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INTRODUCTION

This report is an attempt to evaluate the first teacher trainers institute in modern languages which was held on the University of Minnesota campus under Title XI of the NDEA from June 20 to August 5, 1966. Not only do modern language teachers out in the elementary and secondary schools deserve careful attention through NDEA institutes but the instructors who teach at the college and university levels and have to do with the training of future teachers of modern language also deserve careful attention and are entitled to the help they need. These are the forgotten men and women of the past eight years.

The institute just held at the University of Minnesota tried to provide an opportunity for the dissemination of new information, concepts, and techniques in the teaching and learning of second languages and to open up the field of foreign language research and education to its participants. It seemed to us most logical that training prospective teachers in appropriate ways before they begin their teaching careers makes far more sense than trying to retrain beginning teachers shortly after they have completed their undergraduate collegiate programs. If such an institute as ours provides the opportunity for college faculty to update itself in an understanding of the new approaches and the problems in the field of language learning and teaching, it
could get at the heart of the problem of teacher preparation in the modern language field. As a direct result, our most important objective, though an unstated one, would be the improvement of modern language teacher training programs in our participants' colleges and universities. If this objective is attained, and here we must wait to see how effective the participant will be on having an impact on the program of his respective college or university, the multiplying factor involved will be of considerable importance. Each individual in the institute (this includes the faculty) would influence hundreds of others in the remainder of his career. Thus, this first teacher trainers institute was an attempt to deal with the source, where all of the future teachers are educated: the colleges and universities.
SPECIAL REPORT

It is quite obvious from the information provided by the participants and the staff that the teacher trainers institute held at the University of Minnesota from June 20 to August 5, 1966, was a successful one.

There was one main contributing factor to the success of the institute. All staff members regarded the participants as their colleagues rather than as their students. We strongly feel therefore that this success can be directly traced to the spirit of "camaraderie" among both staff and participants. This relationship created an atmosphere which was conducive to a very full exchange of ideas on a wide range of topics of concern to the institute. Distance from dormitory to Peik Hall and the bad housekeeping in the dormitory were pointed out. Adjustments in the content of some courses were made as a direct result of "feedback." The flexibility of the staff was of great advantage here.

A very free exchange of ideas concerning language learning also took place. In this respect it is possible to state that the majority of participants left the institute with what seemed to be a new attitude, an objectivity about language learning and teacher preparation that they did not have before. In fact, some came with very strong prejudices towards new ideas and felt that the move toward transformational grammar was a return to the grammar-translation
approach. Thus the free interchange of ideas among the linguistics professors, the instructors in methodology and the beginning language courses led to much synthesizing. It must be said that at the present time we are at a crucial stage in language learning and the audio-lingual approach is being challenged. Thus, this synthesizing of what is happening in psycholinguistics, in transformational grammar, in educational psychology with what has been done in descriptive linguistics was much in order.

The choice of participants was another contributing factor to the success of the institute. We would like to believe that the ability of the participants to work together was the result of the fact that they were college and university staff members, but there is always the possibility that we might not find this quality in another group at another time.

We also feel that the fine cooperation received from our own Central Administration, The College of Education, The College of Liberal Arts, and the Graduate School was an important factor in our success. Without this cooperation the administering of the institute would have been infinitely more difficult.

In general we feel we accomplished the goals that we set up for the institute. There are some things that we would like changed and others we would not. (See Section
Perhaps the most important change that needs to be made in the institute were it to be given another summer is the schedule. All regularly scheduled courses should be given in the morning thereby allowing time for workshops, seminars, group study time, and field trips in the early afternoon. The participants should be finished with the day's schedule by 3:00 p.m. This year the day's program ran to 4:45 p.m. Such a long day becomes unbearable for many participants especially when the summer is hot and there is no air-conditioning available.

Other changes that we would make are minor, indicating therefore that we would stand on most of what we have done this year.

Some of the participants approached the professionalized course in the Teaching of Beginning Language with different objectives than those we proposed for the institute. These courses were originally intended to give the participants knowledge of another language as a tool with which they needed to be familiar in methods courses and supervision. Instructors many times see themselves confronted with a need to know all three major languages. Some looked upon these courses as a "shock" language and wondered whether, at a future institute, an uncommonly taught language such as Chines or Arabic could not be included for those who would
like this experience. The decision concerning this phase of the program must undergo careful consideration by the co-directors of a future institute.

The linguistics courses need to be altered to provide for individual differences, since the differences among participants are greatest in this area. Perhaps a basic course in linguistic concepts needs to be offered for those who are relatively unsophisticated in the science of language. The other courses might deal with more advanced topics such as transformational grammar. Both kinds of courses however should be aimed at the direct application of the information to the classroom.

The course objectives for the development of materials and techniques for teaching advanced levels need to be more limited. This course might concentrate on the analysis of materials suitable for advanced classes with the idea of finding out what "connaissances" a teacher needs to possess for teaching such material. Or it could concentrate solely on techniques of teaching advanced classes. It would be ideal to have a synthesis of the two. However, the course was not able to cover both areas adequately and therefore some basic decision will have to be made regarding direction here.

The language laboratory and materials course needs to be in the hands of one person with help from three teaching
assistants who are knowledgeable also in laboratory and audio-visual techniques and materials. We missed the help teaching assistants could have provided at this year's institute.

The methods curriculum workshop and research course we would not alter appreciably. We would request the participants to go through a programmed learning course in statistics before their arrival at the institute. This would give the consultants used in the latter course a point of departure. The institute seminar needs to be used more for an exchange of ideas about the week's work than it was. Feature films and cultural films should be limited and related directly to what can be done with them in the classroom.

In general, we felt the courses were very good for a first attempt at such an institute, but the changes suggested above would help make an even better "next" institute.
EVALUATION

Section I
RELATIONS WITH THE UNITED STATES OFFICE OF EDUCATION AND THE ADMINISTRATION OF THE UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

A. USOE: The program that the USOE has designed for dealing with the institute seems to be effective. The Directors meeting in December 1965 was helpful with the exception of the Plenary Session where the Directors Handbook was read aloud.

