together with strategies for teaching it to students.

How we might ensure that the materials teachers write are actually introduced into their own teaching was a basic issue. Also, we did not want the Institute to be something concocted by Yale and imposed on the schools. For both reasons, the teachers planning the Institute decided that the seminars should be organized around topics that teachers themselves had requested, topics on which teachers wanted to work because they perceived a need to prepare these topics for their own teaching. In this way, they thought, the introduction of the work of the seminars into New Haven classrooms would be self-fulfilling. Our experience has borne this out. As a result, we sometimes ask university faculty members to lead a seminar on a subject they do not ordinarily teach, and this adds to the collegiality with which everyone in the seminar pursues the subject together.

I come last to the question of scheduling, in part, because we placed it last during our initial planning. We realized that, if we placed it first, we might not get beyond it. We wanted first to determine what ideally we wanted the program to be; then we would consider how best to make it possible for teachers and Yale members to participate. We did not want practical questions of scheduling to dictate what the program would be. Our primary aims in scheduling were twofold: To make the program as demanding as possible and still to achieve the highest possible level of participation by New Haven teachers. We knew that if we made it so demanding that we could convene in a phone booth, the program would have no influence on schools. The Institute's impact would be roughly proportional to the number of teachers participating on a recurring basis; that seemed only common sense. On the other hand, to have a large number of participants in something insubstantial would also be ineffectual. We spent a lot of time on the schedule, and we still do. It is possible to comment here on only a few points from these discussions that annually test the patience of everyone involved.

We quickly decided that the program should not be conducted on a daily, summer schedule. From our experience with HEP, we knew that we could not attract a high proportion of teachers if we presented them with a choice between the Institute and their needs for summer employment and time with their families. We also knew from experience that the teachers who might participate on that basis would not be a cross section of New Haven teachers, and we were determined that Institute Fellows be as numerous and as representative of all New Haven

teachers as possible. In the end, we decided to schedule talks and seminars in weekly meetings of two hours on the same day each week, so that people could plan ahead and so that we could work more easily with school administrators to avoid scheduling conflicts. Tuesday has become the Institute meeting day, and this is widely known by teachers who have participated, or who are considering participation. In 1978, these weekly meetings were held over three months; they now span almost five months, overlapping the school year in New Haven by four months. By lengthening this most intensive phase of the program, we elongated the period during which Fellows read in the seminar subject. We also were able to add steps in the process of writing the curriculum unit, described above.

That so much of the program occurs during the school year we regard as a major advantage. Fellows are not participating in an isolated experience that is removed from the realities of the classroom. Instead, they come to talks and seminars after a day of teaching, and return to their classes the following morning. In this way, they are constantly reminded of the purpose of their participation; they also can begin to try out in their own classes some of the materials and approaches that they eventually will include in their curriculum units.

How, then, having arrived at the aims, activities, and schedule for the Institute, should we determine the incentives and rewards that would encourage maximum participation by New Haven teachers? For three reasons especially, it was clear that there should be a stipend. First, we wanted to cover Fellows' expenses for books, other materials, typing, and travel. Second, the demands of the program would reduce or preclude for several months the outside income (real estate, homebound, and after-school instruction, coaching, and so forth) on which many teachers depend to support their families. Third, we wanted to emphasize that teachers would participate, not just for their own personal benefit, but especially for the ways in which their participation might over time strengthen the schools. There were dissenting voices: Taking seminars is, after all, what the university usually charges for, not what it ordinarily pays people to do; the program would represent something already expected of teachers in terms of curriculum development and planning for their courses. We were nonetheless convinced that the stipend should be as generous as possible, for the reasons mentioned above, and even more important, because we wanted to make the program as demanding and professionally important as possible. We did not want the question of compensation to limit

participation in the Institute in the way it limits the attractiveness of the teaching profession in the first place. We also decided that the stipend would be paid only upon successful completion of the program, which meant, and means, Fellows' attending and coming prepared to all seminar meetings and talks, meeting all deadlines in preparing a curriculum unit consistent with Institute guidelines, and conferring at least twice individually with the seminar leader to discuss the concept and development of the unit. The teachers in the leadership of the program are firm about what we term *full participation* by all Fellows.

