



THE JACOB RADER MARCUS CENTER OF THE
AMERICAN JEWISH ARCHIVES

MS-831: Jack, Joseph and Morton Mandel Foundation Records, 1980–2008.
Series B: Commission on Jewish Education in North America (CJENA). 1980–1993.
Subseries 2: Commissioner and Consultant Biographical Files, 1987–1993.

Box
5

Folder
16

Davidson, Aryeh, 1989-1990.

For more information on this collection, please see the finding aid on the
American Jewish Archives website.

Aryeh Davidson

AUG 28 1989

August 23, 1989

To: Annette Hochstein

From: Aryeh Davidson

Re: Training institutions -research project

On the basis of my reading of the documents distributed at the Seattle meetings and discussions with you and the other participants I am presenting below my understanding of the research needed in the area of training institutions.

For purposes of the final report the Commission is concern with two areas of training: An inventory of current training opportunities preparing personnel for Jewish education and a literature survey on current approaches to training as they compare with existing practice in Jewish education.

I. An inventory of current training opportunities preparing personnel for Jewish education

- A. In depth study of the 11 North American institutions of higher learning that prepare Jewish educators and senior personnel.

The insitutions will be examined with respect to the following profile:

The purpose and goals of the programs: the types of programs (e.g., M.A., D.H.L) ; ideology and/or philosophy of program; training approaches or models perceived as influencing program(s); the structure and status of the program within the institution of higher learning (e.g. vis-a-vis rabbinical school); the structure and status of the programs with respect to other institutions of higher learning (e.g. joint programs with universities, Federation).

The content and structure of training programs: What are course and field requirements? What training models or approaches are perceived as influencing the structure and contents of programs? What criteria and/or standards determine program content? (All programs preparing educators will be examined, including early childhood and informal education. Programs designed specifically to train communal workers will not be extensively examined.)

The faculty: Who are the faculty? What was the nature of their training? What are their respective areas of expertise? What proportion of time do they devote to educational training efforts within their respective institutions? What educational roles do

they perform outside of their respective institutions? Do faculty have any training responsibilities with respect to schools, BJEs, JCCs etc.? (These data will be inferred from college bulletins, reports, and interviews. It will be presented in aggregate form in order to provide commissioners with a picture of the current faculty situation in Jewish education.)

The student population: A description of the student bodies enrolled in Jewish training institutions over the past 10 years; How are students recruited? What are the career aspirations of students? What criteria are used to determine a student's appropriateness for the program(s)?

Program costs and funding: What is the cost of the training program (expenses and income). What funding sources are available and used by students and the institutions?

Future visions: An examination of the respective institutions training visions and needs. What is needed to realize that vision? What are the key factors inhibiting the realization of the vision? What resources would be needed to make the vision a reality? If resources were available now what changes/innovations would be initiated ?

B. Examination of secular institutions providing Jewish education training. Programs such as George Washington's and McGill's (Admission to the Association of Institutions of Higher Learning in Jewish Education is pending.) teacher training programs for Jewish education will be described. Similar programs will be identified. Time permitting, data will be gathered with respect to their programs, faculty and students.

C. An overview of in-service training opportunities. This research will result in a grid for examining in-service training applicable to the panoply of Jewish educational systems. International (e.g. Melton Center) and nationally (e.g. JTS summer programs) sponsored programs will be identified and described. Local and regional based programs will be identified and described in terms of: the clients, the staff, the training agency, settings, formats, frequency, effectiveness, finances and purpose. Since a profile of all in-service programs is not feasible within the context of the current research project an attempt will be made to provide commissioners with illustrations or case studies of the types of local and regional programs that are available. For example, a large urban setting such as New York will be examined in detail. Similarly, in-service opportunities for a small non-eastern urban setting will be documented and described. This research will provide commissioners with an appreciation of the scope and opportunities for in-service staff development available to Jewish educations. This research is likely to generate more questions than it will answer and point to addition areas of needed research.

