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	Folder
6	22

Schiff, Alvin I., 1988-1990.

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

3101 Clifton Ave, Cincinnati, Ohio 45220
513.487.3000
AmericanJewishArchives.org

COMMISSIONER CONTACT SHEET

Name Alvin I. Schiff

Assigned to AJN

Mailing Address
Board of Jewish Education of Gr.NY
426 West 58th Street
New York, NY 10019

Off. phone 212-245-8200

Home phone

Fax

Telex

Comments

Date	Nature of Contact/Status	Next Steps/Action Needed

Commission

INTER-OFFICE CORRESPONDENCE

TO: Morton L. Mandel
NAME

DEPARTMENT/PLANT LOCATION

FROM: Arthur J. Naparstek
NAME

DEPARTMENT/PLANT LOCATION

DATE: 8/23/88

REPLYING TO
YOUR MEMO OF: _____

SUBJECT: ALVIN SCHIFF'S BOOK

Alvin wanted me to pass on the attached to you. The more I learn about him, the more impressed I am with him.

SCHIFF

ASN

Premier Industrial Foundation
4500 EUCLID AVENUE
CLEVELAND, OHIO 44103

September 8, 1988

Dear Alvin:

Again, thank you for your thoughtful letter of August 5, 1988. I really appreciate the kind of support you are giving both myself and the Commission. I am optimistic that we will be able to come up with a great product. My optimism stems from the knowledge that you will be very much involved in the development of the program.

I would like to take a moment to bring you up to date on what we hope can be accomplished over the coming three or four months leading up to the next Commission meeting.

I expect Seymour Fox and Annette Hochstein to develop several papers that we will be able to review between mid-September and the first of October. We expect to have an options paper that will include the possible alternatives for the content of the Commission and topics the Commission could decide on. This paper will be based on the proceedings of the first meeting, the interviews and knowledge of the field, and of educational theory. It could become the background document for the deliberations on what topics to address and how to address them. It may also be the basis for a research design. I would very much like to review the contents of this paper with you as it is developed.

Perhaps we can set a time to talk about your ideas and Seymour's work. I'll call next week.

Until then, I wish you a happy New Year and again, thank you very, very much for all that you've been able to do to help move the process along. Thank you very much.

Sincerely,

Arthur J. Naparstek
President

Dr. Alvin I. Schiff
Board of Jewish Education
of Greater New York
426 West 58th Street
New York, NY 10019

Interview:

1. Commission Alvin Schiff
2. Interviewer: AJN
3. Date: 11-3-88
4. Spirit: Positive, enthusiastic, and hurt because he was not mentioned in "Jewish Week" article.
5. Setting: Schiff's office at the bureau.
6. Duration: 3 hours
7. Commissioner's current stand:
   A. Personnel - Yes
   B. Community - Yes
   C. Programmatic options - eliminate those that are redundant and develop a creative scheme to deal with the rest.

Summary: Dr. Schiff opened the meeting by asking if I had seen the article in "Jewish Week". I told him I had heard about it but had not seen it. He said he was very hurt that he was not mentioned. He was upset by Peggy Tishman's quotes in the article and indicated that he is the strongest supporter of the Commission, among educators in New York City and did not understand why the reporter did not seek his advice. I indicated that I value his advice as does Mort Mandel and I also reassured him that there would be appropriate forums as the commission developed. Once we put that behind us, the interview proceeded with great enthusiasm and intellectual stimulation, particularly on his part. Alvin Schiff offered the following comments:

I. Personnel - Alvin agrees that personnel is a key issue. We need to focus not only principals but teachers. We need to look at principals in relationship to different types of schools. There are principals and directors. A principal of a day school needs different tools than the director of a part-time supplemental school. In terms of issues, I asked Alvin about the requisite conditions related to Jewish education such as continuity. He indicated that there are 3 levels or goals that the commission needs to consider. The first level is Jewish survival. Alvin pointed out that with Jewish survival, there is no need for education. The second level is Jewish continuity. With Jewish continuity, a requisite condition is Jewish education. The third level is enhanced Jewish living and of course, with enhanced Jewish living is also the need for Jewish education.

II. Community - There is a need for communal leadership; however, it must be substantively based. You cannot have effective leadership unless people have a sense of the cognitive dimensions of Judaism. The focus on community should deal with lay leadership and financial support. The Commission needs to understand why support of day schools and camps are necessary and why they are different. In terms of community, Alvin pointed out that we need to define it. He identified three dimensions to community. 1. He defined it in geographic terms; 2. people terms; and 3. structural organizational terms. First under geographic

terms, we need to look at geography from a national, regional, and local perspective. How do we work in each arena? Two, in people terms, we need to look at the interrelationship between the lay and the professional. Who are the people that we need to focus on? Three, in structural and organizational terms, we need to look at the various organizations as well as the religious organizations.

Schiff than went on to talk about the principles that make community go. First, we need to describe the construct and context of community i.e. geographic, people and structural. Secondly, what is the mission? What does the community want to do to focus in on day schools or whatever? Third, what is our operational philosophy in relationship to community? How do we want to connect organizations and institutions? How do we begin to deal with the networks and national organizations like JWB, JESNA, COJE? How do we link in with the World Zionist Organization Hadassah, etc.? The Commission he claims, must be positioned so that it is bigger than any one entity.

III. Programmatic Options - Alvin felt that we had to organize a list of rubrics and each one should be a priority. He identified a number of redundancies in the list. He listed the following: 3, 5, 6, 7, 12, and 16.

Alvin will be attending the meeting on December 13. The interview with him was excellent.

COMMISSION
ON JEWISH EDUCATION
IN NORTH AMERICA

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

March 13, 1989

Dr. Alvin I. Schiff
Board of Jewish Education
of Greater New York
426 West 58th Street
New York, NY 10019

Dear Al:

Last month, a new committee was formed to assist in the development of a public relations strategy for the Commission on Jewish Education. At its first meeting on February 22, the committee identified several key publics to whom our efforts should be directed, and some perceptions regarding Jewish education, the Commission, etc. which may need to be addressed in our communications.

We have engaged the services of Paula Berman Cohen, a communications professional, to assist us in developing an approach to effectively reach our publics. I have suggested to her that she talk with you within the next few weeks in order to get more specific information on your various areas of expertise in the field of Jewish education (i.e. priority organizations, key contacts, target audiences, etc.).

Enclosed for your review and consideration are the minutes from the February 22 meeting on Public Relations, and a list of key publics which have been identified. Please feel free to add other publics to those already identified, and pass your ideas along to Paula when she contacts you.

Once again, please accept my thanks for your assistance.

Sincerely,

Arthur J. Naparstek
Director

Enclosures

INTERVIEW WITH
ALVIN SCHIFF

ARTHUR J. NAPARSTEK
MAY 3, 1989

Alvin Schiff has been very close to the process as he participated in the Jewish educators meeting of late March and was briefed at that time.

We began the discussion with Alvin talking about how national initiatives must tie into localities. He went on to say that the quality of what happens on the national level is dependent on the input from localities. Once a national mechanism develops guidelines, it has to implement them locally.

Alvin put forward a model that he has used in developing initiatives, both on a national basis as well as locally. He stated that the role of the national mechanism is first to develop plans; second, to validate those plans; third, to demonstrate the plans in program form through localities and; fourth, to replicate the plans throughout the country.

The remaining part of the interview dealt with a look at the functions that the IJE may fulfill:

1. Criteria for Choosing Community Action Site

   What are the criteria for choosing a community action site? What size should it be? What are the important characteristics? Alvin's response on criteria was that it should not be seen as a Mandel initiative solely. He also feels that the mechanism should be located in New York as much of the resources are there. The first criteria is for us to determine whether the community has the ability to bring about change in personnel. He went on to say that it may not matter how big the community is, but whether or not it has critical mass, for example, does it have three or four schools? He feels that we should select communities that are both large, medium and small and to determine whether or not they have the infrastructure to bring about change. Infrastructure can be defined in terms of leadership, organization, etc.

2. Quality of Projects

   How do we guarantee that the projects are of the quality the Commission aspires to? He feels the quality must come from the IJE and the relationship with the local community. We need to use a variety of techniques in order to receive ideas and proposals from local communities. He identified three ways of assessing that: (1) experimental programs that would be initiated by the IJE staff and

funded directly, these are trial balloon programs in which IJE staff feel they want to learn something; (2) programs of match where local communities can come up with a match; and (3) programs in which local communities respond to a request for proposals.

3. Negotiations with Existing Institutions

How will negotiations with the existing institutions in the community be conducted? Alvin believes that there has to be a synegism between the lay and professional through federations, bureaus and congregational leadership. It will vary from community to community and be pluralistic. However, he does believe it's the interrelationship between the federation and the bureau.

4. Appropriate Funding

Alvin referred back to the earlier question on quality in which he put forward the three options: trial balloon, match, and application. He does believe that the IJE should have appropriate funds so that it can make an impact. He did not come up with an amount, however.

5. Monitoring and Evaluation

Alvin has a theoretical formulation that is quite technical for monitoring and evaluation and is not necessarily appropriate to get into here.

6. Diffusion

On the question of diffusion, Alvin feels that through the IJE and the evaluation process, diffusion can occur. He would use national organizations.

7. Central Mechanism

On the question of a central mechanism imposing itself on localities, Alvin feels that through the threefold proposal process for funding and carefully drawn up guidelines, communities will be protected.

Regarding the June 14th meeting, Alvin feels that we should have three goals for this meeting: (1) to keep commissioners' interest alive, (2) to get them excited and, (3) to create the preconditions in which we will get their financial support. Here he was talking about foundations and others who are potential donors. Alvin felt the agenda for the meeting should be for MLM to provide a quick review on where we are and how we've gotten to where we are. We then need presentations that put forward personnel and community in interesting ways, but the plenary session should be over by 11:30 a.m. He would like to see small groups meet from 11:30 a.m. through 2:00 p.m., possibly having lunch as they work, and from 2:00 p.m. to 4:00 p.m. to meet in a plenary session. He hopes the meeting ends up with consensus on general direction of where we want to go, who our clients will be, the beginning ideas of how it will be funded or perhaps even the structure for funding. I indicated that Alvin's wish was somewhat ambitious and he agreed but said we should shoot for it.

JOSEPH REIMER 9/21/89

INTERVIEW WITH ALVIN SCHIFF

1. Dr. Schiff believes that we should be continuing the focus on Community Action Sites and he has much to say on the topic. He approved of the papers commissioned, saying that he'd like to have input into them -- especially the one by Walter Ackerman on Institutional Analysis.

2. As to CAS, Alvin is convinced that is the way to go, that the action all starts locally. National agencies can provide services, but they have a secondary or tertiary relationship to the action itself, while the community is closer to the action.

3. He had strong feelings about the denominations. Our approach should be to work with the total community, which means that we show respect to the denominations, but not be bound by them. The commission has to create by its own vision and consult, but not see itself as beholden to particularistic interests. Bring denominational people on board to make sure their perspectives are represented.