Negotiating the contract, was a most trying process, probably because it was a new experience for Mr. Lange and because of what seemed to him to be overconcern for certain extraneous matters. When we compared there seemed too little uniformity between the English, Modern Language or Geography negotiations. There seemed little or no room for discussion of questions regarding the necessity for certain budgetary considerations, such as Mr. Lange's appointment starting January 3 rather than 2 1/2 months prior to the beginning of the institute and the question of adding two teaching assistants which we found we needed after we started negotiations with the USOE.

The visit by the USOE staff members, Drs. Bigelow, Slaughter and Schmieder, was cordial and informative. At the same time however, we, as institute co-directors, were at a loss as to what the exact purpose of the visits were, especially when it came to the discussion period at the joint
meeting of the modern language and the geography institute participants and the direction it was taking especially by the questions and statements raised by the geography participants. The visits of the USOE staff members the following morning and the discussions with the visitors were highly beneficial and most worthwhile.

The interviews of staff and participants by Dr. J. N. Hook of the Consortium will probably yield more objective information with regard to the questions asked by the visiting team from the USOE. The questionnaires given out by Dr. Hook were returned by the participants at the end of the week rather than at the end of the institute. Some of the participants stated that had the questionnaire been filled out during the last day of the institute when we had our evaluation session they would have answered some questions differently because what they thought were lacunae, such as the structuring of a methods course, lesson plans, etc. were discussed and worked on during the final two weeks.

In general, we feel that relations and communications with the USOE and our institute were good.

B. University of Minnesota Administration: We can only commend our own Central Administration and the Administration of the College of Education, the Departments of Modern Languages in the College of Liberal Arts for the outstanding cooperation we received. We feel this cooperation was one
of the main contributing factors to the success of our institute.

Section II
PUBLICITY

A. Our basic means of publicity was the Institute Brochure of which we had 2,500 printed. We mailed 2,000 brochures to methods teachers from a list developed by the Modern Language Association. The list was not up to date as we discovered later. We also mailed approximately 500 to state foreign language supervisors, asking them to alert people in their states who might qualify for our Institute. No other publicity was used.

B. Refer to Appendix A for a copy of the Brochure.

C. Although this means of publicity was successful (we had approximately 300 inquiries and 155 applicants), we do not feel we reached all of the people who were interested in an institute of this type. If we have another institute, we would like to send brochures to Deans and Heads of Schools of Education as well as Heads of Language Departments of all teacher preparing institutions in the country.

Publicity should go out sooner to college and university people because they must begin as early as January to make plans for the summer. Earlier notification of selection would also be appropriate for the same reasons.
Selection of participants was based on primarily two criteria: (1) evidence of either teaching a course in modern language methodology or supervising modern language student teachers for fall of 1966, (2) evidence of at least an M. A. Degree. These two points were basic to our selection. There were however some minor considerations. Preference wherever possible was given to persons with little or no formal training in the various areas emphasized in the institute. Attention was given to the recommendations of the superiors of the applicants with the assurance that the applicant was fluent in all four skills of one of the major languages of concern in the institute (French, German, Spanish) and that he would be given the opportunity to introduce new information, concepts, and techniques into the college program.

The final selection was made by the co-directors, the foreign language consultant of the Minnesota State Department of Education and a member of the modern language staff in the College of Liberal Arts.

We tried not to select as participants those applicants who had attended more than one previous NDEA Institute as secondary school teachers or had taught in one. Since we had three language groups, French, German and Spanish, we decided we would pick ten in each language. On the whole
we feel we were quite successful with these selection
criteria and would not want to alter them.

Section IV
ORIENTATION OF PARTICIPANTS

Orientation of participants was done largely through
letters prior to the institute. We attempted to inform our
participants about housing, what clothes to bring, the
University and its cultural program, registration, etc.
When the participants arrived we oriented them more specif-
ically to their housing, the Institute program, parking.
We also had an evening "get acquainted" party, on June 19th,
at Dr. Birkmaier's home which helped break "the ice." The
first day of classes was designed specifically to orient
the participants to the program of the institute.

We feel that the orientation program was effective. It
could be improved upon by doing the following:

1. Every participant should be required to come one
day in advance of classes in order to get settled and be
oriented to the program in a total group situation rather
than be oriented informally, one by one.

2. Specific questionnaires should be devised and sent
out before the beginning of the institute to determine some
of the needs of the participants regarding courses in the
program. For example, in the course dealing with language
laboratory materials and equipment, information from the
the participants concerning knowledge and skills in handling equipment would have been valuable for a more precise pre-planning of the course. Such questionnaires could be developed for most of the other courses as well. Although some participants wrote, in their applications, that they knew all about the language laboratories and other audio-visual equipment, we found that these same applicants did not know how to splice a tape and many of the other fundamental operations necessary for the effective use of technological equipment in the teaching process.

3. It would be of great help to know in advance precisely in which dormitory the participants are going to be housed in order to provide the participants with an address, what services the dormitory will furnish so that the participants can bring along what is needed, and how the payments are to be made.

Section V
PHYSICAL FACILITIES

A. Classroom: The classroom space was adequate. We had four classrooms available for use in Peik Hall, three for teaching and one for materials and equipment display. We also had the cooperation of the University of Minnesota Language Laboratory Director for use of the large language laboratory and its facilities in the College of Liberal Arts as well as the two small laboratories (25 positions
and 33 positions) available in Peik Hall. None of the class-
rooms or laboratories on campus are air-conditioned. Fans 
were the only source of air movement. Since we had an ex-
tremely hot summer, the lack of air-conditioning was a major 
complaint of both staff and participants.

Equipment such as film, slide and filmstrip projectors, 
overhead projectors, tape recorders, etc. were housed in 
Peik Hall in the Modern Language Area where the institute 
was held. Small study rooms were available in the Peik Hall 
(University High School) library as well as in the Modern 
Language Area. The library of books, pamphlets, bulletins 
of immediate use to the participants was housed in two 
of the large classrooms. Materials such as texts, realia, 
tapes, films, recordings, language systems (Holt, McGraw-
Hill, etc.) were in rooms adjoining the large classrooms 
and immediately accessible to the participants for study 
and review. Besides these facilities they had access to the 
University of Minnesota Walter Library and the University 
High School Library. The participants were very pleased with 
the easy access to an extraordinarily large modern language 
curriculum library. The last week of the institute found 
them busily taking notes on all the materials which they 
did not find time to read. The USOE visitors also commented 
on how well equipped we were.