Method for data collection: The principal investigator will use a variety of techniques to obtain data for developing a current picture of teacher training institutions in Jewish education. They will include: interviews with administration, faculty and students of each institution; examination of existing bulletins, course syllabi, and self studies; examination of relevant research reports issues by Federations, BJE's, JESNA, commissions, dissertations and articles.

The research findings will be presented and interpreted in the final report in order to provide commissioners with the a broad qualitative and quantitative overview of the preparation of Jewish educators in North American. Therefore, most data be presented in aggregate form. The report is in no way intended to present an evaluative assessment of the respective institutions. The non-evaluative nature of the research will be stressed to each of the participating institutions and emphasized in the final report.

II.A literature survey on current approaches to training as they compare with existing practices for preparing Jewish educational personnel.

The review will will draw from existing reports and research. It will outline how practices, innovations and reforms in general education tend to inform the preparation of Jewish education personnel. On the basis of existing literature, interviews with experts in the field, and the findings of part I of this research specific issues, concerns and recommendations will be ennumerated.

The following questions will be addressed in the review: What are the agencies and mechanisms that inform Jewish education training institutions of practices in general education? To what extent is the application of findings in general education to Jewish education viewed as desirable? Are there specific practices and/or reforms in general education that broadly affect Jewish education? What appear to be those factors which determine the effective translation of findings from general education to Jewish educational training centers?

The final report will include an extensive bibliography and a listing of questions and issues, emerging from this research that require additional attention.

Time table

Sept. 1-19 Development of interview schedules and instrumentation

Sept. 19- Nov. 23. Examination of training institutions
Examination of in-service programs

Oct. 16 Interim report

Nov. 23-Dec. 15 Review of the literature, development of final report

Jan. 15.1990 Final research report



Budget

Principal investigator	5,000
Travel expenses *	
Research and secretarial assistance	1,500
Research expenses (photo-copying, telephone, etc.)	500

<u>Total</u>	7,000
--------------	-------

* \$ 1,500-2,000 to be applied to designated research travel budget for puposes of visiting training institutions

February 4, 1990
David S. Ariel

NOTES ON ARYEH DAVIDSON'S PAPER ON TRAINING INSTITUTIONS

The paper presents a great deal of valuable information on training. It is the first reliable source of information on the state of the field. I know from personal experience that Aryeh himself engenders trust among his colleagues and encouraged many reluctant correspondents to answer questions freely.

The major fault with the paper is that it presents a static view of the situation. It does not present the visions and philosophies of the training institutions in any depth. The picture which it leaves is that there is little vision coming out of the training institutions about issues and the directions of the field. That is true of some, but not all, institutions but it damns everybody. I think there is more forward thinking than the snapshot presents. By presenting a composite without taking into account individual differences, it misses an opportunity to present something of the ferment within the institutions. The differences are as significant as the similarities.

When the accrediting bodies evaluate an institution, they often ask questions about the future: Will the institution have the resources to continue to fulfill its mission? What are the long-term or strategic plans of the institution? These sorts of questions could be considered in this report.

There should be greater acknowledgment of the fact that the Jewish educator training institutions reflect the changing social trends within American Jewish community. The problems within the training institutions are, in part, due to profound changes over 50 years in what the Jewish community wants from Jewish education. Institutions which were founded as Hebraic institutions have been out of step with the recent social trends in American Jewry. Whether they can adapt to the new realities of American Jewish life including ambivalence about Jewish education has great bearing on their future.

PAGE 1: The institutions surveyed should be mentioned on the first page to indicate the universe sampled in the research for this paper.

PAGE 2: Identify Kaplan, Magnus, Benderly for non-specialist readers and the 11 schools established by 1954.

PAGE 2-3: The paper should say why the colleges moved away from Hebrew teacher preparation: Decline of Hebraism as an ideology, growth of congregational supplementary schools, decline of teaching as a full-time profession, rise of university-based programs in academic Jewish studies.