4. As to choosing sites, it has to be a community where people already know how to work together as a community across denominational lines. If we are speaking about personnel, the approach has to be generic and applicable across the board. The site should also allow for developing a comprehensive model which is replicable, so the community has to be somewhat representative.

5. To make the CAS work, there needs to be created an independent fund which is not tied down by political considerations. This fund could then be used in a CAS as a challenge to the community to come up with matching funds to support the projects specific to that community.

6. As to the successor mechanism, Alvin envisions a new model of a foundation that does not give out grants, but works with its money to see that given projects are undertaken. He would envision this foundation as engaging in research as to what could be done, giving seed money to start implementation and evaluate its success and then handing over the project to the local community and dissemination to JESNA. He believes JESNA and JWB can only be stimulated by an independent foundation whose purpose is to take the state of the art knowledge and make it work in a particular site.

7. Dr. Schiff is planning to attend on October 23.

Notes on meeting with Alvin Schiff - 1/10/90

Prepared by Joseph Reimer

As I reviewed the draft recommendations with Dr. Schiff, he focused on two areas: community action sites and training institutions/opportunities.

I Community Action Sites (CAS)

1. What are the criteria for selecting a commmunity as a CAS? Some possible criteria may be:

   a) Geography and demography: Where is the community located, what is its size, of what kind of community is it representative?

   b) Lead agency: Does the community have a lead agency to take responsibility for coordinating and seeing through the project?

   c) Lay leadership: Does the community have a stable, committed group of lay leaders who have the money to support and the ability to monitor the project?

   d) Replicability: Does the community have the capacity to create educational models that can serve as examples to other comparable communities?

   e) Personnel: Does the community have a coordinated model for handling issues of personnel - such as training, professional development, salaries and benefits?

2. Dr. Schiff thinks of Suffolk County on Long Island as being the kind of community which would meet these diverse criteria.

3. How would the local lead agency work with, eg., the synagogue schools? The model he suggests is the one he is trying to implement in the New York area with synagogue-based family education. There is a proposal to establish a full-time family educator in each synagogue. Each synagogue would put up $15,000 per year and the Fund would initially put up $25,000 on the condition that the educator would be involved as part of the work in an on-going training experience that would help to train the educator as well as help the educator and synagogue to think through issues of restructuring educational opportunities in the synagogue. The local BJE, college or a national training institution may take joint responsibility for designing and implementing the training component.

4. The IJE would have to play the crucial oversight function of meeting with the responsible parties in the CAS and monitoring progress, reminding them "this is the contract we made." IJE money needs to be leveraged and used to raise local contributions to Jewish education. IJE needs to be part of a formative evaluation process that constantly monitors the progress of the demonstrations. Being a free-standing institution is essential to the IJE's mission as change-agent.

II. Training Institutions

1. Dr. Schiff believes it is important to set conditions in contracting with the training institutions to do pieces of the training. The institution might be asked to design a specific training module - eg. in Jewish family education - and may need help in stretching to meet that need.

2. He favors a collaborative approach to training educators in the community in which a training institution, a local BJE and (eg.) synagogues might work together to design training experiences for the personnel involved.

3. Dr. Schiff favors establishing a comprehensive approach to servicing personnel. Rather than leaving the recruiting, training and servicing of educators to each area (eg. early childhood), why can't a community establish a committee or center whose function would be to study the whole community's personnel needs and work with local institutions in a planning process to systematically address those needs?

Alvin felt positive about these recommendations and will attend on February 14th.

JR:ls

Board of Jewish Education of Greater New York

426 West 58th Street / New York, NY 10019 / (212) 245-8200 / FAX # (212) 247-6562

DR. ALVIN I. SCHIFF
Executive Vice President

HLZ ✓
VFL —
MG ✓

February 6, 1990

Mr. Morton L. Mandel
Commission on Jewish Education
in North America
4500 Euclid Avenue
Cleveland, OH 44103

Dear Mort:

Good seeing you at the Stern College meeting. I thought it went very well. Your remarks were on target, as usual. The discussion was high-level and useful.

Enclosed is my monograph, PERSONNEL AND COMMUNAL FINANCIAL SUPPORT ARE THE TWIN MAJOR CHALLENGES (ENABLING OPTIONS) IN JEWISH EDUCATION IN NORTH AMERICA, I told you I would write in light of the meeting.

Also enclosed are three articles I have written and two other items that might be helpful to the Commission process.

1) "Teachers & Principals - The Crucial Link to the Bureaus," Jewish Education, Spring 1989.

2) "The Manpower Crisis in Jewish Education - Real Problems and Realistic Solutions," Jewish Education, June 1968.

3) "What is Our D'mut Atzmit Quotient?" Jewish Education News, CAJE, Summer 1988.

4) Advocacy Plan for Enhancing the Jewish Education Profession, COJEO

5) Jewish Education Resolution Adopted at 1988 CJF General Assembly.

With warm wishes,

Alvin I. Schiff

AIS:sd
Enclosures

Board of Jewish Education
of Greater New York

426 West 58th Street / New York, NY 10019 / (212) 245-8200 / FAX # (212) 247-6562

February 6, 1990

DR. ALVIN I. SCHIFF
Executive Vice President

TO: Morton Mandel

FROM: Alvin I. Schiff

ITEM: PERSONNEL AND COMMUNAL FINANCIAL SUPPORT ARE THE TWIN MAJOR CHALLENGES (ENABLING OPTIONS) IN JEWISH EDUCATION IN NORTH AMERICA.

I. PERSONNEL

A. Professional Status

1. Improving image of educators, particularly teachers. Strategies to raise their social status must be developed. (Rabbis were able to achieve this.) Improving the image of the Jewish educator might be accomplished directly by a campaign highlighting the importance of the role of the Jewish educator in ensuring Jewish continuity, and indirectly by demonstrating the critical importance of Jewish education in the Jewish community.

   Allied to this challenge is the need to help Jewish educators, particularly teachers, to enhance their own self-image. A variety of self-help procedures must be advanced.

2. Recognizing and rewarding excellence, particularly for teaching.

   Currently, the major and frequently the only way of recognizing instructional excellence is promotion to an administrative position. Not all excellent teachers become excellent administrators. More often than not, the opposite is true. Needed is the institution of a communal approach which will reward teaching by "lateral promotion" (financial rewards, communal recognition and new instructional opportunities) that will help retain excellent teachers as teachers.

   Excellent teachers must be rewarded for what they do best - teach! And they must be retained for what they do best - teach!

   This procedure, once it becomes well known, will attract more talented young people to the field of Jewish teaching.

B. Professional Needs

1. Providing effective preservice preparation and inservice training.

   a) The need here is to provide quality preservice programs - to prepare classroom teachers for effective instruction via the combined use of formal and informal techniques of teaching. Similarly, informal Jewish educators must be trained to function effectively in informal educational settings.

      Moreover, quality preservice programs are needed to prepare Jewish educators for effective educational leadership.

   b) The training must include the sensitizing of teachers to be responsive to special individual needs of students and to the special needs of Jewish families. This latter need suggests the training of a cadre of Jewish family educators who will be able to function effectively in a classroom setting, combining formal and informal instructional approaches and working effectively with parents according to their Jewish needs.

2. Empowering educators - facilitating autonomous performance.

   Essentially this means enhancing the role of Jewish educators, particularly teachers, by giving them greater latitude and responsibility in planning and implementation of their own programs. With greater responsibility goes increased accountability for the results of their work and increased gratification for their productivity.

3. Increasing opportunities for professional growth.

   One of the critical shortcomings of the formal Jewish educational system is the lack of opportunities for professional growth within individual schools. In part, this is caused by small school size. Nevertheless, in all schools, competence and effective performance should be rewarded with increased school-wide pedagogic responsibility - such as,

a) serving as mentor to new teachers;

b) becoming a 'lead teacher';

c) developing experimental programs;

d) creating and implementing family-education programs; and

e) integrating formal and informal activities synagogue and school settings.

4. Developing effective recruitment strategies.

Greater effort to recruit and place Jewish educators involves a variety of activities including,

a) career day forums at the rabbinic seminaries and selected universities with significant Jewish student populations;

b) career guidance activities at Jewish Day High Schools and Jewish youth organizations (B'nai Brith Youth, Zionist youth groups, ideological youth groups);

c) distribution of career opportunity materials to adult Jewish organizations, ideological movements, Zionist groups.

d) incentive programs providing scholarships for Jewish education study with concomitant commitment to teach for 3-5 years.

e) salary incentive programs for beginning teachers.

f) public relations media programs aimed at Jewish teenagers.

g) missions to Israel (and to Poland and Israel a la the March of the Living) for prospective Jewish educators.

II COMMUNAL/FINANCIAL SUPPORT

A. Sensitizing the Jewish community to the need for and the value of the Jewish educator - fostering respect, esteem (including self-esteem among teachers.)

Here is the dual challenge of raising the consciousness of the Jewish community about

1) the critical need for effective, quality Jewish education; and

2) the vital importance of effective, high-calibre Jewish educators.

While financial support is not the only way to demonstrate community awareness of the dual significance of quality education and skilled educators, it is a conditione sina qua non for attracting and retaining quality professionals.

B. ECONOMIC NEEDS

Essentially there are three levels of economic needs. Each must be addressed so that the "financial package is attractive.

1) making entry salaries competitive to compete with the marketplace;

2) providing adequate fringe benefits to include pension benefits, medical and dental insurance, life insurance, and long-term disability insurance, in addition to social security, statutory insurance programs for unemployment, disability and workmen's compensation;

3) offering competitive salary increments - especially to increase earning power of teachers.

Without sufficient incentives to remain in Jewish education, the best Jewish educators will leave. Retaining skilled teachers is most critical.

EDITORIAL ESSAY

ALVIN I. SCHIFF

TEACHERS AND PRINCIPALS — THE CRUCIAL LINK TO THE BUREAUS

Some Assumptions

- The current condition of teachers and principals in Jewish schools is not the making of Jewish educators.
- While very critical, this condition is improvable.
- Teachers and principals in Jewish schools are, by and large, devoted, dedicated and committed Jewish communal personnel, anxious to be effective and to succeed — to contribute to Jewish continuity and to enhance the quality of Jewish life.
- Many Jewish educators continuously search for ways to be more effective and to grow professionally.
- Jewish educators need and deserve much more support from the Jewish community than they presently receive.

Challenge and Response

The following is essentially a set of challenges and potential responses to the critical condition of Jewish school personnel. Based largely on my own experience in New York, as per the suggestion of Dr. Emanuel Goldman, chairman of this annual meeting, they are framed as a conversation — a presentation in the making — to be completed after serious deliberation by bureau directors.

THE CHALLENGES

The formal Jewish education vocation has evolved into disparate types of jobs or work styles varying in nature, scope and time commitment. These are: day school teaching, day school principalship, day school administration, supplementary school teaching, supplementary school principalship, early childhood teaching and early childhood directorship.