B. Housing: Twenty five of the participants were housed
in Frontier Hall, a University dormitory built within the last five years. Two commuted and three brought their families. Mr. Lange did his best to facilitate housing accommodations. Those housed in the dormitory mentioned the fact that this enabled them to get together at the dinner table and in other ways to carry on discussions which were stimulated by the class sessions, visiting lecturers and other activities held during the day. They also made mention of the fact that the food was excellent.

The dormitory is a twenty minute walk from Peik Hall and parking facilities are such that it is almost impossible to use one's car to commute from dormitory to Peik Hall. As a result more than half the participants brought bag lunches, since noon hour (12 to 1:30 p.m.) was often used to view the many films sent to us by various companies and which the participants did not want to miss. This we would not care to see happen again. It would be much better to have one hour for lunch and preview films, especially the feature films, in the late afternoon or in the evening in one of the dormitory lounges.

The faculty lounge and home economics facilities in Peik Hall were used for coffee breaks and lunch periods.

The housekeeping in the dormitory left much to be desired and the directors are making complaints to the proper authorities.
We have had an extremely hot summer not usually anticipated in Minnesota, and both participants and staff complained of lack of air-conditioning in the dormitory and Peik Hall, where classes were held. However, one participant, after returning to his home state (Texas) wrote "As you recall, the subject of the summer weather was a common topic while we were in Minneapolis. Well, it might have been warm up there for a number of days but I hope to make you feel cooler by saying that after a few days of Texas summertime I can assure you that the heat in Minneapolis was 'nuthin'.' Fans, however, did help to allay the heat somewhat.

If we have another institute, it would be possible to locate dormitory space in a new dormitory, which will be finished in the fall of 1966, 1 1/2 blocks from Peik Hall. All new buildings are now air-conditioned thus enabling the participants to have a good night's rest in case we have a repetition of hot weather.

C. Office Facilities: The office facilities for resident staff members are adequate in Peik Hall and Folwell Hall (College of Liberal Arts). The visiting staff members, of which there were two, chose to stay in Peik Hall, near their classrooms and base of operations. This meant that they had to share the large office which houses several staff members during the academic year. During the institute this office also had to house two secretaries. It will be possible to
house visiting staff in separate offices in the new dormitory as has been done in former NDEA institutes held for elementary and junior high school language teachers.

In general, we were satisfied with the teaching facilities, but there is a need to improve housing facilities for the participants.

Section VI

A. Field Trips, Lab Work, Practica

Five field trips were taken by the participants, four of which had to do with the language laboratory workshop and one was a visit to the Concordia College German Language Camp.

The field trip to Marshall High School was intended to familiarize the participants with a simple audio-active lab facility without booths.

A field trip was taken to the Education Materials Corporation, one of the leading commercial facilities in the country for making tape recordings for publishers of modern language materials.

The field trip to the educational television station KTCA-TV was intended to show the participants a facility which produces many modern language programs in French, Spanish and German for the elementary schools, and for the colleges and adult public in the community.

The field trip to Macalaster college was to show the
participants the uses of the video tape recorder and the new elaborate Chester laboratory in which students dial for their particular tapes.

A day was spent visiting the German Language camp about 150 miles northwest of the Twin Cities.

Both faculty and participants found these trips valuable and very informative. Many participants said they had gotten new ideas to try out upon their return home.

One of the laboratory instructors wrote: "It was evident from the beginning that a number of the participants had dismissed multi-media and language laboratories from their courses and their thinking. Towards the end of the institute, however, we were gratified to observe that many of these participants were at least inclined to take a new look at the multi-media or systems approach to language learning. Also we were able to overcome the apparent stigma of being a 'practitioner' when one splices tape, cleans the heads of a tape recorder, threads a movie projector or handles hardware in general."

The German language camp visit was the most popular trip and several made the statement that they would like to try such an activity in their states. Certainly the camp experience inspired many of them to take another look at the FLES program.

The KTCA field trip was weak in not showing videotapes
of at least one of the elementary school programs produced by Howard Hathaway. The focus seemed to be on showing off the facilities, which is undoubtedly one of the finest in the country.

Unfortunately, the Macalester College field trip could have made a much better impression and given us much more information if it had been more highly structured and we had had more time. But as it was presented to us it was too much "hardware" rather than "curriculum" oriented. Some one wrote: "an expensive facility poorly demonstrated."

The participants had the opportunity of using the foreign language labs and all the facilities already mentioned in Section V. Each had his own tape of the material to be learned in the language he was taking. Besides the regular laboratory workshop extra hours were scheduled in learning how to use the new materials and media in a practical manner.

There was opportunity to observe a beginning German and a beginning Russian class held at Marshall High School (1 1/2 blocks from Peik Hall) during the first five week summer session but only a few of the participants availed themselves of the opportunity because of the tight schedule from 8 to 10:15 in the morning when these classes were held.

B. Use of New Materials

One would have to say that the entire institute was
Based on the use of new materials. We had all of the latest materials published by companies and the MLA-FL program in every medium - systems of materials, tapes, films, filmstrips, sets of programmed learning courses in the various languages, visuals of many kinds. Encyclopedia Britannica Films and McGraw-Hill deluged us with films for which we used the noon hour for viewing, since one of the faculty members wished to see everything that was being sent!

There were two slots in the institute schedule on Friday morning and Friday afternoon which provided for demonstration of new materials.

Friday morning from 10:30 to 12:00 was devoted to viewing films which could assist in teacher training and be of help in the methods class. Here were viewed the Teaching Film Custodians' film number five on the Organization of Language, the Yale-Capretz films, the 8 fifteen-minute language laboratory films from the Pennsylvania State Department of Education, the new USOE film on the long sequence in language learning, the New York State teacher training films, the Two O'Clock Classroom and Live Talk from McGraw-Hill, the Chilton teacher training films (Voix et Images), and the Encyclopedia Britannica teacher training film. The uses of the overhead projector (3M Educational Services Division) in modern language classes was demonstrated. The A-LM materials were not demonstrated by
Harcourt-Brace since they were some of the basic materials used at University High School.