The historical survey of the emergence of Hebrew teacher colleges mentions the preparation of Hebrew teachers as a means of "ensuring continuity." It does not present them in the context of their ideology and cultural mission of Hebraism and cultural zionism as a social vision of the American Jewish community. The social agenda of Hebrew education was central to the mission of the early Hebrew teacher colleges and was part of what later made them anachronistic.

The paper should expand on the relationship between the Hebraism and congregational denominationalism as the vehicle for carrying out Jewish education. The teachers colleges maintained Hebraism (language and texts) in the face of growing emphasis on congregational Jewish education which stressed synagogue literacy and Jewish civics.

PAGE 4: The issue of defining "independent community-based colleges" is tricky. They are not truly independent since they are dependent on the community for funding, etc. They are, however, accredited by regional bodies. I am not familiar with the Toronto Midrasha but I am certain that it is not like the others, is not a college, and is not accredited. Thus, the right term might be "accredited community-based colleges" which would properly leave out specialized institutions like Toronto Midrasha and yeshivot which should be identified as a separate category.

I am not familiar with the College of Jewish Studies in Washington DC. Later on (table 1) it is identified as BJE. The correct name for Spertus is "Spertus College of Judaica."

PAGE 5:(Funding) In general, this section needs more precision. Although anonymity has been guaranteed, specifics can be given without naming institutions. Aggregates and general conclusions do not tell much about the funding of

the institutions. Granted, we know funding is low; we still need to give more precise description. For example, we could say: x institutions have institutional budgets under/above \$2 million; y institutions have budgets in the area of teacher preparation of \$z. Also, check the budget figures on independent colleges. At least two are over \$2.25 million.

More extensive analysis of governance and funding is necessary. Specifics should include sources of income by category and on a comparative basis (federation allocation, tuition [and tuition rate], annual fundraising, special grants, foundation support, endowment income, government grants). Are they free to raise additional funds? Who are the trustees and where are they in the ranks of community leadership? What is the role of the governing body in policy, funding, etc.?

Accreditation: It is not accurate to include non-accredited institutions in Table 1 or to say "most" are accredited. Accreditation is a significant dividing line which should be used to include and exclude institutional categories.

PAGE 6: (Programs and activities) This paragraph is repetitive but could be included if it is developed better. Perhaps more (page 5-6) should be said about the respective mission of each category of institution rather than the generalization on page 6.

Page 7: The opposite of a specialized Jewish institution is a "general college" rather than a "secular college."

Page 8: (MA Program) Teachers from general education are also eligible to receive credit toward state certification by taking MA in-service courses at accredited colleges of Jewish studies.

It should be noted that until recently one disincentive for the field was the fact that master degree programs required a BHL before admission to the graduate program. This made it impossible for undergraduates graduating from general colleges with majors in Judaica to enter graduate programs in Jewish education without significant additional coursework. The shift from undergraduate to graduate education programs greatly opened the pool of potential students. Some veterans saw this as a further sign of decline in standards for Jewish educators.

A typology of MA programs might be impossible but with such a small number of programs some general descriptions would help give the reader a sense of the differences. Perhaps it could be done in terms of a brief paragraph for each institution.

At some point early on, something needs to be said about the NBL: How it fits into the organizational scheme, its relation to training institutions, its history, its new role in relation to licensure, how the institutions do/ do not relate to NBL.

In addition to the four types of philosophies, would it be fair to add "change agents?"

PAGE 12: (Program curricula) The philosophies of the various programs take into account the balance between providing sufficient course work to remediate deficits in knowledge of matriculating students without deterring motivated students from applying because of the length of the program. How do programs work within the limitations of the two/three years available? Is the notion of a continuum of learning realistic?

PAGE 19: (Student Profile) The two opening paragraphs should end with the statement that: "Changes in Jewish identity patterns of American Jewry have deeply affected the picture of who enters the profession since 1967."