There are some commonalities and generalizations that apply in full, or in part, to each of these employment arrangements. The common or vocational characteristics can be summarized in one overarching statement: *Working as an instructor or supervisor in a Jewish school is not really a profession.*[1]

Essentially there are eight criteria that characterize a true profession. They are:

1. Rigorous preparation
2. Rigorous entry requirements
3. Supervised induction
4. Carefully developed certification procedures
5. Peer defined standards of practice
6. Autonomous performance
7. Rigorous evaluation, and
8. Assignment of greater responsibility to practitioners with increased competence.[2]

DR. SCHIFF *is executive Vice President of the Board of Jewish Education of Greater New York.* *This paper was presented at the annual meeting of the Bureau Directors' Fellowship New Orleans, November 20, 1988*

1. Working as an instructor or director in a Jewish early childhood program may be an exception to this generalization. According to the director and staff of the Jewish Early Childhood Center of BJE of Greater New York, early childhood teaching and directorship qualify to be called professions when measured against the criteria in this presentation. In terms of rigorous preparation, all early childhood directors in New York, with rare exception, and most head teachers working in JCC's synagogue programs, modern Orthodox and Conservative day schools have a Master's degree in education — a requirement for New York State Certification. Entry requirements for early childhood teaching are explicit. In the large majority of schools, where there are early childhood directors, supervised induction does occur. Professional growth opportunities are available on the early childhood level. Advancement is possible from assistant teacher to head teacher to assistant director to director — the steps of the early childhood education ladder.
2. Linda Darling-Hammond, "Beyond the Commission Reports — The Coming Crisis in Teaching," The Rand Corporation, July 1984, p. 17.

Let us apply these guideposts to teaching and principaling in Jewish schools.

1. Rigorous preparation.

Excluding the one- and two-year pre-service programs in the right-wing orthodox teacher training schools for women in New York,[3] there are no large-scale pre-service programs for teachers in Jewish schools in North America.

To be sure, currently, in 1988, there are only 45 bachelor level students enrolled in all the Hebrew colleges on this continent. Most of the 101 master degree students in the colleges are already teaching in Jewish schools. A large number of these are Israelis not particularly interested in full-time careers in Jewish education. Moreover, there are hardly any young people preparing for careers in Jewish education in American universities.

Compare this reality with Hebrew college enrollment two decades ago. In 1966, there were 1800 bachelor level students in the 14 accredited Hebrew teachers colleges. All of these institutions have since dropped the word "Teachers" from their official names.[4]

In the three postgraduate programs of the rabbinic seminaries (Hebrew Union College — Jewish Institute of Religion, Jewish Theological Seminary and Rabbi Isaac Elchanan Theological Seminary, Yeshiva University), only a very few students are being prepared for supervisory and administrative roles.

2. Rigorous Entry Requirements

Given the shortage of personnel, Jewish schools generally settle for almost anyone interested in becoming a teacher or principal. Most teachers begin their careers with minimal Judaic backgrounds. A recent study of Jewish education in Cleveland showed that 53 percent of all teachers had no Jewish education beyond high school.[5]

The Jewish Supplementary School Study in Greater New York demonstrated that over 80 percent of the teachers had only elementary or high school Jewish education. Eleven percent had no formal Jewish education at all.[6] Moreover, most teachers lack adequate knowledge of Jewish pedagogy and most principals do not have sufficient knowledge of supervision of instruction in Jewish studies and Hebrew language programs.[7]

There are, of course, exceptions to settling for unqualified teachers. One example of this is the principal of a yeshiva high school in New York who interviewed 35 applicants for a *Tanach* teaching position. Not finding a suitable candidate, he finally went to Israel to recruit a teacher.

3. Supervised Induction

Induction procedures vary greatly from school to school. In some schools, careful step-by-step orientation is provided by principals and/or senior faculty and/or bureau staff. In the vast majority of our educational institutions, there are inadequate or no induction procedures at all.

4. Carefully Developed Certification Procedures

To begin with, there are a very small number of certified teachers and principals in our schools. Moreover, there is no standardization of certification procedures. The current national, regional and ideological certification practices are entirely inadequate or irrelevant to the vast majority of Jewish schools. To its credit, the national Board of License of Jewish schools is currently initiating a self-study to remedy this situation.

While much different in scope and nature than that of the public schools, the problem of certification in Jewish schools can be in-

3. Bais Yaacov Academy, Bais Yaacov Seminary of Boro Park, Sara Schenirer Teachers' Seminary, Beth Rivkah Teachers' Seminary, Bnos Leah Seminary of Prospect Park and Rika Breuer's Teacher's Seminary. These seminaries have a total enrollment of approximately 500 students.
4. A.I. Schiff "Career Choice and The Students of The Hebrew Colleges" in Oscar Janowsky, ed. *The Education of American Jewish Teachers*, Boston, Mass., Pilgrim Press, 1967.
5. *The Report of the Joint Federation/Planning Commission on Jewish Continuity*, Jewish Community Federation of Cleveland, October 1988.
6. A.I. Schiff, et. al., *Jewish Supplementary Schooling: An Educational System in Need of Change*, Board of Jewish Education of Greater New York, June 1987.
7. *Ibid.*

formed by the current certification dilemma in general education. In the public school arena, education leaders ask, "Should we tighten certification requirements which is needed, or should we loosen them to counteract the teacher shortage?" Jewish education's response to this dilemma has been to relax them altogether.

In public schools the greatest shortage is in the districts that serve the most disadvantaged. In Jewish education, using the term "Jewishly disadvantaged," we might make the same observation.

5. Peer-defined Standards of Practice

This is nonexistent in Jewish education.

6. Autonomous Performance

This is nonexistent in Jewish education. Moreover, there is little or no teacher empowerment in our schools.

7. Evaluation Process

Carefully planned and implemented personnel evaluation is the exception and not the rule. By and large, there are no regularized, effective evaluation procedures for teacher or principal performance.

It is no consolation that the conditions regarding peer-defined standards of practice, autonomous performance, teacher empowerment and evaluation are not much better in general education. In the public schools teachers are not generally involved in defining standards of instructional practices, teacher evaluation and staff development. As a rule, they "lack power and input in all the important decisions" about their schools. To be sure, teachers in the public schools are frustrated "about their powerlessness in teaching."[8]

8. Assignment of Greater Responsibility to Practitioners with Increased Competence.

One of the earmarks of Jewish education is the *lack of growth opportunities* for teaching personnel.

How do bureau directors view these eight criteria of professionalism? How important is their fulfillment for the advancement of Jewish educators and for the enhancement of Jewish schooling? How do central agencies currently relate to each of the criteria? What differential roles might bureaus play regarding the application of each criterion to school-based procedures? to community-wide practices? to continental activity?

Developing responses to these questions is a necessary step in ameliorating the condition of Jewish school personnel. It is a major challenge to Jewish educational leadership and should be one of the immediate tasks of BDF. To underscore the need to place this challenge on future agenda of BDF let us briefly highlight the professional characteristics of the persons employed in instructional and supervisory positions in Jewish schools on this continent.

Characteristics of the Jewish Education Non-Profession

1. Teaching and principaling in most Jewish schools is, at best, a part-time vocation. The vast majority of Jewish educators teach 12 hours or less. The New York Jewish Supplementary School Study found that there are no full-time teachers in these schools. Only one-third of the principals are full-time and this percentage is declining.[9]

The only full-time career educators are in the day schools and the bureaus.

2. Teacher salaries are absolutely and relatively low — averaging $21,000 to $23,000 for 30 hours of teaching in day schools and $9,000 for 12 hours of supplementary school instruction. There is a wide gap between teachers' and principals' salaries, particularly in the day school, where principals earn, on the average, between $55,000 and $65,000 annually. In some day schools, administrators earn as much as $80,000 and more.

3. Fast-tracking to principalship and even to bureau positions is a growing vocational phenomenon: On the one hand, the reasons

8. Ernest Boyer, *The Condition of Teaching — A State-by-State Analysis*, 1988. The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1988.

9. A.I. Schiff, et al. *Jewish Supplementary Schooling*.

for this are the lack of qualified, experienced candidates for senior positions and inadequate career ladder opportunities. On the other hand, ambitious teachers are not satisfied with their income potential if they remain teachers. The logical step within the Jewish education enterprise is to aspire to an administrative post even if they lack the necessary qualifications.

4. Neither teachers nor principals enjoy the kind of social status or communal recognition they deserve. This generally results in low self-image and low self-esteem.

5. Jewish school teachers work under great stress. The sources of the stress are essentially the principal, parent and school board member. In the supplementary school it is the rabbi as well.

6. Turnover is very high. The recent Cleveland study found a 20 percent turnover annually in Jewish schools.[10] In Greater New York 62 percent of Jewish supplementary school teachers have been in their respective schools two years or less and 83 percent four years or less.[11]

7. Jewish education does not attract new young talented persons. However, interestingly, some young committed Jews do choose to become Jewish school teachers. Witness the young people at the conferences of the Coalition for the Advancement of Jewish Education.

8. There are some good and some excellent teachers and some good and effective principals in both the day schools and supplementary schools. I have an ambivalent feeling when generalizing about teachers and principals in Jewish schools because of this minority population. I must admit that when I attend teachers' and principals' meetings and conferences, I often get a good feeling. Many of the participants are truly committed and dedicated. Many are enthusiastic about their work. But, in reality, the vast majority of teachers and principals need significant improvement and upgrading.

The challenges here are: How do we upgrade current Jewish school personnel as quickly and effectively as possible? How do we attract new, vital talent into our field?

THE RESPONSES

Looking at the development and progress of the medical profession since the Flexner Report in 1904, the advantages of professionalization stare at us boldly. The question is: Can Jewish education ever become so professionalized? Should it make attempts at such professionalization?

On the other hand, perhaps laissez faire is the best approach in the voluntary setting in which Jewish education operates. Perchance, we have the best situation that can obtain. Some Jewish educators will pull themselves up by the bootstraps without imposition of professional criteria upon our vocation. The vast majority of Jewish educators will never be fully professionalized, particularly since Jewish education will remain a part-time profession for most Jewish school personnel.

If we feel, however, that Jewish education must be professionalized, what course of action should we take?

The following is a set of potential responses by the bureaus to this challenge. The responses are presented as opportunities and possible strategies leading to professionalization.