On Friday afternoon, either former foreign language consultants or teachers, some of whom were on the staffs of the publishing companies, demonstrated systems of materials: *Voix et Images* (St. Cloud); Holt, Rinehart, Winston; *Encyclopedia Britannica Films* (*La Familia Fernández, Je Parle Français*); *McGraw-Hill, Parlons français* (Heath-de Rochemont); and the new audio-visual-lingual materials developed by George Borglum.

Quite a few of the participants had not seen some of these materials and if they did it was only at an exhibit. Thus, the demonstrations were very valuable and useful and none of them felt this phase of the institute should be omitted. Some suggested more time for discussion of these materials with the directors and other faculty members after having seen the films. Individual differences and needs tend to show-up in evaluating these films, some liked certain ones very much; the ones liked by some were abhorred by others. Nevertheless, there was a consensus that they were very valuable as a take off for discussion and demonstration in methods classes and they, as methods teachers, needed to know these systems and teaching films in detail: the teaching films especially in lieu of demonstration classes and practical teaching situations encountered when a methods course
precedes the practice teaching situation; the systems of materials because the young student teacher most likely will be using one of these systems or choosing one of them when out in the field.

Much stress was placed on programmed learning materials in and out of class time and the participants had the opportunity to use them not only in the languages but also in statistics, transformational grammar, and beginning linguistic. Those that tried these materials could see the role they could play in clarifying concepts because such minimal step learning and teaching is very rarely seen in the classroom at the college level and could help the student teacher (and the methods teacher!) clarify concepts which are not made clear by the classroom teacher.

Section VII
PARTICIPANT COMMUNICATION WITH DIRECTORS AND STAFF DURING THE INSTITUTE

The directors were always available. Participants liked the open door policy and appreciated the fact that they could speak freely to both directors and the other members of the faculty. Whenever possible the directors visited other classes, participated in the field trips, attended film showings, shared in all institute activities and participated in the extra-curricular activities which were planned by the participants.

Several of the staff members also participated in the
above activities as much as possible. The final evaluations of the participants showed their appreciation of the openness and understanding of a fine teaching corps. Many commented on their generosity, warmth, spirit of dedication and their concern for each individual participant.

A number of circumstances facilitated contacts between staff and participants and close communication among participants during the institute:

- the proximity of offices to classrooms in Peik Hall. Participants were free to talk to the professors at any time.

- the organization of small classes (never more than ten members) for the professionalized language courses, the linguistics courses and the courses in the teaching of literature and subject matter in advanced language courses.

- the committee work in the methods workshop and the foreign language research class.

- participation of faculty and speakers in the coffee breaks.

- the open discussions of all issues on both institute and non-institute matters. These factors contributed greatly to the overall success of the institute.

Communications among staff were felt to be adequate but staff members agreed that there needed to be more informal discussion among staff of course work in regularly
scheduled staff seminars. The visitation of each other's classes by staff should always be encouraged. This would take care of the piling up of assignments at certain periods in the institute.

Section VIII
STAFF

A. Full-time versus Part-time

All staff members were effective in their courses. Though some were teaching the same courses but in a different language, the approaches used gave the participants an idea of various approaches to the audio-lingual aspect of language instruction. This factor at times irritated the participants because the classes were scheduled at the same hour and they would have liked to attend all of the classes.

There were three part-time staff members out of a faculty of nine. One part-time staff member, a co-director, actually devoted full-time to the institute. The other part-time staff members would have gladly done so but other part-time commitments to the university prevented this. The third came and spent many hours with the participants in the various activities, both co-curricular and extra-curricular. These part-time staff members were very effective and very popular with the participants. The co-directors would like very much to have them full-time in another in-
stitute because they have so much to offer the participants.

To increase the effectiveness of a part-time staff, informal communication with participants during coffee breaks, at the lunch hour, participation in extra-curricular activities such as dinners, excursions, and the like, and regular attendance at the Friday seminar should be encouraged.

Full-time staff members did an extraordinary amount of work and spent much time attending other classes, lectures, and activities.

B. Regular versus Visiting Staff

There seemed to be no difference in the effectiveness of either regular or visiting staff. The two visiting members of our staff were well-known to both Directors and to the other staff members. They participated in all activities, fit very well into their positions and proved to be as amiable as the other members of the staff. They were energetic and provided for many of the extra features of the institute not originally planned but of great benefit to the participants. These were extra film showings, field trips in the laboratory workshop, etc. In fact, we did not even consider them visiting faculty, they were one of us.

C. Lecturers

The following lecturers participated in the institute:

Percy Fearing, state foreign language consultant, talked on the services the consultant has to offer the
trainer of teachers and on the non-graded foreign language classroom;

Dr. David Premack, psychologist, spoke of psycho-linguistics and its possibilities for the modern language teacher;

Dr. George Shapiro spoke on the disadvantaged children, their characteristics and possibilities;

Dr. Loren Ekroth lectured on kinesics and proxemics;

Dr. Hedi Oplesch, modern language coordinator of a large suburban school system with a nine-year language program, spoke on what the teacher training institution should contribute to the development of an effective language teacher;

Dr. Gordon Mork, director of the division of student teaching, talked about good practices in student teaching and some of the problems in the field. The lecture was focused on student teaching in modern languages.

Mr. Almon Hove, principal of Marshall High School, gave an illustrated lecture on the possibilities of modular scheduling especially at the junior high school level to accommodate a sound foreign language program.

The participants felt that they had an excellent selection of topics and speakers which gave them a broad perspective of the various fields which have an impact on the language program. One participant made the comment that
these lecturers alone were worth the institute! Even the one speaker evaluated as being a bit too dogmatic in her approach gave them such good ideas and suggestions that the participants asked specifically to have a copy of her talk.

We looked forward to a very special meeting, an evening of dining and discussion with André Paquette, director of teacher training and testing in the MLA-FL Program, but the airlines strike prevented him from coming.

For another institute we would probably keep the same topics and most of the lecturers with perhaps a few more specialists in fields such as testing and cultural anthropology.

