



THE JACOB RADER MARCUS CENTER OF THE  
**AMERICAN JEWISH ARCHIVES**

**MS-831: Jack, Joseph and Morton Mandel Foundation Records, 1980–2008.**  
Series B: Commission on Jewish Education in North America (CJENA). 1980–1993.  
Subseries 4: Publications and Research Papers, 1988–1993.

---

Box  
15

Folder  
19

Davidson, Aryeh. "The Preparation of Jewish Educators in North America", June 1990.

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

---



AND THE BUSH  
WAS NOT  
CONSUMED

THE JEWISH  
THEOLOGICAL  
SEMINARY  
OF AMERICA

3080 Broadway  
New York, NY 10027-4049  
(212) 678-8000

FAX (212) 678-8947

FAX COVER LETTER

Our Fax # (212) 678-8947

TO:

Annette Hockstein / Seymour Fox

AT:

NATV

FROM:

ARYEH DAVIDSON

AT:

212-678-8028  
(Phone number)

THERE WILL BE 4 PAGES INCLUDING THIS COVER PAGE.

DATE:

July 20, 1989

SHOULD YOU HAVE ANY PROBLEMS IN RECEIVING THIS TELECOPY, PLEASE

CALL (212) 678-8068 AND ASK FOR FAITH

SPECIAL INSTRUCTIONS:



07/20/89 08:59 12125788000 6786788000 002  
July 19, 1989

### Research Prospectus

The Professional Training of Jewish  
Educators in the United States and Canada

submitted by : Aryeh Davidson, Ph.D.

Recent attempts investigating the current state of Jewish education in the United States have tended to focus on senior personnel. The most recent survey (Hockstein, 1986) indicated that no more than 65 senior personnel graduated from Jewish educational institutions of higher learning in 1986. Hockstein's report highlights the need for additional personnel and the development of strategies and resources for attracting people to the field of Jewish education. To better understand how effective strategies may be developed an extensive examination of current teacher training institutions in the United States is necessary; both with respect to the ways they prepare senior personnel and teachers. More precisely we need to answer the following questions: How are Jewish educators trained? In what ways does their training differ from the preparation of general educators? What are the profiles of students who enter Jewish education programs? Answers to these questions will provide a data base for better understanding the dynamics of training Jewish educators. Such research will also provide needed data for policy makers concerned with the development of strategies to meet the increasing personnel needs for Jewish educators in the United States.

The proposed research will address two areas of concern with respect to the preparation of Jewish educators. First, it will provide elaborate profiles describing how Jewish educators enrolled in training programs have been prepared over the past four decades, with special emphasis on the current status of teacher training programs. Secondly, these training programs will be examined within the broader context of general teacher preparation in North America. The research will focus on what has and what can be learned from the field of general education that has application for personnel preparation in Jewish education?

#### Research design.

I. A review of the literature on teacher preparation in Jewish and general programs of education

Some of the questions to be investigated are:

1) What are the significant educational reforms in teacher training over the past forty years and how are they reflected in teacher preparation programs? 2) What are those factors that affect the introduction of educational reforms in teacher training institutions? 3) What are the teacher preparation models and trends that have had the greatest impact on Jewish training?

This information will be gathered through reviewing published and unpublished research as well as teacher preparation program descriptions. In addition, experts in the field of Jewish education



07/20/89 09:01 12126788000 8785788500 003  
education will be consulted to discuss the review findings.

## II. An examination of training programs in Jewish education

Some of the questions to be investigated are: 1) How do these programs work i.e., what are the typical components of training from the time of student recruitment through graduation and job placement? 2) How many students are currently being trained for junior and senior positions in Jewish education? 3) What do we know about the students who enroll in training programs with respect to educational and Jewish backgrounds? 4) What does it cost to complete a program in Jewish education and how are these costs covered by the student? 5) In contrast to general academic preparation programs, what factors and/or agencies uniquely affect training program philosophies and design as a direct result of their mission as Jewish educational institutions?

These data will be gathered through telephone and direct interviews. Each training institution will also complete an extensive questionnaire describing its program, students and faculty. In developing profiles of the training institutions, we will also be made of course syllabi and student evaluations, when available.



Time line :

Interim report: Mid October

Final Report mid-February

Budget

Principal investigator

research assistant

research expenses ( photo-copying, telephone,  
secretarial)

Total

6250.00



AUG 28 1989

August 23, 1989

To: Annette Hochstein

From: Aryeh Davidson

Re: Training institutions -research project

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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



Time table

Sept. 1-19    Development of interview schedules and  
                 instrumentation

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

Oct. 16      Interim report

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

Jan. 15.1990   Final research report

Budget

Principal investigator	5,000
Travel expenses *	
Research and secretarial assistance	1,500
Research expenses ( photo-copying, telephone, etc.)	500
<u>Total</u>	7,000

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



08/23/89 19:33

12126788000 6786788800

006

5



Principal Investigator  
Travel expenses \*  
Research and secretarial  
assistance  
Research expenses ( photo-copying, telephone,  
etc.)

5,000

1,500

500

Total

7,000

# **COMMISSION ON JEWISH EDUCATION IN NORTH AMERICA**

## **The Preparation of Jewish Educators in North America: A Status Report**

Aryeh Davidson, Ph.D.

June, 1990



# **The Preparation of Jewish Educators in North America: A Status Report**

Aryeh Davidson, Ph.D.

June, 1990

**A Report Submitted to  
The Commission on Jewish Education in North America**

Aryeh Davidson is Assistant Professor of Education and Psychology and Head of the Department of Education at the Jewish Theological Seminary of America.

The Commission on Jewish Education in North America was convened by the Mandel Associated Foundations, JWB and JESNA in collaboration with CJF. The ideas expressed in this report are those of the author and do not necessarily reflect the views of the Commission.