1. Advocacy

The first response mode is making active advocacy a central agency priority on both lay and professional levels, a) to improve the image of Jewish educators, b) to increase significantly their earning capacity, and c) to improve their working conditions. Basic to this priority program is an understanding of the cultural and social contexts within which schools function. A fundamental contradiction inheres in the American societal context. On the one hand, the American people place a high value on education. They feel strongly about the need for an educated citizenry; they appreciate the importance of education as a factor for national strength. On the other hand, Americans consider teaching, in the words of a former U.S. Commissioner of Education, "a profession entirely appropriate for

10. *The Report of the Joint Federation/Planning Commission on Jewish Conferences*, Cleveland, 1988.
11. A.I. Schiff, et al., *Jewish Supplementary Schooling*.

persons of second and third rate ability, and therefore have all too commonly proceeded to provide them with second or third rate educations and pay them third or fourth rate salaries."[12]

The perennial question of teacher compensation is more than a dollars and cents issues. According to the New York State Association of Independent Schools it is "not fundamentally managerial or economic or political." This prestigious organization of elite private schools where teacher salaries, like those in other school systems, is low claim that teachers' compensation is basically a moral issue. "When heads and trustees finally decide on next year's teacher salaries let them ask themselves without obfuscation and without rationalization: Are we doing the *best* we can?"[13]

The question Jewish communal leaders should ask is "Are we doing the *best* we must do in order to insure quality Jewish education and Jewish continuity?"

The advocacy mode on the local and national levels suggests a) launching think tanks comprised of top community lay leaders; b) utilizing top public relations firms to develop specialized communications techniques; c) organizing communal task forces; and d) sponsoring Town Hall type meetings.

The targets of the advocacy program are synagogue and day school lay leaders, rabbis and Federation lay and professional leadership. Jewish school personnel and potential Jewish educators — high school and college students — should also be targets of the advocacy program. In the 1966 study of 1800 students in the Hebrew teachers colleges only 15 percent finally chose to enter Jewish education. For the vast majority of potential Jewish educators, Jewish education lacks adequate salary inducements, sufficient communal recognition and satisfactory working conditions.[14]

The study findings demonstrate that four conditions are necessary to convince Jewish youth with intensive Judaic backgrounds to make Jewish school career choices:

(a) a competitive salary structure, including competitive entry level salaries, good fringe benefits and long term annual salary increments;
(b) social status at least equal to that of rabbis and top Jewish communal professionals;
(c) good working conditions and potential for job satisfaction; and
(d) professional growth opportunities.

A recent study of young professionals in Jewish communal service concludes that these are the very same characteristics that will attract and keep young Jewish professionals in Jewish communal service.[15]

In this regard, the efforts of the Conference of Jewish Educator Organizations during the last two years are noteworthy. The "Year of the Jewish Educator" plan should be wholeheartedly supported by bureau directors and their staffs. Unfortunately, this is not the case.

In addition to the above goals for the advocacy program, one other purpose is self-evident: making Jewish education a full-time career for a significantly larger number of educators. This requires providing full-time career opportunities to many supplementary school personnel by expanding the job description of an increasing number of Jewish school teachers and principals to include Jewish education activities and curriculum development. This is one of the recommendations of the Greater New York study of Jewish Supplementary Schools.[16]

It is obvious that even after significant efforts are made to provide full-time career opportunities to increasingly larger number of Jewish school personnel, for the foreseeable future, most teachers in Jewish supplementary schools will be part-time and avocational personnel. Special attention must be given to the needs of these educators, particularly since so many of them have such minimal Judaic backgrounds. How the bureau can effectuate the

12. Sterling McMurrin, "Introduction," in James D. Koerner, *The Miseducation of American Teachers*, Boston, Houghton, Mifflin, 1963, p. x.
13. Frederick C. Calder, *Bulletin No. 134*, The New York State Association of Independent Schools, December 1988.
14. A.I. Schiff, "Career Choice and the Students of the Hebrew Colleges."
15. Bernard Reisman, personal communication, October 31, 1988.
16. A.I. Schiff, et al., *Jewish Supplementary Schooling*.

necessary upgrading of their basic Judaic knowledge is a question that may be beyond the challenge of professionalization. Nevertheless, it requires an immediate response.

2. *Innovative Recruitment Programs*

Closely associated with advocacy plans are active efforts to recruit new talent.

This means developing creative strategies for reaching high school and college students, utilizing young, effective teachers and administrators to communicate the positive message of a Jewish education career and the potential the future holds for Jewish educators.

This challenge is underscored by the nature of the recent award winners of the Wexner Foundation Graduate Fellowship Program. Forty-nine percent of all applicants and 71 percent of the award recipients were candidates for rabbinical schools. Of the 14 fellowships, 10 were awarded to rabbinical aspirants and two each to aspiring Jewish communal workers and educators.[17]

3. *Pre-Service, Early Service and In-Service Training*

Needed are pre-service programs for potential educators and early in-service education for newly appointed teachers requiring additional preparation in content and methodology to guarantee their effectiveness and success in teaching.

Several creative programs sponsored by the BJE of Greater New York Early Childhood Education Center might well inform the rest of the Jewish education enterprise. About a decade ago, realizing the ongoing need for early childhood teachers with both Judaic and general education backgrounds, the Early Childhood Education Center of BJE established a teachers' training program at Stern College, Yeshiva University. Currently, in the 1988-89 School Year, 27 teachers are enrolled in this program. BJE staff give some of the course offerings, make all the student-teaching placements and supervise the student teachers. As incentives, BJE arranges for stipends paid by the host school, where appropriate, especially to those student teachers who work as assistants. As an added incentive, the Jewish Early Childhood Association (the organization of Jewish early childhood educators) provides grants to assistant teachers and head teachers — who do not have sufficient background to be certified — to encourage them to return to college and begin or continue their studies toward certification. As far as in-service education is concerned, the Center offers basic skills courses to teachers in need. The Directors' Support Network sponsored by the Center enables new directors to acquire or reinforce supervisory and administrative skills.

The two-year old Holmes group of 100 universities working in five regional groupings may be an instructive model for central agencies. Noting the serious problems in teacher preparation and teacher readiness in general education, the Holmes group is "looking for a new vision of teaching" and "is seeking a new alliance to make that vision come true." A crucial element of the Holmes group effort is "schooling at the grass roots" with genuine school–university collaboration.

To achieve this purpose, a number of universities in the Holmes group are forming partnerships with public school systems to create "professional development centers" that function like teaching hospitals.[18] In effect, this is a unique way of uniting theory and practice in education.

In Jewish education, lacking strong university teacher education settings, we might ask: Is creating such centers a desirable or realistic goal? If it is, how should we go about achieving it? The New York Supplementary Education Action Plan proposal for a BJE Teacher Center Institute in cooperation with local universities and the three New York based rabbinical seminary educator training programs might serve as the model for Jewish education.[19]

17. Bernard Reisman, lecture to National Jewish Executives Group, at UJA-Federation, New York, November 3, 1988.

18. Judith E. Lanier and Joseph Featherstone, "A New Commitment to Teacher Education," *Education Leadership*, 46:3, November 1988, p. 19-22.

19. *Supplementary Education Action Plan*, Board of Jewish Education of Greater New York, September 1987.

Another strategy that might be emulated by bureaus is New York BJE's Interschool Visitation Program (IVN) for Day School teachers, sponsored with the Yeshiva Elementary and High School Principals Councils.

IVN's program objectives are:

(a) To reduce the burnout rate among novice teachers in day schools;
(b) to designate veteran "master" teachers as mentors to new teachers and to create a rubric wherein they can share their knowledge and experience with others; and
(c) to raise the level of knowledge and skill among novice teachers, specifically in the areas of teaching methodology.

IVN's Major Program Activities include:

(a) annual identification of about 50 new teachers and 15 veteran "master" teachers;
(b) five full-day programs of school visits, consisting of model lessons in the classroom by master teachers, followed by post-lesson analysis and discussion;
(c) a series of ten evening seminars and hands-on workshops on teaching methodology in Bible, Prophets and Hebrew language; and
(d) a full day's visit to BJE's Teacher's Center, including a hands-on workshop on curriculum materials development.

Incentives are provided to new teachers and master teachers participating in the program. Veteran teachers are compensated for their efforts and novice teachers given stipends for the purchase of books, materials and for transportation costs.

Since its inception in 1980-81, the program has served 200 new teachers and cultivated 26 master teachers. According to teacher-participants and their principals, IVN has generated a renewed sense of excitement, professionalism and challenge about the teaching of Judaic Studies. The most eloquent testimony to IVN's success is the fact that of all participants since 1980, only one has left the field of Jewish education.

Already, some of the program's graduates have assumed leadership positions. One master teacher is now principal and two others are assistant principals of major day schools. Others are the "star" teachers in their respective schools and motivate their peers to attend continuing education programs.

Another approach to pre-service and early in-service training in Jewish schools might be patterned after the Alternative Teacher Certification Programs of the State of California. Originated as the Teacher Trainee Program and renamed the District Intern Program, it embraces four basic elements of training for novice teachers:

(a) Teaching and learning processes: (classroom management and student diagnosis);
(b) Curriculum development and instructional techniques;
(c) Planning the classroom environment; and
(d) Working with parents[20]

The California program features the pairing of mentors with novice teachers over a one to two year period. This strategy has proven to be very effective in early childhood programs in New York. During the past five years, New York BJE's Early Childhood Center has been operating a "one-on-one" program in which selected experienced teachers meet individually on a regular basis with new instructors, exchange classroom visitations and meet as a group to share ideas and experiences. The one-on-one program, under the guidance of a BJE early childhood specialist, has had a salutary effect upon both the novice teachers and the mentors, the latter group being groomed for directorship postiions.

Developing in-service strategies for principals also requires the immediate attention of bureau directors. In this regard, the Principals' Center concept innovated at Harvard University's School of Education in 1980 might serve as a model for Jewish schools as it has in general education.

The value of this concept is confirmed by our experience in New York. Our Principals' Center, developed with Harvard University, is a self-motivated, self-directed program of professional growth by and for principals of Jewish schools. Over the years, it has develop-

20. Michael D. McKibbin, "Alternative Teacher Certification Programs," *Education Leadership*, 46:3, November 1988, p. 32-35.

ed programmatically in two directions — as a resource center for a variety of support services and as an information center. The year-round regional sharing programs include in-depth exploration of relevant topics. The highlight of the Principals' Center activity is the annual university-based two-and-a-half-day conference at end of the school year utilizing university faculty. To date the conferences have been held twice with Harvard and once each at University of Pennsylvania and Columbia.

3. Autonomous Performance and Teacher Empowerment

Providing opportunities for teacher autonomy and the enabling of teacher empowerment will give a new face to the teaching experience in Jewish schools. With the exception of Detroit, teachers' unions present no problem in effectuating new status for teachers in Jewish schools.

Autonomous performance is a hallmark of the professions in the American free enterprise system. Medicine, law, accounting, engineering thrive on it. Similarly, industry and corporate life encourage it. Professional empowerment goes hand in hand with autonomous performance.

In facilitating both of these aspects of professionalism for teachers, new roles for principals might also be developed. Principals can serve as facilitators and real change agents by providing opportunities for teachers to observe each other, work in teams, make choices, plan their own work and help beginning teachers adjust to their teaching loads.

Moreover, teachers can become involved in selecting teachers and administrators in their schools and invited to participate in such crucial matters as teacher evaluation, staff development, school budgets and student promotion, procedures. Also, teachers can have a voice in what they are expected to teach and can regularly participate in textbook and curriculum decisions. Providing teachers with significant roles in shaping school policies would be the best expression of empowerment.