PAGE 20: (Jewish background) Are the people entering the people both products of weak supplementary schools but successful/stimulating nonformal education programs? How significant are undergraduate academic courses at colleges in influencing men and women to enter the field? I suspect camps, Israel and youth groups are more important and often explain why they take college courses in Judaica in the first place.

PAGE 22: (Summary) This could be a whole new section on recruitment. The questions raised are important but basic information on recruitment strategies, pools, and data on matriculating students (GPAs, countries of origin, etc.) are needed. Is recruitment local, regional or national? What are the differences between the types of institutions in their catchment areas for recruiting?

PAGE 23: (Faculty) Are they treated with "enmity" or "intellectual condescension?"

Page 24: The salaries for full-time faculty in education at independent community-based colleges should read: "ranging from \$18,000 to \$50,000 in 1989-1990." In addition, I think a report on fringe benefits should be included. The report could contribute by offering better data on compensation in institutions of higher Jewish learning. One model is the 1989-1990 KPMG Peat Marwick and AS&U's study on compensation in higher education.

Teaching load should also be indicated by number of hours teaching per week and whether it is undergraduate or graduate.

PAGE 26: (#3) This is the first mention of the Association of Institutions of Higher Learning for Jewish Education (AIHLJE) (N.B. correct organization name and acronym on page 40). Should more be said earlier in relation to subsequent developments since the demise of the Iggud?

PAGE 34: (#3) The origin of the Cleveland College should be identified as "Bet Midrash l'Morim (1929)

PAGE 35: (#8) I am not sure the statement that no faculty hold doctorates in curriculum development is correct.

One of the unanswered questions in the paper is for whom do the institutions prepare educators? Is there a breakdown which indicates the entry points of new graduates into the system? I am especially eager to know if the differences between denominational and community colleges holds up in placement of graduates? Do graduates of denominational take positions nationally and graduates of community colleges take local positions? Are denominational programs local, regional, or national?

C:\DAVIDSON.DOC

MORTON L. MANDEL

4500 EUCLID AVENUE • CLEVELAND, OHIO 44133

VFL

File

February 8, 1990

Dear Aryeh:

Thank you for your very warm and supportive letter of February 2. It was good to get your impressions of our meeting. They were very helpful.

Also, I have your Research Report, and I appreciate very much the work and thought that went into it. I feel that we are all building something very important, and that our combined efforts will make an important difference.

Thanks again, and warmest regards.

Sincerely,

MORTON L. MANDEL

Aryeh Davidson
The Jewish Theological Seminary
3080 Broadway
New York, NY 10027-4649



AND THE BUSH וְהַסֵּבֶה
WAS NOT אֵינוֹ
CONSUMED אָכַל

THE JEWISH
THEOLOGICAL
SEMINARY
OF AMERICA

3080 Broadway
New York, NY 10027-4649
(212) 678-8000
FAX (212) 678-8947

Department of
Education
(212) 678-8028

Feb. 2, 1990

*Rescued
Negot*

Mr. Morton Mandel
Premier Industries
1750 Euclid Avenue
Cleveland, Ohio

Dear Mr. Mandel,

When Chancellor Schorsch informed me that you had requested to address the education cabinet, I thought it would provide a good opportunity for all cabinet participants to become familiar with the Commission. It would also introduce you to some of the key educational players in our Movement.

The meeting succeeded far beyond my expectations. After you left we continued to engage in a discussion that revealed genuine enthusiasm for the work of the Commission and excitement about fits possible outcomes. The ensuing discussion of Ramah also addressed how our work in informal education relates to the Commission's agenda.

Perhaps more than any other aspect of the discussion, I was struck by the profound impact you had on all those present. The vision, the shared language, the energy, understanding, optimism and wisdom you expressed, succeeded in fostering within us a sense of trust and commitment to the "quiet revolution in Jewish education."

Yishar Koach.

