



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
34

Ingall, Carol K., 1988-1990.

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



לשכת החינוך

Bureau of Jewish Education of Rhode Island

A MEMBER AGENCY OF THE JEWISH FEDERATION OF RHODE ISLAND

130 SESSIONS STREET • PROVIDENCE, RHODE ISLAND 02906 • (401) 331-0956

June 16, 1988
1 Tammuz 5748

Executive Director
CAROL K. INGALL
Media Coordinator
TOBY G. ROSSNER
Educational Services Coordinator
MINNA ELLISON
Educational Director
Harry Elkin Midrasha
EVELYN F. BRIER
Israel Desk
Adult Education Coordinator
RUTH PAGE
Special Education Coordinator
BARBARA ZENOFKY
President
CINDY KAPLAN
Vice Presidents
ALICE GOLDSTEIN
DR. STEPHEN KAPLAN
DR. EZRA STIEGLITZ
Treasurer
LEON RUBIN
Associate Treasurer
ROBERT LANDAU
Secretary
REMMIE BROWN
Associate Secretary
JUDITH MISSRY
Honorary Presidents
IRVING BRODSKY
DR. BENJAMIN CHINITZ
BARRY DANA
GERALDINE FOSTER
SHERWIN J. KAPSTEIN
SANFORD KROLL
DR. EDWIN S. MEHLMAN
*JOSEPH TEVEROW
Honorary Vice Presidents
DR. MAURICE GLICKSMAN
RONALD SALAVON
Honorary Board Members
EDITH E. GRANT
*BENJAMIN HAZEN
LOUIS I. KRAMER
BERNARD J. MARGOLIS
WILLIAM MELZER
Board of Directors
SHEILA ALEXANDER
FRED BERKOWITZ
ARNOLD BLASBALG
DR. BRUNO BORENSTEIN
DAVID COHEN
DIANE DUCOFF
MILLIE EISENSTADT
SAM EISENSTADT
DORIS FEINBERG
DR. MARK GOLDMAN
DR. CALVIN GOLDSCHIEDER
DR. PHYLLIS HARNICK
KENNETH HERSH
BETSY HOLLAND
EILEEN HORWITZ
ELIZABETH KAPLAN
SEYMOUR KRIEGER
RABBI DANIEL LIBEN
DR. JANE PEREL
DONNA PERELMAN
DEBORAH RASKIN
BONNIE RYVICKER
MATHEW SHUSTER
JANET SHANSKY
RABBI LAWRENCE SILVERMAN
ROBERT STARR
RABBI SHOLOM STRAJCHER
ANNE TEIFELD
JOSHUA TEVEROW
DR. ROBERT YOUNG
NORMAN TILLES, Ex-Officio
MAX ALPERIN, Ex-Officio
ELLIOT COHAN, Ex-Officio
*Deceased

Mr. Morton L. Mandel
Mandel Associated Foundations
1750 Euclid Avenue
Cleveland, Ohio 44115

Dear Mr. Mandel:

I am delighted to be able to serve on the North American Commission on Jewish Education. Much as I would like to attend the opening meeting on August 1st, I will be at the CAJE conference in Israel, as I suspect will be several others on the Commission. If we are briefed prior to our departure and CAJE is somehow brought into the process, CAJE can then be utilized to publicize the Commission among the grass roots, the teachers in the field.

I look forward to our association.

Sincerely,

Carol K. Ingall
Carol K. Ingall
Executive Director

cc: Dr. Arthur J. Naparstek

CKI:rb

"And the study of Torah outweighs them all"

ingall/2MN-W

MI-NA: TOWARDS THE FIRST COMMISSION MEETING

INTERVIEW OF COMMISSIONER

Commissioner: CAROL INGALL
Interviewer: Annette Hochstein
Date: July 4, 1988
Place: Providence, Ms Ingall's home
Duration: 2 1/4 hours
Focus: Content

Anticipated Participation : active. All Commission meetings except the first (because of CAJE) and active role in taskforce.

Category: Educator. Executive Director, BJE of Rhode Island. JTS MA in teaching.

Atmosphere: interested, examples and cases of excellence (of which some interesting in R.I.), practice oriented.

Summary

The meeting begun with an overview of Jewish Education in Rhode Island - and some of the work of the BJE there.

This was followed by a discussion of some major issues in Jewish Education in North America today:

- 1.The need to build the profession
- 2.The problem of the part-time principal.
- 3.The absence of teacher training programs
- 4.The need for adult education
- 5.The need for family education
- 6.The need to promote high-school education
- 7.The importance of an Israel Experience.

Amongst the major opportunities Ms Ingall points to a change in spirit among the young towards more idealism. She believes this will allow to recruit suitable candidates for the field of Jewish Education.