Teacher autonomy and empowerment are based on the assumption that teachers are professionals who are accountable for what goes on in their classrooms. Working on this assumption, the Rochester (New York) School District is creating a revolution in teacher professionalism in the public sector. It substantially raises salaries, guaranteeing that by 1990, teachers will earn an average of $45,000. Lead teachers will be able to earn up to $70,000 by that time.

In the new Rochester contract with teachers, traditional guarantees associated with seniority and tenure are eliminated. Instead there is a career ladder that bases advancement on performance rather than years of service and education credits. The accountability agreement requires teachers to put in five additional days for in-service training. Lead teachers must work as mentors with beginning teachers and those who need improvement. Part of the contract is a home-base guidance system.

The Rochester experiment can well serve as a model to bureaus for what might be accomplished in Jewish education.

4. Strategies for Teacher and Principal Evaluation

A recent survey of 42 public school systems in Penssylvania found that the vast majority of teachers earned top ratings in the teacher evaluations concluded in these districts. "Was this the birth of a new (and long awaited) excellence in teaching or were there other ways of interpreting the data?" was the question asked by the surveyors.[21]

Their conclusion was that the teacher ratings are the sign of a problem, not a solution. Moreover, the surveyors felt that "school executives don't know how to evaluate" and that "supervision and evaluation have become empty, time-stealing rituals."[22]

Jewish education doesn't have the problem of a poor rating system. We simply don't rate teachers. But we do have a problem of teacher evaluation. Our challenge is to help principals learn to be real supervisors and teacher evaluators.

---

21. Donald E. Langlois and Mary Rita Colarusso, "Improving Teacher Evaluation," *Executive Educator*, May 1988, p. 32, 33.
22. *Ibid.*

The Pennsylvania surveyors recommended three strategies to improve teacher evaluation:

(a) Institute a team approach to evaluation.
(b) Put teacher supervision and evaluation at the top of the principals many tasks.
(c) Free up time for evaluation by cutting down on other administrative activities.[23]

Given the value of these recommendations, we might ask the same question posed by the surveyors for general education. "Even if the principal gets the time to do real evaluation, does he have the know-how?"

This, then, forms the substance of another critical challenge — principal evaluation. It is especially significant in a voluntary system like Jewish education where school-based management is a general practice. Developing methods of assessing the effectiveness of principals without compromising their supervisory roles is a matter of extreme importance. Given the small size of Jewish schools and the overall administrative responsibilities of the principals, their position and potential as change agents are critical to the well-being and effective operation of their respective institutions. One of the ways to make principal evaluation a nonthreatening procedure is to help principals become involved in self-evaluation.

In developing methods for initiating educator evaluation, the possibility of peer evaluation strategies should be explored thoroughly.

5. Professional Growth Opportunities

Two approaches may be used in responding to the need to provide professional growth opportunities for teachers. The first is developing an instructional ranking model à la university teaching, as this writer has recommended on numerous occasions: teacher, senior teacher, master teacher and distinguished teacher; or associate teacher, staff teacher, senior teacher or master teacher.[24]

Teacher ranking might use the medical profession's terminology as did the city of Rochester, New York: intern teacher, resident teacher, professional teacher and lead teacher — the latter term taking a leaf from the Carnegie Report on teaching.[25]

Creating the category of lead teachers is an excellent way of rewarding outstanding service and competence. Given their pedagogic experience and effectiveness, lead teachers can provide educational leadership in a variety of ways including teacher training, curriculum development and teacher evaluation.

Another approach to providing teacher growth opportunities has been recommended by Lee Shulman who notes that the teachers he respects most are uncomfortable with the ladder idea. "They want opportunities to differentiate their functions during the course of the careers, but not necessarily in a one way fashion. We probably need a new metaphor: a ladder may be misleading because ladders go up, suggesting something else is down. We need a model like the one in medicine, where getting better and more respected as a physician does not mean that you've stopped caring for patients. The chief of medicine at a good hospital takes on leadership responsibilities, but continues to be fully involved in practice."[26]

Using the lead teacher idea as a lateral concept with differentiated pay for added pedagogic curriculum and administrative responsibilities is one way of implementing this nonladder approach to growth.

Regarding principals, professional growth — and empowerment — might be achieved via principals' councils established and staffed by the bureau. A cost effective way of involving principals, in their own self-development, the council acts as a support group, a sharing mechanism and a learning environment. Within the council setting, principals can work on common projects, develop self-growth activities in a nonthreatening climate and initiate program proposals for implementation in individual schools

23. *Ibid.*
24. A.I. Schiff, "On the Making of the Jewish Teaching Profession," *Jewish Education*, 53:3, Fall 1985.
25. *A Nation Prepared: Teachers for the 21st Century*, the Report of the Task Force on Teaching as a Profession, Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy, 1986.
26. Ron Brandt, "On Assessment of Teaching: A Conversation with Lee Shulman," *Education Leadership*, 46:3, November 1988, p. 44.

Afterword

If one applies the criteria of a profession to Jewish education, we find, indeed, that it is wanting all the attributes that characterize a true profession.

Given the current level of awareness by Jewish communal leadership of the importance of Jewish education for Jewish continuity and for the enhancement of the quality of Jewish life, there is reason to believe that support will be forthcoming to help professionalize the Jewish education vocation.

The key to upgrading the career of Jewish educators lies, in great measure, in the hands of the respective bureaus of Jewish education. Individually and collectively, it is both a challenge and an opportunity.

ALVIN I. SCHIFF

The Manpower Crisis in Jewish Education:

Real Problems and Realistic Solutions

INTRODUCTION

JEWISH EDUCATION in the United States has undergone many changes since the days of the *siddur peddler* and *heder melamed*. These may be classified under three broad headings: quantitative, institutional and organizational. Some of the changes have been purely *quantitative*. There have been increases in the number of pupils—from 45,000 in 1900 to 550,000 in 1968, and increases in the percentage of Jewish school-age children attending a formal Jewish school during a given year—from about 20% in 1900 to approximately 50% in 1968. The number of schools has also increased dramatically.

Changes in the *nature* of the Jewish educational institution have taken place. The first half of the 20th century has seen the rise and decline of the *heder*, and the almost total disappearance of the private *melamed*. It has witnessed the growth and gradual deterioration of the communal Talmud Torah, the development of the less intensive congregational Hebrew school and the one-day-a-week school and the remarkable growth of the Jewish Day School movement which now claims more than 300 schools and departments and about 65,000 pupils.

Changes in the *organization* of Jewish education have occurred. A variety of ideological and central educational agencies and departments, national commissions of education, and local bureaus of Jewish education made their appearance on the American scene during the last six decades.

The quantitative growth, the institutional developments and organizational changes in Jewish education were not accompanied by substantial increases in the number of competent instructors and supervisors. On the contrary, the ranks of qualified Jewish school personnel have become depleted gradually during the last 25 years. The major source of teachers and administrators for American Jewish schools disappeared with the annihilation

DR. ALVIN SCHIFF is associate professor of education, chairman of the Department of Religious Education, Ferkauf Graduate School of Humanities and Social Sciences, Yeshiva University, and coordinator of Hebrew teacher training programs in the undergraduate schools of the University. This paper was presented at the Fifth National Conference on Jewish Education sponsored by the American Association for Jewish Education, New York Hilton Hotel, March 18, 1966. Statistical data have been updated.

From: Jewish Education quarterly, 38:3, June 1968

of the Central and East European Jewish communities. Neither the American Jewish community nor the State of Israel has been able to keep pace with the growing personnel needs of Jewish education in the United States and Canada.

The shortage of Jewish school personnel has been a leading topic of discussion in Jewish educational circles for more than a decade.

As one educator has noted, "all that can be said on this subject has already been said. It has been wrung dry."[1] Nevertheless, we persist to discuss it in the hope that, in our typical Jewish stubbornness, we will some day discover the *one* drop of *mayim hayim*.

Permit me, therefore, to raise a number of issues in the expectation that they will yield sufficient reaction—either in support of, or in opposition to my views—to embark upon the improvement of a condition we have been bemoaning individually and collectively for so many years. Recently, I addressed a meeting of the Praesidium of the World Council on Jewish Education on the topic of recruitment and teacher education.[2] My remarks today incorporate much of what I said at that world conclave, since they are pertinent to the focus of this workshop.

The forum provided by this conference seems especially conducive to the launching of an all-out thrust towards a solution or to a series of solutions to the problems to which we address ourselves today.

While I am aware that this conference represents a cross-sectional interest in the problems of recruitment and training of teachers, I am not especially conversant with the needs of the Reform schools, particularly of the one-day-a-week schools, and am therefore happy that Rabbi Schindler is a discussant for this session.

At present, the Orthodox and Conservative schools and some of the Reform schools draw upon the same undifferentiated sources for their teaching personnel. This condition is a dimension of the seriousness of the manpower problem. At the height of an era of great ideological divergence and rapid tri-directional growth, the various Jewish movements still depend, for the most part, upon old, slow-moving processes for the production of their educational personnel.

THE RECRUITMENT PROBLEM

To begin with, let us clearly focus on the problems of recruitment. Each of the problems suggests a target for the American Jewish community to reach.

TARGET 1: Collect and Analyze Information About Teacher Personnel.

What are the facts? There is no real objective data. This, in itself, is a problem that deserves attention. A recent educated guess supplied by the American Association for Jewish Education to the Jewish Telegraphic Agency has it that there are 13,000 licensed and unlicensed Jewish teachers in the United States and Canada. Dr. Alexander Dushkin estimates that there are about 19,000 Jewish teaching posts in the United States of which 6,500 are in afternoon schools and 3,000 are in Jewish Day Schools.[3] Last night we heard from one "informed" speaker that there were 17,000 Jewish school personnel in this country. While exact current figures are not available, the percentage of non-licensed teachers is staggering indeed. Licensing per se does not indicate effective performance, as non-licensed status does not preclude quality teaching. Nevertheless, certification is the best means presently at our disposal for measuring, however, roughly, the degree of minimal acceptable performance.

The most recent information indicates that there is a need (due to annual teacher attrition) for approximately 900 teachers each year. During the past decade, the Hebrew teacher colleges have graduated annually between 100 and 150 young people eligible for certification by the National Board of License or by approved local licensing agencies. According to informed sources, between one-third and

one-half of these graduates assume teaching posts in Jewish schools. However, no more than 15%—20% of the graduates become career teachers.

The other sources of recruitment are the *yeshivot gedolot*, the rabbinical seminaries which ordain between 150-200 young rabbis each year, a large percentage of whom go into teaching. Five of the larger seminaries in cooperation with Torah Umesorah, have recently organized teacher training programs for their students. In addition, there are the Beth Jacob teacher seminaries which supply about 50 teachers a year, particularly for the Beth Jacob movement. Finally, there is the Israel teachers' exchange, which in 1964-65, supplied 187 Israeli teachers for American schools. During the current school year 126 Israelis are teaching via the exchange program.