D. Consultants

In the class in research in modern language education we asked to have the following consultants work with us:

Dr. Don MacEachern, Experimental Design and Statistics. Dr. MacEachern worked with us on some fundamental statistics, analyzed some experiments to point out to the participants what is good design and what are some of the pitfalls in the field of modern languages;

Dr. Dan Neale, spoke on the field of educational psychology and experimentation on the teaching and learning processes;

Don Ehrlichmann, high school teacher in the Minneapolis Public School system, discussed his experiences and experi-
mentation with programed learning;

Dean Stanley Kedler of the College of Education, spent one two hour session on the USOE and the different parts of the various education acts in which the participants should become involved. He handed out materials valuable to the teacher trainers for making proposals, etc.

In conjunction with the language laboratory workshop:

Dr. Russell Burris, Chief of the Center for Programed Learning at the University of Minnesota, talked on programed learning, the various approaches to it, different schools of thought, the problems involved and the programing of German and French going on at the Center;

Dr. Neville Pearson, Head of the Audio-Visual Department at the University of Minnesota, talked to the group, illustrated many of the technological media as well as opened up the huge laboratory and made available a teaching assistant to help the participants with their problems;

Robert Spindler, working in Educational Services of 3M, which is located in St. Paul, and a high school Spanish teacher, illustrated the versatility of the overhead projector in the language classroom.

In conjunction with the methods workshop:

Mr. Howard Hathaway, KTCA television Spanish teacher, demonstrated the use of modern, popular songs, as an ideal take off point to develop practical pattern drills;
Nancy Lichtenstein, junior college teacher of French, showed the rigorous techniques used in teaching an audio-visual-lingual course such as the Voix et Images system developed at the experimental center in St. Cloud, France. These consultants were appreciated by the participants and in their evaluations were very positive in having had these consultants work with them.

In many instances some of the participants found these areas to be completely new fields for them. Some twelve participants suggested an institute set up solely for those who had become interested in foreign language research, to study the research in the field, the problems in the field, to analyze and write proposals and studies to be carried out during the following year.

Section IX
UNIQUE FEATURES OF THE INSTITUTE

The participants pointed out the uniqueness of the institute in the following areas:

- the organization of its total program and the kinds of classes and activities within the structure of the institute
- the tremendous opportunities to work with others, to interact with individuals whose interests lay in the same field
- the inspirational spirit
- the opportunity to be immersed in a discipline
- the presence of persons in the three major languages taught
- the spirit of inquiry and the open-minded attitude exhibited by both staff and participants
- the summaries provided by designated secretaries for all sessions so that the participants were free to give full attention to the lectures and discussions
- small group sessions with language peers and committee work
- a program geared to the college teacher for the first time
- the rich cultural program provided by the University of Minnesota and the Twin Cities for summer school students
- the selection of participants (we were lucky)
- the class in foreign language research
- as one participant summed it up: "It was the first of its kind. That's unique enough! It should be continued."

The directors, having worked in other institutes, would say that one of the unique features and most positive aspects of the program was the close cooperation and the ability of the staff to work together. Now that we have achieved this much we would even like to improve on this aspect in another institute.
Section X

MAJOR STRENGTHS OF THE INSTITUTE

All members of the institute, participants and staff, in their evaluation of the strengths of the institute mentioned these factors:

- the opportunity for a free exchange of ideas among participants and staff and the excellent working relationships
- the excellent program
- the outstanding staff, consultants and lecturers
- availability of a wide variety of materials and resources
- perspectives from other fields which would relate to foreign language teaching and learning
- introduction of new teaching materials and resources
- open-mindedness of staff and participants regarding foreign language methodology. The first "honest look at the foreign language teaching world that I've seen."

- facilities in Peik Hall
- having all classes and "home base" in Peik Hall
- living in the dormitory as a group
- fine reports and discussions in all of the classes
- the new language experience
- the positive attitude toward the introduction of transformational grammar as explained in the linguistics classes
- experience of small group work, group reports
- equal status of staff and participants
- each participant was given confidence and status within the group
- up-to-date bibliographies
- attempt at synthesizing the many seemingly apparent contradictions in the field (linguistics and methodology)
- introduction to research
- introduction to audio-visual materials
- the course in the teaching of literature and related subject matter in advanced classes.

Section XI
MAJOR WEAKNESSES

According to the participants the one outstanding weakness of the institute was that the formal classroom program was too long. Related comments indicated that as a result not enough study-time was available and not enough time to share the many ideas, to do more effective work on committee reports and to read the many available materials which they had never encountered.

Although some of the participants liked the wide variety of experiences that the individual participants brought with them, it made the range of individual difference so great that not all of the participants could get the most out of a class such as linguistics, which in some cases was
too sophisticated for some participants who had never had a class in linguistics and for others not sophisticated enough because they had been well immersed in descriptive linguistics and were anxious to have the instructor work with them on transformational grammar.

Some participants felt uncomfortable in the professionalized courses in the teaching of beginning Spanish, German and French. The approaches were different, one quite experimental, even though all three instructors adhered to the fundamental skills approach. There was much discussion and debate about the various approaches they were exposed to. Since one of the purposes for the course was introspection as well as acquisition of language, this phase of the program could be considered either positive.

There was not enough time to observe the classes at the high school level in German and Russian. Some also expressed the wish to see a student teaching situation and follow-up conference and felt that a little more time should have been spent on supervision.

The French participants felt they had seen too many films. Because of the many French films sent to us one of the faculty thought it best to show them during the noon hour. French participants were not obligated to attend but the compulsion was there not to miss any.
At times the work load was too heavy.

Section XII

A. Reaction of Participants

There seemed to be general agreement among the participants that the most significant thing that happened to them during the institute was the attempt to make them open-minded about foreign language learning and to be exposed to the field of research in language education. Both directors and all staff members would very definitely agree that this was the one outstanding outcome of the Institute.

B. What they would do differently

All of the participants have indicated that they are going back to their institutions with much more interest in teaching. They want to improve not only their methods courses, but also the total program of teacher preparation including the language courses. Some have indicated they want to further improve the teaching of foreign languages through initiating workshops for foreign language teachers in their states. Some have expressed interest in applying for NDEA institutes of their own.

They want to try out more seminar type classes, open-ended discussions, the use of the "summary report" technique in class. Many will change the structure and content of the methods course and make use of the many new materials given to them as well as experiment with the many techniques
they have learned.

The introduction of a linguistics course in their curriculum is of major concern to some. Some will investigate the possibilities of language camps, the development of a foreign language major in elementary education. Most of them now see the value in a close working situation with the state foreign language consultant. They also see the need for a large foreign language curriculum library and resource center.