We also discussed the composition of the commission, the way it plans to work, taskforces, anticipated outcomes and Ms Ingall's preferences for taskforce involvement.

A.Jewish Education in Rhode Island - and some of the work of the BJE there. [A recently completed study offers up-to-date data. We should get it when published].

The following points were raised:

- a.Rhode Island, with 17,000 Jews, is a small community and differs in many points from large metropolitan areas.
- b.It also differs from many communities by virtue of being probably more conservative and more affiliated.
80% of the community is affiliated with a synagogue.
85% of the children are enrolled in schools.
23-27% are in dayschools.

The BJE is actively involved in professional development. It has developed its own certification program linked to a salary scale. a code of practice sets standards for teacher-school relations. Certification leads to a doubling of the teacher's salary. [We should look at this]. The bulk of teachers are a-vocational teachers. Incentives to schools and to teachers for training. Teacher training and teacher support are major activity areas. [Look at some of the programs -- mentors for a-vocational starters, etc..]

B. From the discussion of local conditions the conversation moved to the question of major problems and opportunities in Jewish Education in North America today. Ms Ingall views personnel issues are seen as central and dominant (though she didn't frame it this way.. The following elements were discussed:

1. The need to build the profession

- need to develop opportunities for professional growth and enrichment
- the issue of status (this is not mainly a question of salary - the a-vocational teacher doesn't care so much - but of all the other elements involved in status, including independence)

2. The problem of the part-time principal.

- In small communities principalships are part-time positions. Thus there is often "no one there" to run programs, develop staff, etc...
- The part-time principal is often a rabbi trained in Jewish knowledge but lacking pedagogic and administrative skills. The principals are often less good than the teachers. They know nothing about supervision, guidance, in-service training.
- Suggestion: develop composite jobs that add into full-time profession. Add family education etc...

3. The absence of teacher training programs

- Nobody trains teachers. The denominational colleges train senior educators (only Y.U. trains teachers too). The Hebrew Colleges graduate single participants, often Israelis in search of an easy degree.
- Idea: create combination degrees in general universities between the Judaics department and the education department.

* There are different categories of teachers:

- "Natives" with inadequate training (e.g. judaics and no pedagogy)
- Israelis - able to teach Hebrew and often texts, but uncomfortable with the ideological message of the institution in which they teach (idea: perhaps the denominational colleges could deal with this issue)
- Teachers trained and experienced in secular teaching but with little Jewish knowledge. Often work as avocational teachers in Jewish schools. Add to this the non-trained a-vocational teacher - probably the largest category of teacher. (A warm and committed person teaching the full-time load of 5h/week in a supplementary schools).

4.The need for adult education

Until such time as the Jewish Community is convinced that Jewish Education is for everyone, until such time as it is a trendy thing to do for adults to learn, the children's education is doomed

5.The need for family education

The vast majority of American Jewish parents send their children to some form of Jewish school. When they do this they are saying something positive about their being Jewish. They must be taught to do their share -- the family's share -- of Jewish education, so that the schools can be freed for the teaching tasks.

{Look at Harlene Applebaum's family education program in Detroit. {ask M.Berman?} -- She is excellent. Consider for taskforce. C.I. dixit].

6.The need to promote high-school education

Deal with the 13-18 year olds

7.The importance of an Israel Experience.

Very important. Believes the experience re-inforces and supplements what the school does. R.I. offers scholarships for good programs. Encourages kids to go. (Ex.HSI; Ramah).

8.Miscellaneous.

** Amongst the major opportunities Ms Ingall points to a change in spirit among americans today young towards more idealism. She believes this will allow to recruit suitable candidates for training. Look particularly at youth movment graduates, camp graduates, etc...

C.I. does not believe informal education is making a significant contribution at this time. The Jewish content level of camps has gone down and they are less fashionable.

JCC's have little to offer in the way of content. Example of their pre-school program in R.I. 50% non-Jewish kids; 25% non-Jewish personnel.

We also discussed the composition of the commission, the way it plans to work, taskforces, anticipated outcomes and Ms Ingall's preferences for taskforce involvement. Her preferences would be:

Building the profession

Training

Family Education

She sees herself as a taskforce member - but not as chair or professional because of time constraints.

We discussed possible staff for taskforce. Few new names.

CAJE as a possible partner to the commission.

Premier Industrial Foundation

4500 EUCLID AVENUE
CLEVELAND, OHIO 44103

October 28, 1988

Dear Carol:

Send me a book and I'll send it to all of the
commissioners.

Love,
Art
Art

Carol K. Ingall
Bureau of Jewish Education
130 Sessions Street
Providence, RI



OCT 24 1988

10/19

CAROL K. INGALL

Art -

I keep getting books
written by members of
the Commission. Shall
I send each an auto-
graphed copy?