Simple arithmetic shows that, according to the most optimistic estimate, there is an annual deficit of approximately 500 teachers.

These positions are filled by a variety of "recruits", although known to us, might be identified for the purposes of this paper. They are:

a) the American version of the *lo yutzlah;*

b) the enterprising young person with some Judaic knowledge eager to supplement his income;

c) public school teachers with varying degrees of Jewish education;

d) young people with Hebrew background who need part-time jobs while they prepare for more lucrative and more intellectually satisfying experiences;

e) young girls with some Hebraic knowledge biding their time before marriage;

f) young religious men with intensive emotional attachments to Judaism and equally strong traditional Jewish background, who are not professionally trained to do anything else, and to whom teaching is a kind of "path of least vocational resistance", and

g) Israeli immigrants (differentiated from the Israeli exchange teachers) who for the most part, do not meet the religious requirements of the great majority of schools. Many of them lack basic knowledge of Jewish religious life and observances and do not have the necessary pedagogic training for effective teaching in American schools. Generally, they lack sufficient fluency in the English language to meet the needs of schools in which English is the medium of instruction. In addition, they generally do not have serious career commitment to Jewish education. They are either graduate students or businessmen(or spouses of students or businessmen) who plan to leave Jewish education as soon as their educational and/or professional goals are attained.

Direct recruitment from Israel also takes place. A number of large Hebraic day schools, regularly send their principals to Israel to engage teachers for short term periods. This procedure, at most, accounts for 20 teachers a year.

Why is there a shortage of trained teachers? Of all the answers, all too well known to us, two are particularly vexing. First, there is a shortage of inspired young people in the Hebrew high schools, the solitary American source from which the Hebrew teachers colleges recruit their prospective students.

Secondly, there is a shortage of inspired students in the teacher training schools. The drop out rate in Hebrew teacher colleges was reported by the National Committee on Teacher Education and Welfare of the American Association for Jewish Education to be between 30-43% in 1957-58. I would venture to say that this is a rather conservative estimate. Moreover, the fact that to begin with, a large percentage of the students in some of the Hebrew teacher colleges are Israelis underscores the seriousness of the problem.

These reasons for the shortage sharply indicate that *the Jewish community must tap more effectively the existing sources of teacher personnel.*

TARGET 2: Recruit Students in the Hebrew Teachers Colleges for Jewish Education Careers.

What is needed is an intensive, continuous campaign to recruit prospective teachers from the student bodies currently enrolled in the various teacher training schools. We must lay claim to the students in our teachers' institutes. They are a captive audience.

When Rabbi Joseph Baer Soloveichick, the father of Chaim Brisker, was asked by a delegation from Brisk to leave Vilna and become the Rav of the Brisk community, he refused. Soon, another delegation was dispatched to try to convince him. Again he refused. Whereupon, one member of the delegation got up enough courage to say "Rabbi, we cannot bring a 'no' report to the 4,000 Jews in Brisk eagerly awaiting your arrival. You can't say 'no' to 4,000 people". To this plea Rabbi Soleveichick had no *breyrah* but to acquiesce.

It is in this spirit of commitment, brought about by inspired teaching and personal guidance that students must be won over to the teaching field. If we will not be able to win over those already in our schools to careers in Jewish education, whom will we be able to recruit?

TARGET 3: Make Course Work in Hebrew Teachers Colleges More Relevant to Needs of Prospective Teachers.

In this regard, there must be greater realization on the part of the already dedicated faculties in our Hebrew colleges of the specific role of their college in preparing teachers. Helping the teachers to understand their role and to interpret it effectively is a challenge to a combined effort. In every course they must engender the feeling regarding the pragmatic value of the subject, that it is being studied so that the student can eventually utilize this knowledge in his own teaching. Teacher college faculty should become more involved in the pedagogics of instruction. They must kindle the spark of love for Hebrew teaching by serving as models for their students. Intensified efforts should be made to encourage students in the Jewish studies programs (in schools where these exist) to transfer to the teacher training programs.

TARGET 4: Prepare Students in Mesivtot for Careers in Jewish Education.

What is needed also is the recruiting and training of young scholars in the various Mesivtot for teaching careers. It is for this very reason that special Master's degree programs in Jewish pedagogy have been initiated by the Department of Religious Education of the Ferkauf Graduate School of Yeshiva University. These programs, however, serve a small segment of the *Mesivta* population since they are limited to ordained rabbis who have a collegiate undergraduate background. The training of young rabbinical students for educational careers must become a community-wide concern.

TARGET 5: Establish a National Foundation to Provide Scholarships to Prospective Teachers on the Basis of a Student Benefit Theory.

What is needed is the development of a viable program to recruit high school pupils into colleges.

Realism is often harsh, especially to sensitive people. We Jews are a sensitive people and the realities of teacher recruitment are indeed harsh. It is a sad commentary on life that monetary means must be used to entice young people to prepare for a profession that requires much idealism. But, without competitive scholarships the American Jewish community will lose many prospective students for its Hebrew teachers colleges.

What is needed is the establishment of a national foundation to sponsor a large scale scholarship program for future teachers. What is needed is a communal foundation to allocate funds on the basis of

a student-benefit theory. This would have the dual effect of attracting individual students and motivating current schools to recruit new students more actively.

The teacher training schools should not have to go pleading to the existing funds and agencies for scholarship aid. Neither should they have to compete for the same money that is made available for European lands. A case in point is the Memorial Foundation for Jewish Culture with limited funds to serve world Jewry.

TARGET 6: Reclaim the Unqualified Teachers Via an Intensive Crash Program of Re-education.

What is needed, then, is an *American* fund sponsored by *American* Jews to meet *American* Jewish needs.

The teacher-retention power of Jewish schools is sadly wanting. The turnover of young teachers is practically severe. They leave teaching after a few years, often to be replaced by other temporary recruits or by some unqualified or untrained persons, who, for the lack of other professional opportunity, remain Jewish school teachers. With proper training many of this latter group *can* achieve instructional competence.

What is needed is a crash program to reclaim the unqualified. This means, recruiting, as it were, a select number of young teachers—presently unqualified because of inadequate preservice preparation— for intensive reeducating. These people are a captive audience. They are already teaching in our schools. If 100 such teachers were to be retrained during the next two years, that would be considerably more teachers than the number of graduates of Hebrew teacher colleges who enter the ranks of career teachers during a two year period. Following this plan, it is conceivable that 500 teachers could be recruited into the ranks of the qualified from the unqualified during the next ten years. Such a program would demand the cooperation of Hebrew teacher colleges, local bureaus, the National Board of License, communal certifiying agencies and individual schools.

I am not unmindful of the in-service programs sponsored by the Jewish Agency, the local bureaus, Torah Umesorah, Yeshiva University, United Synagogue (particularly in conjunction with the Melton Program), the Union of American Hebrew Congregations, and the college-conducted in-service courses in a number of cities, principally New Haven, Springfield, Mass., Providence, Washington, and Milwaukee. These are already *in-service* courses. They are significant developments and should be continued and improved upon. However, these will not give the necessary relief. What is needed is an *all-out massive campaign* to *retrain* large groups of teachers. The incentives for this retraining must be provided by the respective schools in collaboration with the local bureaus and supported by a special fund set up for this purpose. This teacher reclamation fund might be known by a prestigious name to lend weight to the project. It is not a new idea. But, I would be remiss if I were not to mention its *sine qua non* importance. Who knows? The sheer incidence of repetition may one day yield an appropriate response.

TARGET 7: Refocus Israel Teacher Exchange Program to Meet Needs of American Jewish Community.

More effective tapping of existing sources means also the better utilization of the Israeli teacher-exchange program. However competent Israeli teachers may have been in Israel, they pose a serious problem vis-a-vis meeting the needs of Jewish education in the United States and Canada. They frequently lack the appropriate linguistic, social and religious orientation for effective performance in the variety of American Jewish schools. What is needed in the case of the exchange teachers is vital meaningful recruitment based on two criteria: selectivity and orientation. Prospective Israeli personnel

must be carefully screened in Israel, even at the possible expense of a reduction of the number of recruits. Our major interest is in choosing the appropriate applicants. The selection of teachers must be done via an ongoing year-round recruitment process which might involve face-to-face interviews, on-location appraisal of teaching performance, and receipt of appropriate recommendations.

Once chosen, the Israeli teachers should be properly oriented for the kind of work for which they are being recruited. A team consisting of former teachers in the exchange program and American educators should be co-opted to develop and supervise such a program. The exchange program should be reviewed also for the purpose of establishing limits for length of service.

TARGET 8: Send Qualified American Teachers to Israel for a One Year Exchange Visit.

Concerning the Israel teacher-exchange idea, I wish to underscore the need of an activity for which I have been campaigning vigorously for the last 5 years. The real meaning of *exchange* must be introduced to Jewish education. The Israel exchange program must become a regular —albeit limited—two way street.

Principals should be encouraged to send qualified teachers to Israel for short-term (one year) exchange visits. This can best be implemented on a national scale via the existing exchange program. In addition to the obvious benefits to the individual teacher and school, such an arrangement would create a vital bridge between the American Jewish community and Israel.

The tapping of existing sources must be accompanied by other long-awaited measures.

TARGET 9: Establish a Vital, Central Placement Service.

What is needed is an intensive, ongoing vital central placement service. This means the setting up of a central registry, the pooling of information about available positions and personnel by each of the national and local agencies. It is a difficult task involving reappraisal and fundamental readjustment of their go-it-alone policies and practices.

TARGET 10: Establish a National Fund Based on a Teacher Benefit Theory for the Enhancement of Teacher Status.

What is needed are drastic, shocking changes in the attractiveness of the Hebrew teaching profession—a long range national program for the enhancing of teacher status and for the raising and equalizing of teacher salaries both within the Jewish teaching profession and in relation to prevailing standards of public education. This may sound like a pie in the sky. It will take millions of dollars to implement it. This program begs to be initiated. And it must be developed on the basis of a teacher-benefit theory. If it cannot be done with all teachers, it should be achieved with a significant segment of the teaching force. Whatever may be said regarding the impracticability of such a recommendation must be weighed in light of the fact, that for years all the *practical* approaches have been to little avail.

When the status and financial position of the Jewish educational functionary becomes at least equal to that of the Rabbi, then can we hope to attract the serious, superior prospective educator so vitally needed to assume leadership roles in Jewish education in the years to come. Steps in this direction have already been taken by the American Association for Jewish Education via the National Committee on Teacher Education and Welfare. The Committee has published and distributed a series of important promotional materials, chief among them was the appearance for several years of the semi-annual newsletter *Our Teachers*. It instituted a national pension plan. It organized a recruitment program. It adopted a guide to a code of practices and established Yom Hamoreh. Steps were taken to resolve

the problem. But, in face of its size and severity, these were baby steps. According to the American Association for Jewish Education orientation memorandum for this conference, "The dimensions of this crisis (the teacher shortage), which grew larger with each passing year, mitigated against the Committee's successful effort."