Some see a need for "building bridges" between the various foreign language departments and the departments of education and now feel more adequate to help build this bridge. They also wish to make a greater effort in influencing those in authority concerning the direction and trends in current language teaching.

"This institute opened up innumerable aspects for me. Frankly, I learned very much, and have been constantly mentally applying what I have learned to my teaching situation."

We would be foolish to believe that 100% of the participants will accomplish what they say they want to accomplish. However, even if only five of them improve their teaching and their teacher preparation programs there will be a small but definite movement to improve the quality of foreign language teachers.
Section XIII
FOLLOW-UP

We hope to develop a checklist or questionnaire to be completed by the participants after they have worked in the field during 1966-67 to see what changes they have actually been able to carry through in their classes, what influence they have had on the total foreign language curriculum in their college and what they have done in their state’s foreign language work.

We have encouraged them to join professional organizations where we hope to see them at conferences, especially at the MLA convention in the two conferences on methods and audio-visual materials. We shall send both Dr. Stowell Goding and Dr. Elton Hocking, chairmen of the respective conferences, the list of our participants. They were also advised to keep in touch with the foreign language teacher training section of the MLA which is under the direction of Dr. André Paquette.

We hope to keep up an exchange of new ideas and materials through news notes several times during the year. In fact, the participants started calling themselves the "66 Club!"

Section XIV
EVALUATION OF THE VARIOUS ASPECTS OF THE INSTITUTE.
SUGGESTED CHANGES

A. Objectives

Our general objectives would still apply if we were
to have another institute. They were realistic and attainable and we feel we accomplished what we set out to do. Both staff and participants' evaluations in this respect were positive.

The objectives for some courses, however, need to be made more explicit now that we have a better idea of what the needs of this type of participant really are.

B. Beginning Dates and Optimum Numbers of Weeks

The dates, June 20 to August 5, were advantageous. The institute thus starts one week after the beginning of the first summer session at the University of Minnesota and runs into the first three weeks of the second summer session. This gives us the possibility of opening up more rooms for individual study and work, especially of the laboratory type, within Peik Hall. The dates June 26 to August 11 would be better.

A few participants suggested that the institute be shortened to six weeks, others asked to have it extended to eight weeks. We feel that seven weeks are necessary to accomplish the goals we set out to do. This is especially true if we were to incorporate the participants' suggestions for several other activities.

C. Number of Participants

Thirty (30) participants is an ideal number, with a proportionate number ten (10) in each of the three languages.
If we were to have another institute we would again request 30 participants. There is a greater opportunity for the interaction of the group as a whole, an extremely important factor in an institute of this kind, where participants desire a great deal of intercommunication with each other with regard to problems and ideas within the field. We would also select not only methods teachers but those who head up modern language departments in the colleges and universities (if they cared to participate!) and, of course, the supervisors of the student teachers.

D. Code Number

The code number did not apply to our institute participants. The participants were expected to have near-native ability in the major language they taught if they were not natives. In another institute we would request all participants to take the battery of the MLA Modern Language Proficiency Tests for Advanced Students and Teachers. We noted that they were touchy about the suggestion in this institute but if they looked at it from the point of view of acquainting themselves at the same time with the different testing techniques involved in the different sections of the battery they would accept the idea. We did give them the Modern Language Aptitude Test by Carroll and Sapon "for the fun of it" so that they could study it carefully to understand where it can be effective, at what levels, etc.
They enjoyed taking it after they understood the purpose for taking it.

E. Distribution of Time

The participants did not have enough study and small group discussion time. They were extremely conscientious in working on their class preparations. They also needed a certain amount of free time for an interchange of ideas among themselves gathered together as a large group (30). We did not schedule anything evenings and Saturdays to give them the opportunity to participate in what we consider a rich cultural program provided by the University of Minnesota and the two cities (St. Paul and Minneapolis) for the summer session students. However, according to the participants, many evenings were spent on preparations for the next day’s classes. The staff must be careful not to infringe on free time by giving excessive assignments.

Classes were scheduled from 8 a.m. to 4:45 p.m. on most days. (See Schedule) If we were to conduct another institute we would schedule all formal classes in the morning with workshops, individual and group conferences, lab work, field trips, previewing of films, in the early afternoon. Participants would be free after 3 p.m. to pursue their special interests and needs. Although many participants said they would like to have more free time, when asked which class hours they would want cancelled, they had difficulty
deciding and even suggested the incorporation of a few more classes!

F. **Emphasis on Substantive Content versus Teaching Skills.**

Basically there were four phases in the institute program. All other activities contributed to these four phases.

We do not see how teaching skills and subject matter can be considered separate entities. They complement each other and without a fusion of the two we fail to bring about an efficiency in the teaching and learning of language which is so imperative when we consider the length of time it takes to get a good competency in all four skills and an understanding of the infraculture of a civilization.

As a result, the staff and the participants continually focused on two questions as they went about their business of the institute:

1. What is it that the student teacher is to teach—what corpus of the foreign language (structures, lexicon, culture)?

2. How can he teach this corpus most effectively and most efficiently?

It is with these two questions in mind that the courses and the activities of the institute were structured in the following manner:

**Phase 1:** This phase included the professionalized course in the teaching of a beginning language, the lab work in
connection with it and the applied linguistics course in the participants' major language. The three teachers of the professionalized courses used three different approaches which were highly revelatory and satisfying to some of the participants and uncomfortable for others because of the experimental approach used in one case. Many were impressed with the teaching approach used in the Spanish class, the experimental class gave the participants much food for thought, engendered much heated and enlightening discussion. In general, language was learned together with many concomitant learnings.

The linguistics courses were highly controversial, as they most always are in the NDEA institutes. But because of certain events that had taken place at the Northeast Modern Language Conference in a confrontation of transformationalist and descriptive linguist, the reports of this highly controversial subject, and the chance to hear on the campus of the University of Minnesota this year a psycholinguist from the hot bed of the transformationalists (M.I.T.) prolonged discussions were held in this area into the wee hours of the morning. Of course, this left some of the participants out in the cold at times. The addition of an elementary linguistics course for these people is a necessity. Better yet, a programmed course in beginning linguistics! For the initiated in the field, it was a
field day.