For more information about the Commission, contact the Mandel Associated Foundations, 4500 Euclid Avenue, Cleveland, Ohio 44103. Tel.: (216) 391-8300.

## Commissioners

Morton L. Mandel  
*Chairman*  
Mona Riklis Ackerman  
Ronald Appleby  
David Arnow  
Mandell L. Berman  
Jack Bieler  
Charles R. Bronfman  
John C. Colman  
Maurice S. Corson  
Lester Crown  
David Dubin  
Stuart E. Eizenstat  
Joshua Elkin  
Eli N. Evans  
Irwin S. Field  
Max M. Fisher  
Alfred Gottschalk  
Arthur Green  
Irving Greenberg  
Joseph S. Gruss  
Robert I. Hiller  
David Hirschhorn  
Carol K. Ingall

Ludwig Jesselson  
Henry Koschitzky  
Mark Lainer  
Norman Lamm  
Sara S. Lee  
Seymour Martin Lipset  
Haskel Lookstein  
Robert E. Loup  
Matthew J. Maryles  
Florence Melton  
Donald R. Mintz  
Lester Pollack  
Charles Ratner  
Esther Leah Ritz  
Harriet L. Rosenthal  
Alvin I. Schiff  
Lionel H. Schipper  
Ismar Schorsch  
Harold M. Schulweis  
Daniel S. Shapiro  
Margaret W. Tishman  
Isadore Twersky  
Bennett Yanowitz  
Isaiah Zeldin

## Senior Policy Advisors

David S. Ariel  
Seymour Fox  
Annette Hochstein  
Stephen H. Hoffman  
Martin S. Kraar

Arthur Rotman  
Herman D. Stein  
Jonathan Woocher  
Henry L. Zucker

## Director

Henry L. Zucker

## Research & Planning

Seymour Fox, Director  
Annette Hochstein, Associate Director

## Staff

Estelle Albeg  
Mark Gurvis  
Virginia F. Levi  
Debbie Meline  
Joseph Reimer



## Table of Contents

<b>Introduction</b> . . . . .	<b>1</b>
Research Questions	1
Methodology	2
Data Analysis and Presentation	2
Limitations of the Study	2
The Historical Context	3
The Current Picture	4
<b>1. Training Programs</b> . . . . .	<b>9</b>
1.1 B.A. Level Programs	9
1.2 M.A. Programs	10
1.2.1 Program philosophies and goals	10
1.2.2 Program standards	13
1.2.3 Program curricula	14
1.2.4 Part-time/full-time students	16
1.3 Doctoral Programs	17
1.4 Administrative Certificate Program	18
1.5 Special Programs	19
<b>2. Student Profile</b> . . . . .	<b>21</b>
2.1 Demographic Factors	21
2.2 Jewish Educational Background	22
2.3 Motivation to Pursue Jewish Education as a Career	22
2.4 Academic Performance	23
2.5 How Students Support Themselves	23
2.6 Summary	24
<b>3. Faculty Profile</b> . . . . .	<b>27</b>
3.1 Summary	29
<b>4. Summary of Training Programs: Retrospect and Prospect</b> . . . . .	<b>31</b>

<b>5. Alternative Training Programs . . . . .</b>	<b>33</b>
5.1 Short-Term Training Programs	33
5.2 Senior Educator Programs	34
5.3 In-Service Training Programs	34
<b>6. Training Informal Jewish Educators . . . . .</b>	<b>39</b>
<b>Notes . . . . .</b>	<b>41</b>
<b>Tables</b>	
Table 1: Institutions of Higher Learning Granting Jewish Education Degrees and Certificates	43
Table 2: Enrolled and Graduating Jewish Education Studies from Institutions of Higher Learning	44
Table 3: Distribution of Jewish Education Faculty in Institutions of Higher Learning	44
<b>Appendices</b>	
Appendix A: Semi-structured Interview Schedule	45
Appendix B: Accreditation and Institutions of Higher Jewish Learning	47
<b>References . . . . .</b>	<b>49</b>



---

# Introduction

---

The preparation of Jewish educators, perhaps more than any other area of Jewish education, reflects the complexity of issues, problems and needs confronting the future of Jewish education in North America. The recruitment of students, the development of appropriate training programs, the placement of graduates, the preparation of prospective faculty, the professionalization of the field, the relationships among the academy, the community and the school, are all issues that embody many of the challenges for Jewish education in the 1990s.

Recognizing the centrality of these issues, the Commission on Jewish Education in North America commissioned this study to describe the nature and scope of the preparation of Jewish educators in North America.<sup>1</sup>

## Research Questions

The study was designed with the input of the staff of the Commission to examine four areas in depth:

1. The nature and scope of training: What institutions of higher learning are preparing personnel for Jewish education? How do these institutions perceive their mission vis-a-vis Jewish education? What are the funding patterns for these programs? What is the range of educational preparation programs offered by these institutions?
2. A profile of those students studying to become Jewish educators: How many students are being trained to become Jewish educators? What motivates students to pursue training in Jewish education? How much does it cost to complete one's training as a Jewish educator?
3. A profile of faculty engaged in preparing future Jewish educators: How many faculty members prepare Jewish educational personnel and who are they? How do they perceive their roles?
4. The identification of issues and problems confronting Jewish institutions of higher learning: What do these institutions see as the issues and roles they will confront in the next decade? Are the issues confronting these institutions comparable to those in general education?

Although Jewish educators trained in North America may engage professionally in formal and/or informal education (Hochstein, 1986; Ettenberg & Rosenfield, 1988; Reisman, 1988), Jewish institutions of higher learning primarily prepare personnel

for formal settings.<sup>2</sup> Consequently, the research questions are aimed towards gaining a better understanding of the preparation of those entering and engaged in formal Jewish education by institutions of higher learning. Some attention will also be given to identifying issues relating to the preparation of Jewish educators serving in informal Jewish educational settings.