What is needed, *rabbotai,* are giant steps: giant steps to initiate a national and comprehensive insurance and pension system for licensed teachers and principals; giant steps to insure a minimal wage; giant steps to refine, implement and strengthen the national code of practice; giant steps to provide fulltime employment opportunities in Jewish education. (In regard to the latter need we must explore the possibility of cooperation with Jewish communal centers and YMHA's.)

The giant steps must be giant. They must be national in scope and non-ideological in structure and intent. To this end, the current plans of National Council for Jewish Education, National Association of Temple Educators, Educators Assembly, the fledgling *Hemed* (*Hever Morim Datti-Im*), and the bureaus should be studied to determine possibilities of conversion to, or conjunctive arrangements with a national program.

While it is improbable and unrealistic and not desirable from my personal point of view to try to overcome ideological differentiation via common school programs, it is not unrealistic, nor should it be impossible to express one phase of the "unity in diversity" thesis via uniform and/or cooperative personnel practices. It is in this area that the American Association for Jewish Education, in its efforts to reorganize, can make a vital contribution to the improvement of Jewish education.

American Jewish life, like all life, is era-oriented. American Jewry has been through many periods of change in a relatively short time. It has been witness to the eras of early settlement, social integration, mass immigration, Americanization, economic growth, demographic mobility and internal diversity. Currently we are at the peak of the era of great diversity. The next era must be one of consolidation. New ideas, new aproaches, new organizational patterns must be directed towards increasing the probability and reality of joint-communal effort. Jewish education is one area where consolidation might begin to take place.

American Jewry has shown the capacity, ability and resiliency necessary for cooperative ventures. I refer to the heightened Zionist efforts on behalf of Israel. Although cooperation in the instance of Israel was peripheral philanthropic and temporal, the American Jewish community rose to the challenge. It is not too early to demonstrate this same ability again. And a new program or new guidelines such as we may initiate during our deliberations can well serve our cause. One way to cut across ideological boundaries is to finance the recruitment of teachers and the improvement of their status on an individual basis (student benefit or teacher benefit) rather than via group or institutional arrangement. This is definitely feasible. The machinery to deal with 1500 students and aproximately 8,000 teachers (excluding one-day-a-week instructors) need not be overly cumbersome. It is easily managed in public education and properly organized can be a source of infinite blessing to Jewish education.

TEACHER EDUCATION*

Teacher-Education in the 1960's

Permit me now to turn your attention to teacher education. In the history of American teacher education, the 1960's will be recorded as the decade of intensified examination, experimentation and criticism. During the past six years there have been a plethora of major conferences on teacher education. Many important

* For amplification of some aspects of this part of paper, see this writer's article, "New Concepts in Teacher Education," *Jewish Education,* 38:1, January, 1968.

books and articles have been written on the subject. The 1960's are witnessing heightened teacher education activity on the part of such prestigious groups as the National Commission on Teacher Education and Professional Standards of the National Education Association, the Fund for the Advancement of Education, the Ford Foundation and American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education. Books like James B. Conant's *The Education of the American Teacher* and James B. Koerner's *The Miseducation of American Teachers* have become household topics of conversation.

Currently, teachers and teacher educators are exposed to public scrutiny more than ever before in the United States.[4] This creates a problem in Jewish education as it does in general education. The problem, put simply, is that "unlike any other professional group, we educators deal with substance that is not only critical to the public at large, but is also perceived by many as part of the public competence rather than as specialized expertise."[5]

The topic of teacher education assumes particular importance against the background of social changes relevant to teacher education, the outstanding of which is the accelerated democratization of higher education. The dramatic initiation of massive government programs—the Economic Opportunity Program, the expanded National Defense Education Act, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, the Higher Education Facilities Act, the Higher Education Act of 1965, all have direct implications for Jewish teacher education.

New institutions have sprung up to meet new social demands, such as the Job Corps program, Project Headstart and community action programs.

This too has bearing on our Jewish teacher education problem. Whereas there is increased ferment, heightened activity, and massive funding in general education, no such parallel can be drawn for educating the "Jewishly disadvantaged", for founding research projects in Jewish schools of higher learning, for Jewish teacher scholarship incentive programs, for experimentation in Jewish pedagogy.

It is interesting to note that all of the new government programs for education avoid entering into formal relationships with existing schools and teacher-education programs because they view "the establishment" as resistive to change and unable to respond quickly to the new requirements of the present situation.[6]

Jewish teacher education establishments must respond to new needs. They must readjust to the new requirements of the present American Jewish community. Like the problems of recruitment, these needs also suggest targets for the Jewish community to achieve,

TARGET 11: Study the Current Teacher Programs in Light of American Jewish Needs.

Currently, there is painfully little research about Jewish teacher education. What is needed is basic investigation into the various phases of teacher preparation.

TARGET 12: Develop an Operational Definition for Desirable Professional Behavior.

In examining Jewish teacher education, one is struck by the fact that we are not certain that we have been preparing the kind of teachers that are required to meet our current needs. Moreover, there is uncertainty and lack of agreement with respect to what knowledge is most pertinent to the professional education of teachers. In this, we are not alone. Presently, this subject is a burning question in general education.[7] What is needed in Jewish education is an operational definition of desirable professional behavior program. This inyolves the developing of a model or a number of models of appropriate teacher performance.

The suggestion to establish a new conceptual framework for the professional training of Hebrew teachers is not new. The National Committee for Teacher Education and Welfare in 1958 called for

"total reorientation on the part of our teacher training schools".[8] It strongly recommended "that a conference of deans, registrars and other administrative heads of the various teacher colleges be convened for the purpose of discussing such recommendations."[9] A number of such meetings did take place. But the effort died or was killed because of the unreadiness of the American Jewish community to finance the implementation of the recommendations. *Ve-hamayvin yavin.*

Any recommendations of this paper will also remain academic unless firm measures are taken to implement them. The specific restructuring of programs would involve relatively small expenditures. It would call on the special talents of teacher-educators, behavioral scientists and subject matter specialists rather than administrators.

The Hebrew teachers college must become a professional school. It must become professionally oriented without sacrificing the scholarly approach.

The programs must provide the unique bodies of knowledge and the unique skills required by the prospective Hebrew teacher that is not needed by the typical graduate not planning to make Jewish education a career.

TARGET 13: Develop a Conceptual Framework for Teacher Preparation.

The programs must be geared to the increasing challenges of all day Jewish education. They must be geared to the expanding concept of the role of the Jewish teacher in supplementary Jewish education. This has been indicated on numerous occasions during the past two decades but has yet to be implemented effectively.

In 1958, the subcommittee on Teacher's Professional Training of the National Committee on Teacher Education and Welfare recommended the training of *teacher-education workers or multi-skilled education workers.* The Committee noted that it was aware of the criticism of this approach and stated, nevertheless, "that equipping a substantial segment of the teaching profession with at least one allied skill not only constitutes a partial answer to the problem of creating full-time economic opportunities—a condition which is indispensable to the professionalization of Jewish teaching—but is a genuine response to a truly felt need in our day."[10]

Such skills include group work, adult education, recreational and cultural programming. Last week I participated in a 3-day conference of executives of Jewish communitiy centers and YMHA's (convened by the Jewish orientation and Training Seminars which is sponsored jointly by the Jewish Education Committee of New York and the New York metropolitan section of the National Jewish Welfare Board) on the topic "Jewish Content in Youth Activities." In my presentation I challenged the executive director to engage Jewish educational personnel on their staffs. From indications of their favorable response it seems that the Center movement is prepared to consider seriously the employment of "Jewish value specialists". This area of activity must be explored fully by the Jewish education community.

TARGET 14: Prepare Teacher-Scholars.

One of the serious shortcomings of the teacher colleges is that they do not produce teacher-scholars. For this informed audience there is no need to make any lengthy analyses of this situation. One example will suffice.

The 1958 study made by the National Committee on Teacher Education and Welfare indicates that Hebrew College graduates are rarely engaged to teach classes beyond the 4th grade in a yeshivah. It is the exceptional graduate who is equipped knowledge-wise to teach in the upper elementary grades and in the junior and senior high school levels of the Jewish day school. My own experience between 1956 and 1965 with teacher placement in the day schools of greater New York

via the Department of Yeshivoth of the Jewish Education Committee, adequately bears this out. On the other hand, the *musmachim* of the various mesivtot who are employed to teach the upper grades are not adequately prepared—neither Hebraically nor pedagogically. If the day schools are important to American Jewry in terms of reversing a downward trend in Jewish education, if they are significant as the single elementary educational institution (or almost the only elementary school-type) to provide intensive Jewish education, if the Jewish day schools represent American Jewry's answer to the training of future Jewish leaders, if they are a factor in our creative survival—then preparing teachers for this type of school must be a primary concern of teacher education.

The dual function of teacher-scholar has been suggested as the necessary minimum for effective general education. Should it be less for Jewish education?

NEW TEACHING TECHNOLOGY

TARGET 15: Introduce New Teaching Media into Hebrew Teacher Programs.

The past decade has been witness to rapidly changing educational technology. This is generally not reflected in Hebrew teacher education programs. What is needed is the development of new media for making the preparation of teachers more effective. The adaptation of new educational devices to the needs of Hebrew teacher training appears to be a necessary step at this time. Programmed instruction, kinescope recordings by remote control of student teachers as developed recently by Hunter College in New York City, the wise use of films and recordings, the introduction of one-way mirror demonstration centers as now planned by the Ferkauf Graduate School of Yeshiva University—all of these media and many more—must be studied and adapted to the specific needs of Hebrew teacher education.

STUDENT-CENTERED APPROACH

TARGET 16: Establish Effective Guidance Programs in the Hebrew Teachers College.

Unlike the general college of education, our Jewish training schools, with one exception[11], are small institutions and do not share in the general trend of developing into large institutions. One of the serious criticisms leveled against the American teacher colleges is the depersonalization caused by their increasing size. While it does not augur well for the much needed mass output of teachers, the smallness of our schools has a definite plus value. Small student bodies are conducive to intensive guidance, to a one-to-one faculty-student relationship. It is this student centered-guidance approach, more than any other factor that is responsible for the large number—80%—of all graduates of Yeshiva University's Teachers Institute for Women between 1956-1968—who are currently teaching.

To be successful, guidance—in which all faculty members according to their ability are assigned a number of students whom they get to know on a very personal level—must be initiated during the students' first year in school. Beginning as academic counselling this procedure progressively involves the social emotional and cultural-religious facets of the students' lives. In its final form the guidance is vocation-centered and continues even during the first few years of their employment.

At the core of the guidance program is the principle that basic responsibility for learning rests with each student. One aim of the student-centered approach is to help the student learn how to learn, and develop a thirst for further learning.