**Phase 2:** The teaching of literature and subject matter at the advanced levels in high school attempted to work on materials and techniques for levels three, four and five. New materials now available were examined and evaluated. This activity brought the participants to a greater awareness of the knowledge and skills necessary to teach effectively and interestingly at these levels. The materials were evaluated in the light of well-known state curriculum guides and gave the participants a better understanding of the entire high school program and their obligation in the training of language teachers in all college language course. Techniques for using different types of materials such as prose, poetry, plays, subject matter in the social studies area, were used and demonstrated by participants. According to the participants the particular strength of these courses was to bring to light and to appreciate the linguistic and cultural preparation language candidates must bring to the high schools which have these long sequences to make them efficient and effective. In the Spanish class much attention was given to twentieth century literature and its cultural and sociological background. The instructor was very perturbed by the lack of perspective the participants had with regard to the emerging modern literature in the Spanish and Latin American countries. These classes were conducted
entirely in the target language by instructor and participants. The participants stated that they had acquired much valuable information and "know how" in these courses.

Phase 3: The methods, language laboratory and audio-visual workshops explored as many different ways and techniques as could be gleaned from the literature, the teaching films and demonstrations to get the specific modern language across. The participants were highly pleased with what they got out of the methods course - the different techniques for conducting such a course, the materials and bibliography given to them, the evaluation criteria for a foreign language curriculum, an examination of the leading testing and evaluation programs, the structuring of a methods course, and a study of the many strategies to use for the teaching of the various skills. The language laboratory course needed much more time for taking care of the individual needs of the participants. Most participants stated that they were taking home with them many valuable and new ideas on how to make a language a "living" subject for the student.

Phase 4: An analytical study of the research in foreign language teaching and learning, its limitations and the scarcity of good research in our field were a real revelation to the majority of the participants. This course opened up an entirely new and intriguing discipline for
many of them. They were fascinated with the analysis of studies done by the consultants. The reports they themselves had to give and the rigor with which such reports were to be given was in some cases almost too much for them.

Since these participants had a near-native if not a native fluency in the language they were able to use their languages whenever possible, which they did. It was also observed that they were busy teaching each other the languages some were learning for the first time. It was amazing at the oral fluency some attained in their beginning language, especially the free rejoinders elicited from those learning German, the experimental group!

In the general session on evaluation of the institute the group asked not to change the program but improve it here and there to take care of the varied experiences each participant brings with him. When asked whether there should be a more homogeneous grouping, the answer was "no" because of the fact that the opportunities in an institute of this kind to share a wealth of ideas were to great.

G. **Ratio of Staff to Participants**

One staff member for every three participants seems to be quite adequate. We definitely would not want to reduce this number.

H. **Budget**

The institute budget was wholly adequate.
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The money allowed for the foreign language camp trip was not enough to allow for each language group to visit their own language camp. As a result the participants visited only the German language camp. The budget should be doubled for this item and allowance made for one night's lodging.

We might want to have money for three teaching assistants and reduce the number of secretaries. One full-time secretary for the seven week institute and a 1/2 time secretary before the institute is enough. Otherwise no major changes would be contemplated.

Section XV
IMPACT OF THE INSTITUTE ON OUR OWN PROGRAM

The impact of the Institute on our own program has and most likely will take several directions:
A. The faculty, composed of both professors in the College of Liberal Arts and in the College of Education, learned much about the various components which go into the training of future teachers and how much we need to consolidate our work together, even more closely than we have before. Thus, we are quite sure we will find an increased solidarity during the year as a result of the experiences we have had in this important, new type institute national in scope.
B. This coming year we are reviewing the courses and requirements of our majors and minors in the foreign languages.
What we have discussed and learned in this institute will certainly have an impact on the decisions to be made and the program itself.

C. The methods courses will be kept up-to-date and advantage will be taken of the new ideas, projects and materials used during the institute.

D. We now see that we need to develop a model program for the training of FLES teachers, not specialist, but the regular self-contained classroom teacher. Although we have done this to some extent already and have had considerable success in this field (the nine-year program in the laboratory high school) and the NDEA Institutes for elementary school teachers in Spanish and German 1960 through 1965, the program needs to be developed formally and put on the books.

E. The direction of the Ph.D. program in Foreign Language Education and Research will place even more emphasis in the area of research with the help of the Center of Experimentation in Human Learning, the applied linguists, the statisticians and specialists in experimental design.

F. A dynamic and exciting institute, such as this undoubtedly was, can not help but leave its mark on an institution when one considers the number of specialists other than those directly concerned with modern languages, who were involved in the program and who say a possible interaction and further intercommunication between their fields and ours.
Section XVI
ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

We wish to thank the Modern Language Institute Section for placing its confidence in the University of Minnesota and entrusting the modern language faculty of the College of Education and the College of Liberal Arts with designing a new type institute for college and university people who are responsible for the education and training of the future modern language teachers in the nation. Our thanks also go out to the officials of the University of Minnesota, who have been most helpful during our operation.

An institute of this kind can have a significant impact on the development of dynamic college and university modern language programs intended not only for future modern language teachers but for college students who have other uses for their study and acquisition of a modern language. This will, of course, depend upon the forceful personalities of our participants and a continuing intercommunication between participants and the faculty of the 1966 institute. According to letters from the superiors with whom the participants are working many of them will have the possibility to exert influence on their institutions.

This institute together with the other NDEA institutes intended for teachers in service in the public schools and for foreign language supervisors should attack the problems in our field from many sides -- thus making for an earlier
and continuing realization of good language programs throughout the schools of our nation.
APPENDIX C

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS
LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

Arminio, Sister Elena (S)  Convent Station, New Jersey
                        College of St. Elizabeth

Baird, Herbert (S)  1704 S.W. Custer Street, Portland, Oregon - Lewis and Clark
                        College, 0615 S.W. Palatine Hill Road, Portland, Oregon

Bloomer, Barbara J. (G)  707 6th Street, St. Cloud, Minn.
                        St. Cloud State College

Bouniol, Eileen C. (F)  2429 Spruce St., Bellingham, Wash
                        Western Washington State College
                        Bellingham, Washington

Cooley, LaVerla D. (S)  2137 South Lorraine, Wichita, Kansas - Friends University,
                        Wichita, Kansas - 67213

Flaherty, Sr. Etienne (F)  College of St. Benedict,
                         St. Joseph, Minn.