## **M e t h o d o l o g y**

Two forms of information, written documentation and interviews, were collected and provided the basis for developing a description of the current state of preparing Jewish educators. Written documentation, i.e., school bulletins, program descriptions, published and unpublished institutional reports, and research studies on the preparation of Jewish educational personnel were reviewed and analyzed. Between September 15 and November 20, 1989, the investigator conducted a total of 70, one to two and one-half hour semi-structured interviews with personnel and others engaged in the preparation of Jewish educators throughout North America.<sup>3</sup> (Appendix A, p. 45, contains the schedule that guided each interview.) Seventy-three students enrolled in Jewish education programs participated in group and individual meetings led by the investigator.

## **D a t a   A n a l y s i s   a n d   P r e s e n t a t i o n**

Answers to quantitative research questions, relating to the numbers and types of faculty and students, are presented in tabular form and discussed in the text. Descriptions of programs, analysis of training issues and problems discussed in the text are based on written documentation and interview data. Excerpts from interviews are used extensively to present the views and perspectives on the current state of training.

## **L i m i t a t i o n s   o f   t h e   S t u d y**

The study is not comprehensive, thereby limiting the conclusions that may be drawn from it. A narrow time required that existing available data, which is sometimes incomplete, be relied on, and the promise of confidentiality to those interviewed prevented reporting profiles of individual institutions. Consequently data are presented and interpreted in aggregate form, and the discussion presents an overview of those issues relating to all training institutions.



## The Historical Context

Beginning in the late 19th century, Jewish leaders such as Mordecai Kaplan, Judah Magnus and Samson Benderly (Kaplan & Crossman, 1949; Margolis, 1968; Sherwin, 1987), and the organized Jewish community were concerned with the education of large immigrant Jewish populations. They worked towards establishing teacher training institutions in large urban areas to prepare a generation of Hebrew teachers particularly suited for educating American Jewish youth on the elementary and high school levels.<sup>4</sup> Between 1897 and 1954 eleven such institutions were established.<sup>5</sup>

Although some were established as denominational schools and extensions of nationally-based seminaries (e.g., Teachers Institute of the Jewish Theological Seminary of America, Teachers Institute of Yeshiva University), most were designed to serve the needs of the entire Jewish community (e.g., Boston Hebrew Teachers College, Gratz College, The College of Jewish Studies). Differences in ideology and religious orientation did not prevent them from being viewed by American Jews as having one primary function: the training of Hebrew teachers who would ensure continuity from one generation to the next (Honor, 1935; Hurwich, 1949). When Leo Honor conducted the first comprehensive study of the curricula of eight Hebrew Teachers Colleges in 1935, he found that these institutions shared three characteristics: an emphasis on the study of classical Jewish texts; an emphasis on Hebrew language/cultural Zionism; and the assumption of additional functions beyond their original mission of training Hebrew teachers. The additional functions included adult education, advanced Hebrew studies, and the training of Sunday School teachers.

Fourteen years after Honor's study, Hurwich (1949) reported that the Hebrew Teachers Colleges were moving further away from their mission of training Hebrew teachers. He found that only 20 to 25 percent of the annual need for new teachers was met by the training institutions. Moreover, the schools actively encouraged students to pursue a full course of study in secular colleges, leading to professional careers other than Hebrew teaching.

In the years that followed, Hebrew Teachers Colleges continued to expand their course offerings and programs to meet the broad Jewish educational needs of the community. Several established joint degree programs with universities (e.g., Jewish Theological Seminary and Columbia University; Spertus College of Judaica and Roosevelt University; Gratz College and Temple University). New programs in Judaic studies, Jewish communal service, adult education and high school education were also established.

In 1981, when Mirsky examined the eleven accredited institutions that constituted the Iggud Batei HaMedrash (Association of Hebrew Teachers Colleges, refer to Appendix B, p. 47), he noted that with the exception of one, all of the colleges had removed "Teachers" from their names. Moreover, Hebrew was the language of instruction in

only 20% of the courses. The colleges also reported shifts in their student populations and viewed their respective missions as changing.

The Iggud Schools have begun to develop courses, and sometimes entire programs, to meet the needs of the general community, and to enroll more and more students . . . non-traditional learners. . . . This, of course, can be seen as a positive development—a guarantee for the continued growth and viability of these institutions—or as a negative development—a sign of decline and change of mission, with the possibility that Hebrew teacher preparation programs may gradually lose importance in the institutions, and may even disappear (Mirsky, 1981, p. 18).

Over a seventy-year period the Hebrew Teachers Colleges, institutions originally established for the sole purpose of preparing Hebrew teachers, expanded their roles within the Jewish community. They currently have thousands of students enrolled in adult education courses, in-service education courses, and secondary level programs. A perusal of their course bulletins shows that they offer a variety of degrees in Judaica, liberal arts, social service, and administration. Their long-range planning and mission statements indicate that they view themselves in broad terms as serving a variety of constituencies and addressing contemporary cultural, educational, and religious needs of the American Jewish community. A profile of each would demonstrate that the institution responds to a complex set of factors which are different for each school.

### The Current Picture

There are currently fourteen Jewish institutions of higher learning offering programs for the preparation of Jewish educators. Between September 15 and November 20, 1989, the investigator visited eleven of these institutions. Each visit consisted of a tour of the facilities and interviews with various administrators, faculty, and students. Where possible, personnel involved with the community were also interviewed. The institutions fall into three categories: 1) independent community-based colleges founded and supported by the organized Jewish community; 2) denominational schools established by religious movements as part of their respective seminaries; 3) university-based programs established by the community and/or individuals within the framework of a general university.