Sincerely yours,

Aryeh Davidson
Chairman

COMMISSION
ON JEWISH EDUCATION
IN NORTH AMERICA

4500 Euclid Avenue
Cleveland, Ohio 44103
216/391-8300

Commissioners

Morton L. Mandel
Chairman
Mona Riklis Ackerman
Ronald Appleby
David Arnow
Mandell L. Berman
Jack Bieler
Charles R. Bronfman
John C. Colman
Maurice S. Corson
Lester Crown
David Dublin
Stuart E. Eizenstat
Joshua Elkin
Eli N. Evans
Irwin S. Field
Max M. Fisher
Alfred Gottschalk
Arthur Green
Irving Greenberg
Joseph S. Gruss
Robert I. Hiller
David Hirschhorn
Carol K. Ingall
Ludwig Jesselson
Henry Koschitzky
Mark Lainer
Norman Lamm
Sara S. Lee
Seymour Martin Lipset
Haskel Lookstein
Robert E. Loup
Matthew J. Maryles
Florence Melton
Donald R. Mintz
Lester Pollack
Charles Ratner
Esther Leah Ritz
Harriet L. Rosenthal
Alvin I. Schiff
Lionel H. Schipper
Ismar Schorsch
Harold M. Schulweis
Daniel S. Shapiro
Margaret W. Tishman
Isadore Twersky
Bennett Yanowitz
Isaiah Zeldin

In Formation

Senior Policy Advisors

David S. Ariel
Seymour Fox
Annette Hochstein
Stephen H. Hoffman
Martin S. Kraar
Arthur Rotman
Carmi Schwartz
Herman D. Stein
Jonathan Woocher
Henry L. Zucker

Director

Henry L. Zucker

Staff

Mark Gurvis
Virginia F. Levi
Joseph Reimer

TO: Members of the Commission on Jewish Education
in North America

FROM: Morton L. Mandel, Chairman

DATE: June 8, 1990

Enclosed is a copy of Dr. Aryeh Davidson's study on training of Jewish educators. Aryeh is chairman of the Department of Education at the Jewish Theological Seminary of America.

This paper catalogues the scope of professional training activity at institutions of higher learning in Jewish education. Even though data provided is not identified by the individual institution (the need for confidentiality to gain data precludes such disclosure), the aggregate data tell a very compelling story about the need for further development of professional education efforts.

Feel free to share your reactions to the papers with me or Mark Gurvis of our staff.

Memo

mailed
9/20

To: Argh Davidson

From: Mark Gurin

Per our discussion, enclosed
are the following:

- 1) 50 Commission letterheads &
envelopes
- 2) Design document
- 3) Commission membership

Of particular note among the
commissioners are Robert Hiller and
David Hirschhorn from Baltimore

Call if you need anything. Best
wishes for the holidays.

Commission stationery - (IT)

+ backup sheets

+ envelopes

✓ mailed stationery
9/11

Consultant fees to demographers
- may be coming

ISA ARON

GINNY -

I HAVEN'T GOTTEN THE MATERIAL
FROM KEN MYERS YET. I'VE
LEFT A MESSAGE FOR HIM TO GET
IT TO YOU WHILE I'M AWAY SO
YOU + HENRY HAVE A CHANCE TO
REVIEW IT BEFORE NEXT THURSDAY.

I'LL CHECK IN TUES AFT
JUST TO MAKE SURE ITS HERE

Mark

SEP 24 1990

THE JEWISH THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY OF AMERICA

M E M O R A N D U M

DATE 9/19/90

TO: Virginia Levy

FROM: Aryeh Davidson

RE: Biographical Sketch

I'm sorry that this is late. Please
feel free to edit this in any way.

Biographical Sketch

ARYEH DAVIDSON

Dr. Davidson, Assistant Professor at the Jewish Theological Seminary, teaches courses in Jewish education and human development and is currently ~~serving as~~ chairperson of the Department of Jewish Education. He has worked widely in both general and Jewish education and was a Jerusalem Fellow in 1987-88. His most recent research focuses on the development of Jewish identity and the psychological processes involved in the reading and teaching of Jewish texts.