Fuehrer, Sr. M. Rosina (G)  6th and Linden, Newport, Ky.
                          Villa Madonna College, P.O. Box 46, Covington, Ky.

Geno, Thomas (F)  5A University Heights, Burlington
                  Vermont - University of Vermont
                  Burlington, Vermont

Green, David R. (F)  2714 S. Rivershore Dr. Moorhead,
                    Minn. - Concordia College, Moorhead, Minnesota

Horry, Ruth N. (F)  211 Pekoe Avenue, Durham, No.
                    Carolina - North Carolina College
                    at Durham, Durham, North Carolina

Jackson, Julia F. (F)  723 Waterford Road N.W., Atlanta
                       Georgia - Morris Brown College
                       Atlanta, Georgia

Jackson, Margaret C. (S)  18 Highgate Road, Berkeley, Calif
                          University of California, Dept.
                          of Education
Landis, Frank E. (F) 126 Manges St. Central City, Penn
Indiana University of Pennsylvania
Indiana, Pennsylvania

Langr. Bernard J. (S) 207 Christensen St. Mankato, Minn
Foreign Language Department
Mankato State College

McCoy, Richard C. (G) 9 Hamilton Place, So. Nyack, N.Y.
College of New Rochelle, New Rochelle, New York

Munoz, Elsie Mott (S) P.O. Box 4832; Arden Branch,
Sacramento, Calif. Foreign
Language Dept., Sacramento State
College - Sacramento, Calif.

Mykytiuk, Thor (G) 914 N. Oakley Blvd. Chicago,
Illinois - College of St. Francis
Joliet, Illinois

Naves, Carroll E. (F) 13613 N.E. 20th Place., North
Miami Beach, Fla. - Barry College
Miami, Florida

O'Neill, James (S) 729 12th Ave S., St. Cloud, Minn.
St. Cloud State College, St. Clou
Minnesota

Rowe, Ilse B. (G) 18 Vincent Rd., Belmont, Mass.
Emmanuel College, 400 The Fenway
Boston, Mass.

Rudowski, Victor (G) 166 W. McMillan St., Cincinnati,
Ohio - University of Cincinnati
Cincinnati, Ohio

Ryberg, Lillian A. (S) 1480 N. Snelling, St. Paul, Minn.
Bethel College, St. Paul, Minn.

Shea, Katharine M. (S) 3 Cedar Street, Worcester, Mass.
State College at Worcester,

St. Julien, Rene (F) 1305 10th Avenue W., Ashland, Wis.
Northland College, Ashland, Wisc.

Streadbeck, Arval L. (G) 1031 Austin Ave., Salt Lake City
Utah - University of Utah, Salt
Lake City, Utah
Swenson, Rodney N. (G) 16 Lincoln Lane, Northfield, Minn
Hamline University, St. Paul, Min

Tyler, Dorothy (F) 15 E. Garrison St., Bethlehem,
Penn. - Moravian College,
Bethlehem, Pennsylvania

Villareal, Albert Jr. (S) Box 5981 SFA Station, Nacogdoches
Texas Dept. of Modern Language
Stephen F. Austin State College
Nacogdoches, Texas

Whiteside, Dale R. (G) 427 E. Cascade, RiverFalls, Wisc.
Wisconsin State University,
RiverFalls, Wisconsin

Wilkinson, Gene D. (G) 3612 Ave. E., Kearney, Nebr.
Kearney State College, Kearney,
Nebraska
APPENDIX D

LIST OF FULL-TIME AND PART-TIME FACULTY
STAFF

FULL-TIME

Lange, Dale - Ph.D. Modern Language Research and Education
Co-director - Helped with the methods and research classes

Mantini, Lawrence - Ph.D. Romance linguistics (French, Spanish) - Taught: French linguistics and Spanish linguistics

Sister Chiara Gilleran - M.A. French - Taught: Beginning French, Techniques of Teaching Literature and Subject Matter in Advanced Classes

Steinmetz, Donald - Lecturer in German - Taught: Beginning German, German linguistics

Sanchez, John - M.A. Spanish - Taught: Beginning Spanish Laboratory Workshop

Krocmeier, Shirley - M.A. German - Taught: Laboratory Workshop

PART-TIME

Birkmaier, Emma Marie - Ph.D. Modern Language Research and Education - Co-director - Taught: Methods and Research Classes

Weiss, Gerhard - Ph.D. German - Taught: Techniques of Teaching Literature and Subject Matter in Advanced Classes

Cuneo, Santiago - Ph.D. Spanish - Taught: Techniques of Teaching Literature and Subject Matter in Advanced Classes
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>W</th>
<th>TH</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8:00 to</td>
<td>Ger 1</td>
<td>same</td>
<td>same</td>
<td>same</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:45</td>
<td>Fr 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:45 to</td>
<td>Sp 1</td>
<td>same</td>
<td>same</td>
<td>same</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:30</td>
<td>Sp Ling.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:30 to</td>
<td>Fr Ling</td>
<td>same</td>
<td>same</td>
<td>same</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:15</td>
<td>Ger Ling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:15 to</td>
<td>B R E A K</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:30 to</td>
<td>Tech. Teach.</td>
<td>Small Groups/</td>
<td>Tech. Teach.</td>
<td>Small Groups/</td>
<td>F I L M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:00</td>
<td>Adv. S.M.</td>
<td>Conferences/</td>
<td>Adv. S.M.</td>
<td>Conferences/</td>
<td>S E R I E S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and Lit.</td>
<td>Study</td>
<td></td>
<td>And Lit.</td>
<td>Study</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:00 to</td>
<td>L U N C H</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>TH</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:30</td>
<td>Special Lecture</td>
<td>Curriculum</td>
<td>Small Groups/</td>
<td>Curriculum</td>
<td>Seminar Workshop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to</td>
<td></td>
<td>Methods</td>
<td>Conference/</td>
<td>Methods</td>
<td>New Materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:00</td>
<td></td>
<td>Supervision</td>
<td>Study</td>
<td>Supervision</td>
<td>For</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td></td>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>Elementary And</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Secondary Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>B R E A K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to</td>
<td>Materials</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:45</td>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>