#### *Independent community-based colleges*

Gratz College, Philadelphia  
Baltimore Hebrew University  
Spertus College of Judaica, Chicago  
Cleveland College of Jewish Studies  
Hebrew College, Boston  
Midrasha (Teacher Training Institute), Toronto



### *Denominational schools*

Hebrew Union College: Rhea Hirsch School of Education, Los Angeles; The School of Education, New York

Jewish Theological Seminary of America, Graduate School, Department of Jewish Education, New York

Yeshiva University, New York: Azrieli Graduate Institute; Isaac Breuer College; Stern College

University of Judaism, Fingerhut School of Education, Los Angeles

### *University-based programs*

Hornstein Program for Jewish Communal Service, Brandeis University, Waltham, MA.

School of Education, George Washington University, in association with the College of Jewish Studies, Washington, D.C.

Department of Jewish Studies, York University, Toronto

Department of Judaic Studies, McGill University, Montreal

Before addressing the major research questions relating to training of Jewish educators an overview of the institutions visited will be presented.

### **Physical plants**

The facilities of each institution are comfortable, well-maintained and generally perceived by school personnel and students as providing adequate space. Both the denominational and university-based programs provide housing for students, whereas none of the independent community colleges have housing facilities. Each institution has a library of Judaica, including an education collection, which meets the standards of the respective regional accrediting associations for institutions of higher learning.

### **Funding**

The operating budgets of the institutions vary significantly. The independent community colleges report budgets ranging from approximately \$400,000 to \$2,300,000. Income is generated through tuition, gifts, and local federations which contribute between 20-90% of the budget. It is difficult to assess what percentage of the total budgets of the denominational and university-based schools is allocated for their education training programs. Their income is generated through tuition, relatively small endowments, grants, and fundraising. None of the denominational institutions are eligible for Jewish community (e.g., federation) funding because of their perceived sectarian status. University-based programs, in contrast, do receive considerable community support in the form of federation allocations, grants, and tuition subventions.

## **Governance**

All of the institutions have independent Boards of Trustees. The amount of authority and control a board exerts is contingent on the status of the institution (university-based, denominational, independent community) and its dependence on the federation. All independent community schools must have their budgets approved by the federation and are included in the long-range planning activities of the federation. University-based programs often have rather complicated relationships with their respective federations and departments of Jewish studies.

## **Accreditation**

The institutions listed in Table 1 (p. 43) all have some form of state (U.S.) or provincial (Canada) accreditation. Most are also accredited by regional accrediting associations and accepted by the National Board of License for Teachers and Supervisory Personnel in American Jewish Schools (NBL) as institutions preparing educators for Jewish schools. (Appendix B, p. 47, provides a description of each type of accreditation.)

## **Mission**

Examination of the mission statements of the respective institutions and the interview data indicate that they share common goals in the following areas:

- the preservation and perpetuation of Jewish culture;
- the preparation of Jewish professionals;
- the support and promotion of Jewish scholarship.

Independent community colleges, in addition to supporting these goals, stress their commitment to serving the needs of their respective communities through various forms of outreach and direct service, including secondary school Jewish education, in-service teacher education programs, and adult education programs. In addition they are responsive to the changing priorities and needs identified by the local federation for the community. The president of a community-based college remarked:

We're experiencing a large influx of Russian immigrants in our community. The College is responding by working together with (. . .) to sponsor ESL programs. We're also thinking about other programs that will involve them in the study of Jewish culture. . . . We see ourselves as serving local needs; that means assessing and being responsive to local constituencies and issues. . . . In a few years we may consider expanding to serve the entire region but I don't see us attracting a national student population, nor attempting to compete with the nationally-based seminaries.

By way of contrast, the administrator of another community-based college indicated that the College was attracting a national student body and would continue to aspire to be perceived as responding to national as well as local needs.

Our recent long-range planning study indicates that we have the potential to train administrators and educators extending beyond (. . .). We are planning to build a dormitory and actively seek fellowship funds to attract students.

With respect to the role of Jewish education and its prominence within the college, each institution has a rather unique perspective. One is engaged in re-establishing a Jewish education program which will require adding faculty and actively recruiting students. The president of another community-based college takes a rather dim view of the prospects for Jewish education.

Frankly, there is no profession of Jewish education; salaries are low, status is low and there is no incentive for us to build our Jewish education program at this point in time. The field of Jewish education needs to change as a profession out there before we can build our programs to train Jewish educators.

Structurally, the community-based colleges do not have distinct academic departments of education, rather they offer programs in Jewish education which do not necessarily have full-time education faculty (see section 3).

Each denominational school has a department, school or institute of Jewish education which focuses on the preparation of educational personnel, and has appointed full-time education faculty (see section 3). By virtue of their ideological affiliation, they emphasize their commitment to the specific needs of their religious movements through programs, outreach and scholarship. They also view themselves as serving the needs of national and international constituencies.

The missions of university-based programs focus on the preparation of educators and communal professionals uniquely trained to serve Jewish communities. They tend to stress an interdisciplinary approach to training and scholarship as part of a university, and a pluralistic attitude towards developing leadership. Structurally, programs in Jewish education are components of either Judaic studies or Jewish communal service programs of the university.

### **Programs and Activities**

Although a profile of each school's program activities is beyond the scope of the present study, each institution sponsors programs in some or all of the following areas:

*Training programs*—pre-service and in-service programs designed to prepare and provide continuing education to rabbis, Jewish communal service workers, cantors and Jewish educators;



*Jewish Studies programs* – academic degree programs in Judaica;

*Adult education* – courses, lectures, workshops and retreats designed for local and regional Jewish communities;

*Secondary level supplementary schools* – intensive Jewish studies programs designed for motivated adolescents;

*Special projects* – museum programs, joint programs with universities, library training workshops and research institutes.