Rashi?

Love to all -

C.

Wald to
answer

1. Commissioner Carol Ingall
2. Interviewer: Joseph Reimer
3. Date: 12-6-88
4. Duration: 1/2 hour by telephone

Carol Ingall was quite familiar with the steps taken since the August meeting and agreed with the validity of distinguishing between programmatic and enabling conditions. She thought it appropriate to focus on the generic "preconditions." She sees the programmatic options as having such variations from community to community that a national effort, such as the Commission, would have its greatest impact by focusing on the generic issues. Personnel and community seem right to her as specific generic foci.

Her own primary interest is in the area of personnel. Carol sees the two main issues within personnel to be recruitment and retention and is personally interested in both - though more so in recruitment.

She favors moving to a task force structure and thinks task forces can be used on December 13. She prefers to have task force piggybacked to Commission meetings.

Carol is enthusiastic about the Commission and will attend the meeting on December 13.

J. Reimer

Interview with Carol Ingall (4/24/89)
1 hour in her office in Providence

1. Carol Ingall attended the 4/5 educators meeting and did not need further review. She was ready to begin with her reactions to that presentation of the I.J.E. Carol believes it is a mistake to focus so singularly in the Commission on the process of implementation. What is also needed - and soon - is a vision of programs that can inspire people: where is the process leading - what might concrete, programmatic outcomes look like in the area of personnel.

2. In relation to the proposed focus on localism, Carol cautions not to overemphasize the individuality of needs in each community. A good model developed in one locale can serve as a guide to other communities who will know how to adapt the model to their local needs if there is a bank to draw on for financing adaptation; she believes the demonstration model is a good one.

3. What is needed to make the demonstration model work is a serious search for best practices. She does not believe that the IJE necessarily needs to invent new solutions, but in many cases, existing best practices - which are currently locally-run and nationally unknown can serve as models of what should be done in that area. But they must be found, encouraged, developed and put on view for others to emulate. "Best practices" is an urgent and top priority agenda item for the commission.

4. Carol's main disagreement with the IJE presentation was with the assumption of synergy: that many demonstrations should be centered together in one or several communities. She believes that concentration of effort in one community would be artificial: it would have no history - no organic roots in that community. Suddenly one or several communities would get a terrific influx of resources - which might be overwhelming and which might make that community seem very distant from other communities. She doubts that people would pick up and come to work in one centralized site.

5. Carol strongly believes in a more de-centralized approach. Take the issue of personnel and break it down into its component parts. Then search hard for where in the country communities are already at work on creating positive solutions for that component problem. (She believes more is being done in the field than is generally recognized, and hence already underway). Then use the IJE to help develop and expand what is already begun in the local community. (She agrees that here the IJE plays a crucial role in setting standards and getting much improved output; but only if it works on goals and programs that are already underway in a community). Then be sure to publicize the local best practice and finance its adaptation to other communities.

6. As a local BJE director Carol believes that her community or comparable communities can develop expertise in one or several aspects of the personnel issue, but not in the whole area. She adds, though, that it would add great luster to her whole program if her agency received national recognition for its area of expertise (eg. - teacher induction) and that these partial solutions can have great relevance for change in other communities.

7. Carol plans to attend on 6/14.

Notes on meeting with Carol Ingall - 1/24/90

In reviewing the draft recommendations with Carol Ingall, she focused her comments primarily on issues of personnel and training.

1) Her own experience in Providence has left her dissatisfied with relying on the local Hebrew college for pre-service training of her professional teachers. She'd rather see Chairs of Jewish Education be established in universities with fine Departments of Judaics and Education. (Eg., she could see this working at Brown in Providence). The best shot would be to attract bright undergraduates (or graduate students) to the field and train them from scratch. With the field of Education gaining more credibility on campus today, that becomes a possibility. Also, summer courses for more mature teachers at places like J.T.S. work well.

2) As for local in-service training of the avocational teachers (who in Providence are the vast majority in supplementary schools), Carol finds great interest in Bureau-run "hands-on" sessions. Teachers are hungry for help in creating materials for classroom use. But that is not serious training, and unfortunately, she finds little interest in the on-going classes that the Bureau offers. Teachers think of themselves as being very part-time and not wanting to invest too much time in training. They may also be embarrassed to admit that although teaching in supplementary schools, they know very little Judaica themselves. Courses in Jewish areas may scare them off.

3) What did help was a system of certification for teachers in which the Bureau ran the courses and the schools received extra financial support if x % of their teachers took the courses. Six of 14 supplementary schools bought into that and the program of training was carried out.