Raising the stipend, only \$650 in 1985, is a perennial issue, and its comparatively low level in relation to the demands of the program suggests that few teachers participate in the Institute because of the remuneration. Annual evaluations confirm that, for most, it is the seminar experience itself that induces them to participate. Fellows have the opportunity to "publish" what they write in the volume of curriculum units the Institute compiles for each seminar; these units are distributed to all New Haven teachers who wish to use them in their teaching. Also, Fellows who remain in good standing become for one year full members of the university community, with all library privileges and access to other campus facilities and resources, not only those organized through the Institute. We particularly sought to avoid placing Fellows in any sort of "second-class citizenship" on campus. Fellows are listed in the university directory of faculty and staff, which has symbolic meaning in recognizing them as colleagues and members of the Yale community, and practical value in opening institutional resources to them.

We also wanted the Institute to be attractive to Yale faculty members who might participate as seminar leaders. Whatever the personal and professional rewards and sense of community service they derive from doing so—and many who have led seminars are eloquent on these points—we decided that their responsibilities to the Institute were roughly equivalent to teaching a course in the summer; they are compensated accordingly.

Some final notes on the terminology: Use of the terms *teacher* and *faculty member* is nettling. Individuals who teach in schools and who teach in colleges and universities are certainly both teachers, but they are not both faculty members in the same sense. Insistent use of language will not erase the differences in the power that these two groups of teachers can exercise as faculty members in their respective institutions. This suggests the reasons that the active support and involvement, not

only of the school administration, but also of the local leadership of the American Federation of Teachers (AFT), has been essential to our program. From the beginning, the AFT has seen the Institute as seeking to serve its membership.

With respect to *collaboration*, a term now widely used to describe quite varied activities, it should by now be clear that, in New Haven, we mean by the term something specific. We find it increasingly useful to use *partnership* to describe the formal arrangement between institutions, and *collaboration* to characterize the collegial process of teachers working together through the Institute. Within a partnership of institutions, there is a coequal relationship of colleagues, a voluntary association of individuals who choose to work together. Equal importance is attached to what each colleague brings to the relationship.

### **DEVISING STRUCTURE AND ASSIGNING RESPONSIBILITIES**

In order to practice collegiality in the day-to-day workings of the Institute, we devised an administrative structure that reflects the primacy of teacher. We did not wish the program to be administratively dominated by Yale, neither 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 School Representatives have provided a solution to all these potential difficulties. Through the Coordinators and 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.

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; encouraging teachers to participate as Fellows; and urging teachers who are not 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.

Institute Coordinators have an indispensable role. Through them, the Institute seeks to ensure that its activities meet the needs of teachers and their students. Coordinators must be, and 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 overall responsibilities for the recruitment and admissions process; and assisting with the long-range planning, evaluation, and national dissemination of the program.

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 [p. 2].

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 [p. 2].

The process of decision making that I have described and that we have employed in establishing and developing our program, particularly given the number of teachers involved, is cumbersome and time-consuming. It requires patience and persistence. It is also, I am convinced, absolutely necessary if a partnership is to be planned, organized, conducted, and sustained in a genuinely collaborative way.

## REFERENCES

- BOYER, E. L. (1981) An Evaluation of the Yale-New Haven Teachers Institute. (unpublished report)
- KELLOGG, R. (1980) An Evaluation of the Yale-New Haven Teachers Institute. (unpublished report)
- National Coalition of Advocates for Students (1985) *Barriers to Excellence: Our Children at Risk*. Boston: Author.
- National School Boards Association (1983) *A Survey of Public Education in the Nation's Urban School Districts*. Washington, DC: Author.
- RAE, D. W. (1983) *The Extent, Distribution, and Causes of Poverty in New Haven (Phase I Report)*. New Haven, CT: City of New Haven Special Commission on Poverty.
- SARASON, S. B. (1971) *The Culture of the School and the Problem of Change*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- SIZER, T. R. (1983) An Evaluation of the Yale-New Haven Teachers Institute. (unpublished report)
- U.S. Congress (1985) Hearings (Oct. 10). Washington, DC: Senate Subcommittee on Education, Arts, and Humanities.
- VIVIAN, J. R. (1985) "Empowering teachers as colleagues," in T. Williams (ed.) *College-school Collaboration: Appraising the Major Approaches*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- (forthcoming) "The Yale New Haven Teachers Institute," in R. J. Fortune (ed.) *School/College Collaborative Programs in Writing and Literature*. New York: Modern Language Association of America.
- et al. (1985) *Teaching in America: The Common Ground*. New York: College Board.