---

# 1. Training Programs

---

As indicated above, each of the institutions offers programs to prepare Jewish educators, but the type and orientation of the programs differ significantly, depending on the particular academic degree and institution. Table 1 (p. 43) lists the training institutions and the various programs they offer in Jewish education. Most offer degree programs at the B.A. and M.A. levels. A growing number are also beginning to offer advanced degrees (doctorates) and principal certification. After each degree program is examined, the common issues confronting training institutions will be reviewed. Because most students are enrolled in graduate programs, an extensive discussion is devoted to an analysis of the M.A. programs.

## 1.1 B.A. Level Programs

Those institutions which offer a concentration or major in Jewish education are listed in the column marked B.A. of Table 1. These programs by and large conform to the requirements of the NBL (refer to Appendix B) for licensing teachers at the elementary and secondary level. Requirements for licensure include: 42 credits of Judaica (Bible, literature, history, customs and prayer); Hebrew language proficiency; and 18 credits in Jewish education including a student teaching experience. In addition, candidates for the NBL license must earn 90 points of liberal arts credit from an accredited college or university. As indicated in Table 1, only the denominational and community-based colleges offer B.A. level or certification programs.

There are a total of 68 students currently enrolled in B.A. degree programs who major or concentrate in Jewish education. Although accurate comparisons with previous enrollment figures are not available, it is clear that there has been a steady decline in the number of B.A. education majors over the past twenty years (Mirsky, 1981; Schiff, 1974). Declining education enrollments at the B.A. level have also been reported for general colleges and universities. They are attributed in part to poor salaries and the low status of the teaching profession (Carnegie Forum, 1986; Feistritz, 1984). Aside from these factors, Jewish institutions of higher learning are encouraging students considering careers in education to complete a liberal arts education and then pursue an M.A. in Jewish education.

In response to your question, we are trying to phase out the B.A. major in Jewish education at (...). In order to professionalize the field we need educators with graduate degrees. . . . It also doesn't make sense for us to place undergraduates in the same courses with graduate students. We don't have the budget to run parallel courses at the B. A. and M.A. levels.

Most of the institutions listed in Table 1 and all of the Canadian-based programs offer courses on the undergraduate level to meet NBL teacher license requirements.

Forty-three students are enrolled in teacher certification programs (refer to Table 2) as non-matriculating students. They generally enroll in the school for the requisite 18 credits in Jewish education courses and take Judaica courses in other institutions. Several interviewees felt this approach to teacher certification worked against the professionalization of the field.

Students who come here to take a few courses in education may not even be acceptable candidates for our degree programs. Since they are here as non-matriculating students we aren't supporting their candidacy for a license; we're just letting them take courses. We need to rethink, on a national level, the whole area of teacher certification.

## 1.2 M.A. Programs

The M.A. program has become the primary vehicle for preparing Jewish educators in North America. With the exception of the undergraduate colleges and the Toronto Midrasha, all institutions now offer an M.A. in Jewish education. Most Jewish education programs are registered by their respective state's departments of education as part of the institution's graduate school of Judaica. Consequently, a student enrolled in an M.A. program in Jewish education will also need to meet the requirements of the particular graduate division of the school. All students receiving M.A. degrees in Jewish education from an accredited institution are automatically eligible for a teaching license from the NBL (refer to Appendix B).

The majority of programs make provisions for both full and part-time study. The exceptions, Brandeis, HUC-Los Angeles, and the University of Judaism, will only accept full-time students. Full-time students complete the program in two to three years, depending on their background and the program. Part-time students take between three to five years for completion of the degree. As indicated in Table 2, in June, 1989, 62 students received M.A. degrees in Jewish education. Of those, approximately 40 were full-time students and 22 attended part-time.

The M.A. programs differ substantially from each other in numerous ways. Unfortunately, these differences cannot be easily classified into a typology<sup>6</sup> and a detailed analysis of each program is beyond the scope of this study. Despite these differences, the data analyses indicate that there are several foci or issues around which programs may be better understood and discussed. Three such issues emerge from the data, and also have relevance to the literature on teacher training: the programs' philosophical orientation, standards, and curricula.

### 1.2.1 Program philosophies and goals

The various programs reflect different educational philosophies and models of teacher training. At a symposium entitled *New Models for Preparing Personnel for Jewish Education* (*Jewish Education*, 1974), leading Jewish educational thinkers dis-



cussed their respective programs. Three distinctive models of training were discussed:

*1) Generalist*

The educator prepared as the generalist (Cutter, 1974) should be familiar with classical texts, fluent in Hebrew, knowledgeable about the worlds of both Jewish and general education, and have experience in curriculum writing, teaching and supervision. The generalist is prepared to serve as both a resource to the Jewish educational community and a leader in a variety of settings including the congregational school, the day school, the bureaus of Jewish education, the JCC and camps.

*2) Critical translator*

Lukinsky (Lukinsky, 1974), discussing the program at the Jewish Theological Seminary, described a model or approach to training that emphasizes Jewish scholarship and its translation to the classroom; provides educational experiences that stress struggling with real problems in our world; and prepares Jewish educators to think critically.

*3) Reflective educator*

The model developed at Brandeis University described by Wachs (Wachs, 1974) and elaborated by Shevitz (Shevitz, 1988), underscored the training of the Jewish educator through self-awareness and reflection; socialization within a community of faculty and students; focused field experiences in the Jewish community; and the development of professional competence.