4) Day school teachers are also often part-timers: most particularly, young mothers who come in to teach for several hours a day, and because of baby-sitting arrangements are not flexible with their time. That creates a situation for training similar to that of the supplementary schools - although these are knowledgeable, well-trained teachers.

5) As for pay scales, there is one in Providence and it is helpful as a way of motivating teachers to take in-service courses leading to certification and higher pay. Yet the congregations are actively resistant to the centralized setting of a salary schedule. Leaders, acting as business people, feel they should pay what the market demands and no higher. Still, the struggle is worth it -- for the salary schedule is an important tool for improving the field.

6) Research: Establishing research capacity is crucial for the practice of Jewish education. Carol suggests developing a research capacity by creating positions in research universities for professors of Jewish education.

Carol Ingall will be present on February 14th and suggests we work hard to structure the meeting so that it will not feel repetitive of past discussions.

JR:ls

JOSEPH REIMER

9/20/89

INTERVIEW WITH CAROL INGALL

1. Carol felt very positively about the last Commission meeting, especially its action focus and use of small group format in which she felt freer to contribute.
2. Carol would like to see at coming meetings a continued focus on CAS and on implementation mechanism. She sees no conflict between supporting JESNA in what it already does in servicing Federations and communities and creating a more action-focused mechanism.
3. As to the background papers, Carol related most immediately to the one by Isa Aron on teachers. She'd find it very helpful to get more accurate data on teachers' salaries and benefits; it would be useful in setting pay scales in Providence. She missed two possible topics among those proposed; best practices, which she thinks essential for planning CAS; and day schools.
4. Ms. Ingall had the most to say, as a head of a successful bureau, about the role of bureaus and Federations in community sites. She is alarmed at the prospect of this Commission skipping over bureaus and working directly with Federations on Jewish education. Understanding that the role of the bureau and Federation varies from city to city, she is yet willing to hazard the generalization that often enough, Federation and its leadership are not familiar with or committed to the detail work of running Jewish educational programs. She sees Federation attracting a different lay leadership than do bureaus, and Federations' leaderships' priorities are more global--and often, Israel and campaign-centered. While she agrees that this is what needs to change (and she is working on changing leadership attitudes in Providence), she also notes that there is resistance and it will take time. Her plea is that the Commission not be unrealistic about the resistance and not be afraid to work through bureaus and Federations in cities where that is appropriate (often large, intermediate cities have best working bureaus).
5. Ms. Ingall plans to attend on October 23.

Notes on meeting with Carol Ingall - 1/24/90

In reviewing the draft recommendations with Carol Ingall, she focused her comments primarily on issues of personnel and training.

1) Her own experience in Providence has left her dissatisfied with relying on the local Hebrew college for pre-service training of her professional teachers. She'd rather see Chairs of Jewish Education be established in universities with fine Departments of Judaics and Education. (Eg., she could see this working at Brown in Providence). The best shot would be to attract bright undergraduates (or graduate students) to the field and train them from scratch. With the field of Education gaining more credibility on campus today, that becomes a possibility. Also, summer courses for more mature teachers at places like J.T.S. work well.

2) As for local in-service training of the avocational teachers (who in Providence are the vast majority in supplementary schools), Carol finds great interest in Bureau-run "hands-on" sessions. Teachers are hungry for help in creating materials for classroom use. But that is not serious training, and unfortunately, she finds little interest in the on-going classes that the Bureau offers. Teachers think of themselves as being very part-time and not wanting to invest too much time in training. They may also be embarrassed to admit that although teaching in supplementary schools, they know very little Judaica themselves. Courses in Jewish areas may scare them off.

3) What did-help was a system of certification for teachers in which the Bureau ran the courses and the schools received extra financial support if x % of their teachers took the courses. Six of 14 supplementary schools bought into that and the program of training was carried out.

4) Day school teachers are also often part-timers: most particularly, young mothers who come in to teach for several hours a day, and because of baby-sitting arrangements are not flexible with their time. That creates a situation for training similar to that of the supplementary schools - although these are knowledgeable, well-trained teachers.

5) As for pay scales, there is one in Providence and it is helpful as a way of motivating teachers to take in-service courses leading to certification and higher pay. Yet the congregations are actively resistant to the centralized setting of a salary schedule. Leaders, acting as business people, feel they should pay what the market demands and no higher. Still, the struggle is worth it -- for the salary schedule is an important tool for improving the field.

6) Research: Establishing research capacity is crucial for the practice of Jewish education. Carol suggests developing a research capacity by creating positions in research universities for professors of Jewish education.

Carol Ingall will be present on February 14th and suggests we work hard to structure the meeting so that it will not feel repetitive of past discussions.

JR:ls