TARGET 17: Explore Possibility of Individualizing Programs of Teacher Preparation

Another personal dimension in teacher education must be considered. That dimension, which is receiving serious atten-

tion in general education. is building curriculum in terms of "each prospective teacher-scholar's unique conceptual scheme."[12] In light of this principle, it is recommended that "when we plan our programs we cannot operate under the illusion that we create a single curriculum best suited to all students. Instead, we must plan teacher education in such a way that we systematically provide opportunities to know what differences exist within each of our students and develop flexible programs which offer a wide variety of approaches for reaching the professional goals of teacher-scholar."[13] The immediate reaction of Jewish teacher-educators might be to dismiss this suggestion as irrelevant, for no other reason than the basic physical limitations of our programs. Before that is done I would urge careful study of the implications of such a statement for Jewish teacher training.

Underlying the success of a viable guidance program—and here lies the difficulty—there needs to be the promise of long-range support—intellectual, emotional and financial.

DIRECT EXPERIENCE

"Only student-teaching should serve as a stipulated certification requirement for future teachers in each state".[14] This was James B. Conant's sole positive finding concerning licensing requisites when he lashed out against current certification requirements in the respective states of the Union.

TARGET 18: Develop Meaningful Student Teaching Programs.

One may draw a parallel need in Jewish education regarding the reappraisal of the certification requirements for Hebrew teachers' licenses, but this is not within the scope of this paper. What definitely is our concern, however, is the importance of direct experience in teacher education. Without the variety of direct experiences —pre-teaching, student-teaching, internship, supervised teaching during the first years of professional employment—we cannot hope to prepare teachers who can adequately meet the challenges of the Jewish school.

The laboratory-type experience which has no substitute and must be cooperatively planned by supervisor, host school and cooperating teacher, depends largely on student feedback for its effectiveness. Receiving the feedback, analyzing it, reacting to it are time consuming matters. For this alone it pays to extend Hebrew teacher preparation to a five year program. Gaining competence with the basic tools necessary for teaching, practicing fundamental skills, analyzing teaching situations, apprenticeship in the sense of "trying one's wings", should all be accomplished during the student's residence in the teacher college and not after he graduates from it. *V'dai Lahakima.*

The direct experience component of the professional preparation of teachers can best be controlled and supervised via demonstration schools in which the education faculties of the respective teacher colleges have policy-making and decision-taking roles. Sufficiently large demonstration schools have other significant values for Jewish education, a discussion of which is not within the scope of this paper.

TEACHER EDUCATION ECONOMICS

TARGET 19: Improve Status of Faculties of Hebrew Teachers Colleges in Order to Attract Superior Teachers.

Since I have used general education for the framework of my few remarks I cannot but enter a plea for a good infusion of the American college into the Hebrew teacher training school with respect to faculty status. What our training schools need to attract outstanding people are fewer hours of teaching, more time for individual guidance and research and better pay and welfare benefits. What they need is the establishment of appropriate requirements for new and old faculty. What our training schools need is the establishment of full-time professorships

in education manned by scholar teacher-educators. Since this breed of person is almost non-existent, the implications for preparing or encouraging the training of these kinds of people are clear.

Much has been said and written about scholarship and stipend programs to attract students to. our teachers colleges. Nevertheless, I would feel remiss if I did not state emphatically that the value of full-scale financial support for teacher education students must not be underestimated. It is an absolute necessity in an educational-funding oriented age.

THE ROLE OF THE TEACHER TRAINING SCHOOL

TARGET 20: Expand the Role of the Hebrew Teachers College.

If the Hebrew Teachers Colleges are to assume a new leadership role in the Jewish educational community—and they must assume leadership responsibility for the theory and practice of Jewish education—then they must be equipped to do so. The first step in this direction is the establishment of full-scale Departments of Education manned by full-time educational professionals in each of our teacher training establishments. In cities which have such schools, in-service programs should be their responsibility and under their sponsorship with the assistance and support of the bureaus. A metropolis like New York is beset by special problems regarding in-service offerings. These can be best resolved by close working relationship with the teachers colleges in the area, provided they have the necessary manpower to make a significant contribution in the direction of meeting in-service and retraining needs of teacher personnel.

CHARGE TO THE AMERICAN JEWISH COMMUNITY

All this adds up to a significant challenge to the American Jewish community. If we have the courage to act, to stir, to create, to dramatically stimulate massive movement to improve teacher recruitment and teacher education, then, in the years to come this meeting and others like it will go down as the most crucial conferences in American Jewish history. We must be ready as a community to emulate the tremendous financial support that the American government is giving secular educational institutions, even if it means changing the entire concept of the organization of Jewish charity, and changing the operation of the federation and welfare funds. You and I know that this may no longer be a dream. Jewish and non-Jewish experts alike, have made strong recommendations in this regard. The solutions to the Jewish educational personnel dilemma must come from the community. They cannot be forthcoming from the Hebrew teachers colleges or from the Jewish education profession.

REFERENCES

(1) Joseph Lookstein, "The Jewish Teacher." Paper read at Department of Religious Education, Ferkauf Graduate School, May 4, 1964.
(2) Alvin I. Schiff, "Some Modest Proposals for the Improvement of the Pre-Service Education and Recruitment," World Council for Jewish Education, December 12, 1965.
(3) "Supply and Training of Teachers for the Jewish Schools in the Diaspora," *Jewish Education*, Fall 1964, p. 24.
(4) Margaret Lindsay, *The Substance of Professional Study for Teachers.* Proceedings of conference honoring Florence B. Stratemeyer, French Lick, Indiana, June 10-12, 1965.
(5) *Ibid.*
(6) Richard E. Lawrence, *Teacher Education and the National Scene, op. cit.*
(7) Herman Hermanowicz, "Studies of Teaching and Their Impact on Teacher Education," *op. cit.*
(8) National Committee for Teacher Education and Welfare, *Current Needs in Hebrew Teacher Education,* American Association for Jewish Education, 1958, p. 14.
(9) *Ibid.*
(10) *Ibid.*
(11) Teachers Institute for Women, Yeshiva University.
(12) Dean Corrigan, *op. cit.*
(13) *Ibid.*
(14) James B. Conant, *The Education of American Teachers,* N.Y. McGraw Hill, 1963, p. 271.

What is our D'mut Atzmit Quotient?

by Alvin I. Schiff

healthy self-image is basic to teacher tiveness, so let's start working on *d'mut atzmit* now.

positive self-concept is essential in arenas—in the community and in the room. First it means *believing in the lute worthwhileness of what we do.*

> Unfortunately, any Jewish educators re adversely affected by the low esteem in which they are held n the community . . .

sh education is the key to the very ex- ce of the Jewish community and is ornerstone of Jewish enrichment. As terface with parents, lay leaders and sh communal professionals, our self- ept should radiate our feelings about value of our work. Moreover, we be prepared to articulate effectively ignificance of Jewish education as a *litio sine qua non* for a viable Jewish munity.

nfortunately, many Jewish educators dversely affected by the low esteem hich they are held by the community universal problem in the teaching ession. The resolution of this pro- in the Jewish community must n with Jewish educators—with our perception of our self-worth and of contribution we make to Jewish con- ity.

If I am not for myself who will be for " is an apt motto for us. This is one he reasons the Conference of Jewish cator Organizations (COJEO)—with ctive and prominent participation of E—has launched the "Year of the sh Educator" during the Hebrew dar year *Tismach.*

econdly, *a positive self-image means ving in ourselves, in our ability to eed and impact the lives of our ents and their families.* This assumes, ourse, that we continuously work to knowledge and improve our instructional skills.

Imitatio Dei is a powerful Judaic principle. After all, man was made in the image of God. Having "His likeness" places an awesome responsibility upon Homo sapiens, especially on people whose mission it is to influence the behavior of others.

Emulating God, as a Jewish concept, finds its early expression in a Talmudic interpretation of a verse in Moses' song after crossing the Red Sea. "This is my God and I will glorify him" (*Exodus 15:2*). According to Abba Shaul, glorifying God means "Be like him. Even as He is gracious so you be gracious; even as He is merciful, you be merciful" (*Babylonian Talmud, Tractate Shabbat 133:b*).

On the one hand, human beings are encouraged to imitate the attributes of the Almighty. On the other hand, people often imitate other persons, especially those whom they respect. Young children are prone to follow the example of adults —particularly in a school setting. In this regard, teachers teach more through what they *are* than through what they communicate. Listen to Abraham Joshua Heschel as he places the teacher role in proper perspective:

> Liking oneself as a teacher in a Jewish school, and having self-assurance vis-a-vis the instructional role, are crucial dimensions of a teacher's behavior.

> . . . everything depends on the person who stands in the front of the classroom. The teacher is not an automatic fountain from which intellectual beverages may be obtained. He is either a witness or a stranger. To guide a pupil into the promised land, he must have been there himself. When asking himself: Do I stand for what I teach? Do I believe what I say? He must be able to answer in the affirmative.
>
> What we need more than anything else is not *textbooks* but *textpeople.* It is the personality of the teacher which is the text that the pupils read; the text that they will never forget. The modern teacher, while not wearing a snowy beard, is a link in the chain of a tradition. He is also the creator of the future of our people. He must teach the pupils to evaluate the past in order to clarify their future.
>
> *The Insecurity of Freedom (New York, The Noonday Press, Farrar Strauss and Giroux, p. 237.)*

An anonymous poet expresses this thought beautifully.

'No spoken word nor written plea
Can teach young hearts what man
should be;
Not all the books on all the shelves,
But what the teachers are themselves.'

And "what teachers are themselves" significantly involves their feelings about "themselves". Liking oneself *as a teacher in a Jewish school*, and having self-assurance vis-a-vis the instructional role, are crucial dimensions of a teacher's behavior. Indeed, there is a relationship between believing in oneself and being effective, as there is a relationship between believing strongly in a cause and achieving the goals of that cause.

As teachers, we communicate our feelings to our pupils via our everyday contact with them. Willy-nilly, we are models for our children. Self-confidence (based upon sound Judaic knowledge and pedagogic skill) will help us translate our teaching into positive pupil behavior. Without a positive self-image, teachers cannot possibly maximize instructional impact. The message from all this is simple. Let's all start working to improve our *d'mut atzmit.* ■

Alvin Schiff is Executive Vice President of the Board of Jewish Education of Greater New York.

*KEY TO STRATEGIES

1) Develop vignettes of Jewish education professionals and disseminate them to target populations, the Anglo-Jewish press and cable TV.
2) Organize a letter writing campaign.
3) UJA-Federation involvement:
   a) Motivate educators to be active in local Federation campaign and activity; develop and distribute guidelines to Jewish educators.
   b) Encourage Federation to involve Jewish educators in community work and in campaign activity.
4) Encourage local and national institutions to honor educators; develop and distribute guidelines to all communities; make inventory of community activities regarding the honoring of educators.
5) Compile and distribute information about income potential for various occupations; compare to Jewish education. Compile, distribute information and prepare manual on available scholarships in regards to Jewish educator training.
6) Orient and train Jewish educators regarding the process of resource development for educator enhancement.
7) Guide Jewish educators re: personal, professional, self-growth and financial planning.
8) Prepare guidelines and distribute information re: full-time positions.