*4) Practitioner*

A fourth model, not addressed in the symposium but clearly reflected in the literature of several of the institutions under study, focuses on preparing the practitioner—a Jewish educator committed to and expert in the art and science of teaching.

These four models—the generalist, the critical translator, the reflective educator and the practitioner—are not pure models in theory or practice. However, by virtue of providing a vision and model of the Jewish educator, each model guides the preparation of educators, provides direction to students and faculty, and helps to inform the Jewish community of the purpose and goals of Jewish education. Implicit in each model is the notion of the Jewish educator as a religious educator, but this emphasis varies depending on the program and its ideological orientation.

In reality, few of the schools preparing educators have clearly articulated a philosophy of Jewish teacher education. Many of the programs refer to themselves as eclectic, borrowing, combining and applying concepts from a number of areas. It is questionable to what extent this eclecticism has been integrated into a Jewish philosophy of education.

There is a clear and burning need for classroom teachers, persons who are grounded in the study of text and fluent Hebrew speakers. Theories and philosophies aren't all that helpful when fires need to be put out. . . . Quite honestly, developing a clear philosophy is a luxury we can't afford at this time.

We (*students*) often sit around talking about the lack of direction in our program. Some of the courses are excellent but the parts don't hold together. I couldn't tell you what the philosophy of this program is.

We've prided ourselves on the development of a clear statement of what kind of educators we want to prepare at (. . .). But, it has required an inordinate amount of work on the part of faculty and administration. We spend three hours per week in weekly meetings to discuss goals, philosophy and the more mundane stuff.

These excerpts from the interviews capture some of the problems and issues training programs face in relationship to the development of a program philosophy. Most programs just do not have the resources, with respect to time and personnel, to do the needed work in this area. Many interviewees observed that when there is a lack of vision and guiding philosophy of training, all aspects of the program suffer and contribute to the sense that Jewish education is not a real profession.

In the general world of education a good deal of attention is being focused on commissions (Carnegie Forum, 1986; Holmes Group, 1986) that advocate reconceptualizing teacher preparation programs and their philosophies of training. Referring to this work, a faculty member concluded the interview with the following comment:

American education has been struggling with the purpose and philosophy of its education schools for decades. . . . It's taken seriously, and every ten to fifteen years, after considerable research and deliberation, reports are issued which lead to proposed reforms that are heard both by the educational community and Washington. We've been struggling with comparable issues for hundreds, thousands of years, but we haven't in recent years taken Jewish education seriously enough to give it the thought and reformulation it needs. We have a lot to learn from our colleagues in American education. Interestingly, analysis of the data found that most program goals or mission statements, reflected little explicit concern with the religious dimension of the educator. With the exception of the denominational schools, course descriptions, self-studies, and interviews suggest ambivalence about identifying Jewish education programs as preparing religious educators.

Let me outline our missions: providing a quality educational program of Judaic and Hebrew studies; the training of Jewish educators and communal service workers; serving as a cultural resource, serving as a scholarly resource, housing a Jewish library; and providing a community Hebrew high school. Religious development per se is not part of our mission. To the extent that adults seeking meaning take our course. . . . I guess you could say we are involved in religious education.

As one engaged in the development of Jewish educators, I am very concerned with their spiritual life. As Jewish educators they are first and foremost crafting learning opportunities where learners can create personal religious meaning, from the text, from the experience. . . . We have a lot to learn from religious educators in the Christian world who are doing some fantastic things in this area.

### 1.2.2 Program standards

The development of rigorous standards to improve the profession of education is high on the agenda for reform of the American educational system (Clifford & Guthrie, 1988; National Board for Professional Teaching Standards, 1989). Similarly, the establishment and enforcement of standards for Jewish educators is viewed as necessary to the professionalization of the field (Aron, 1990). In the course of data collection, standards were often mentioned with reference to two issues: the perceived low status of teacher training institutions, addressed by accrediting and licensing agencies (Appendix B); and standards within individual programs relating to admission criteria, Judaica background, and Hebrew language proficiency.

With the exception of two schools, all of the administrators and Jewish professionals interviewed want to increase their programs' enrollments and out-reach to untapped potential student populations. In fact, several schools have begun to recruit bright, motivated people who desire careers in Jewish education but who lack extensive Jewish backgrounds. This tension between attracting new blood to the field and maintaining standards was expressed repeatedly in the interviews. Schools have responded in different ways. A few have developed *mechina* (preparation) programs in Israel; two have initiated special summer institutes enabling students to study Judaica and Hebrew; one school requires weak students to spend a "preparatory" year of study at the institution before they are formally accepted into the program. None send the message that "students with weak Judaica backgrounds need not apply."

The overall results of these strategies are questionable. The *mechina* and special programs receive mixed reviews from faculty, students, and administration, with respect to their ability to compensate for weak Judaica backgrounds. They impose serious financial burdens on students and often discourage them.

(...) was a good program; it gave me some of the basic skills, but I feel that breaking my teeth over Talmud isn't exactly what I need in order to teach kids in Hebrew school. I don't know if I can make it through another two and one half years.

Psychologically I never expected it to be so difficult to be in a learning situation where I feel infantilized because the material is so foreign and, from my current vantage point, utterly useless for my intended career, working as a Jewish family educator.

A faculty member commented:

The quality of preparation our students receive in the Israel program is questionable. And standards are non-existent. We have no control and little input. . . . They study text, but they could also attain comparable gain here.

Standards are also an issue with respect to teaching competency. Although all schools have some type of practicum, most have not developed effective forms of

evaluation to assess a student's ability to teach. A few programs zealously adhere to self-imposed standards, but that does not mean that their programs conform to the standards of the NBL (refer to Appendix B).

We have committed ourselves to a quality program meeting self-imposed criteria. We will maintain the requirements of full-time study, numerous field placements, study in Israel, because they all flow from our vision of what is required to train a Jewish educator. We realize that our standards inhibit growth of the program but that is how we maintain standards of excellence for ourselves and the field.

### 1.2.3 Program curricula

Issues of curriculum, i.e., the content of training programs, appear to be directly influenced by institutional positions towards standards and philosophical orientation. Programs which have clearly articulated goals and a guiding educational philosophy are perceived by students and faculty as having courses and practical experiences which complement each other and help create a unified program. By way of contrast, programs which are not grounded in a philosophy are often perceived as diffuse, a collection of courses that do not hang together. This sense of diffusion was particularly obvious within programs which primarily serve part-time students.

In contrast to my work at ( . . . ) where I deal mostly with students who have a full-time commitment to graduate study, the students here check in and out, hardly know each other, seem to be taking courses in any sequence that meets their schedule, and have very little sense of what it means to be a professional Jewish educator. I certainly don't have a sense of a program where students and faculty fully participate, and I don't know if students perceive it any differently.

Irrespective of students' and faculty's perceptions of the program curricula, analysis of the program and course descriptions do indicate specific areas of curricular content and emphasis. All programs require courses in three areas of concentration:

*Judaica*—classical Jewish text study (e.g., Bible, rabbinic literature), Jewish literature, Jewish history, liturgy, customs and ritual;

*Jewish education*—foundations (e.g., philosophy of Jewish education, human development), methodology skills, specialization courses ( e.g., informal education, special education, adult education)

*Supervised practicum experience*—student teaching or internship (paid training experiences tailored to the needs and career aspirations of each student).

Aside from these core areas of concentration, programs may require courses on contemporary Jewry, administration, and supervision, or departmental seminars. All programs also require that students demonstrate proficiency in Hebrew language. "Proficiency" is determined and evaluated by each institution.



A program's course requirements play a large role in determining its duration. Programs which emphasize all of the aforementioned areas are three year programs requiring approximately 60 credits. Programs comprised of the three areas of concentration generally consist of 35-40 credits.

The curricula of training programs vary significantly with respect to the relative emphases that are placed on the areas of concentration and the additional areas noted above. Although a detailed curricular analysis of each program would be useful, it is beyond the scope of this study.

Program specialization also affects the curricular models adopted by each school. From their inception, teachers colleges focused on training of the Hebrew school teacher. The term connoted a rather specific type of occupation that resulted in a narrow conception of training. In response to community needs, occupations in Jewish education have burgeoned to include day school teachers, early childhood specialists, special educators, resource personnel, curriculum specialists, supervisors, family educators, Jewish community center educators, and summer camp educators. Many of the faculty interviewed felt that their schools have not kept pace with the changing needs of the Jewish community. Tinkering with a training model designed for preparing supplementary school teachers may not be an appropriate response to the need for new training programs. What are those training models most appropriate for preparing family educators, day school teachers, and other specialists?

Two curricular issues were repeatedly mentioned in the interviews: the tension between theory and practice and the nature of the role of the practicum.

#### *1) The tension between theory and practice*

Schools and departments of education are continually faced with the problem of balancing the theoretical aspects of teaching and learning with the practical (Zeichner, 1988). Jewish educators are keenly aware of the need to integrate these elements. At many of the training institutions this issue frequently appears as an agenda item for faculty meetings. Students often clamor for more practical courses that will provide them with teaching skills, whereas faculty members are prone to stress a theoretical approach to understanding practice. Few schools have taken an either/or position, i.e., stressing either a practical or theoretical orientation to the detriment of the other. Most programs reflect a tension between the two, exacerbated by the significant Jewish content of programs which also has its theoretical and practical aspects. The tension between theory and practice is also reflected in the various practica and student teacher experiences of the programs.

#### *2) The role of the practicum*

According to the guidelines of the NBL, all students are required to complete a supervised field experience (practicum) to be eligible for a teaching license. The nature and design of the practicum in Jewish schools depends on a variety of factors,

including: the orientation of the program, its ideological affiliation, student schedules, geographic locations of educational facilities, the availability of master educators, and economic realities. For those preparing to assume positions in supplementary schools, there is a good deal of flexibility in arranging the field placement. Students take their courses in the morning and use their afternoon teaching jobs to fulfill their practicum requirement. Such accommodation is not feasible for those training to become day school educators. They must be available during the day time for their placement and also take courses. This affects only two training programs which have day school tracks. One has developed an internship model which reduces the student's course load; the other has students take course work during the summers.

Students enrolled in general education programs rate their practicum experience as the most significant, interesting, and helpful part of their training (Feiman-Nemser, 1989). Among Jewish educators in training this often is not the case:

When I hear the words 'field placement' the first thing that comes to mind is commuting, getting in the car and driving 10 hours a week for a 14 hour field placement. Overall, I feel the placement looms too large in our program. I've had a good deal of experience in Jewish education; I need more basic Judaica knowledge, not more field experience.

The kids are great, but the administration just doesn't use me properly. I'm the gofer, the substitute, the small group teacher, and lowest person on the totem pole. It's infantilizing.

The administration just doesn't realize how labor and time-intensive the supervision of student teachers is. We should have a ratio of one faculty person to five students. I currently supervise eight students and teach an additional three courses per semester.

The quality of the practicum experience is significantly influenced by the supervision a student receives. General programs for teacher training tend to borrow from several models of supervision (e.g., peer supervision, on-site supervision, university-based supervision, see Woolfolk, 1988). All of the models require trained personnel to provide supervision. Many students and faculty discussed with the investigator their concern about the lack of supervision in their field placements. In most instances on-site supervisors, burdened with their own job responsibilities, visit students infrequently. Faculty who supervise students spoke of their frustrations in not finding enough time to provide adequate supervision. In contrast, programs which have full-time requirements do not have the same degree of difficulty because they have adequate staff to supervise.

#### **1.2.4 Part-time/full-time students**

Issues relating to the differences between full and part-time students were raised repeatedly during the interviews. Those who invested in full-time study clearly felt it

was superior to part-time enrollment with respect to the overall quality of the training experience.

When students are part of a full-time program they form a learning community, a sense of professionalism, and a strong knowledge and skill base. . . . It also makes a difference for me—when working with part-time students, I feel they sort of squeeze my course into their busy schedules. I also feel I have to be more sympathetic to their external pressures outside of my class. Consequently, I'm embarrassed to say, I tend to be less demanding of part-time students.

I just love the opportunity to be in school full-time. It's not just the learning, it's the fellowship I feel part of. Jewishly, socially, and academically it's very supportive.

The superiority of full-time study is by no means a matter of consensus. Most of the training institutions are invested in programs for part-time students (see section 2.5). Historically, Hebrew Teacher Colleges always had students who attended on a part-time basis (Margolis, 1968; Janowsky, 1967) while they taught in Hebrew schools and attended secular universities. Aside from tradition, several of those interviewed felt that it would not be economically viable for students preparing to be supplementary school teachers to attend a full-time training program.

From my perspective an education program that is designed for full-time students in this community is neither possible nor desirable. Those interested in studying at (. . .) generally have families and need to work. Even with fellowship money they would not be able to study full-time. Secondly, I'm not at all convinced that the preparation of Jewish educators for supplementary schools requires one to study full time. . . . We produce some excellent teachers who teach in schools and take one or two courses a year. The work and study complement each other.

### 1.3 Doctoral Programs

There are 67 students (Table 2) enrolled in doctoral programs—Ph.D., D.H.L. (Doctor of Literature), and Ed.D. (Doctor of Education)—at three institutions. The majority (58) are part-time, taking between one and three courses per year. However, schools offering a Ph.D. in Jewish education have a two-year full-time study residency requirement. Course requirements for all doctoral students include taking approximately 35 credits beyond the M.A. and the writing of a dissertation; the Ph.D. also has foreign language requirements.

Doctoral students may be classified into three overlapping categories:

#### *1) Continuing education*

The majority of students (55%) view a doctorate as a way of continuing their studies and improving their skills. Students in this category hold full-time positions as educational leaders. Although they associate the title "Doctor" with status, its attainment will not affect their marketability or economic situation. These "continuing

education" students are most likely to complete their course work in four years, but often do not complete writing a dissertation.

### *2) Career advancement*

About 30% of the doctoral students view the degree as a credential for improving their professional status and marketability. The majority of career advancement students are Israelis who study full-time and complete all course work and their dissertations in four years or less and then return to positions in Israel.

### *3) Scholarship*

This category includes doctoral students who have academic and research interests (approximately 15%). They are generally full-time students who view doctoral study as preparing them to assume leadership responsibilities in academic or research settings. They are perceived by many as representing the cream of the crop and therefore assume teaching and administrative responsibilities before completion of their dissertations. Students in this category often take upwards of eight years to complete their dissertations.

There are also many who enroll in doctoral programs because they are continuing to take course work past the M.A. level and decide to have those courses count towards a degree. Many do not complete their degrees; they stop short of writing the dissertation.

Unlike in most schools of general education, the doctoral education students in Jewish institutions of higher learning do not tend to function as active members of the school, i.e., they do not assume roles as research assistants, instructors or supervisors. To a large extent this seems to be a function of their part-time status and economic pressures to maintain full-time positions outside of the institution.

## **1.4 Administrative Certificate Program**

Four institutions currently sponsor programs to certify school principals and thereby train senior personnel. These programs are modelled after general education programs, tailored to enable full-time educators to study on weekends and during summers (Clifford & Guthrie, 1988). The programs require course work during the summers – courses in administration and supervision which may be taken at general universities – and an internship. Approximately half of the 42 students enrolled in these programs (see Table 2) already hold administrative positions. The schools and bureaus of education feel these programs should be expanded to prepare more senior educators and to fill informal and formal education positions. Most of the programs seem to be modelled after programs observed in general education (Clifford & Guthrie, 1988). Jewish professionals and faculty who were interviewed voiced enthusiasm for the expansion and reinforcement of principal and educational leadership programs.



These programs provide us with opportunities to create new models specifically tailored to the needs of the Jewish community.

### 1.5 Special Programs

The growing needs in the field of Jewish education have created new positions for personnel—day school teachers, special educators, family educators, and early childhood specialists (Hochstein, 1985; *CAJE Newsletter*, 1989). Interviewees maintain that the training institutions are not able to adequately respond to those needs. The data indicate that among the 14 institutions, three have begun early childhood programs in conjunction with local universities or BJEs. Although five have courses in special education, none have comprehensive training programs in that area. None have developed programs in family education. Day schools have flourished in the past decade, but there are only four institutions that have developed a capacity for the preparation of day school personnel and the unique challenges it involves. Day school teachers need extensive knowledge of Jewish texts, fluency in Hebrew language, and a willingness to work for low salaries (see Aron, 1990). Paradoxically, the training required for school administrators and “generalists” assuming leadership positions involves fewer demands in the areas of text study and Hebrew language but results in significantly higher salaries. The issues in the development of day school programs are directly related to the student applicant pool, financial support, and personnel.

It's very unlikely that we will ever be in a position to develop a training program for day school educators. Even if the demand is there, and that's debatable, we don't have the personnel. I doubt if we could recruit students to enroll in a three or four year program with the hope of going out and earning \$25,000. It makes more sense for them to consider an administrative program. Theoretically, we could develop a joint program with (. . .) in early childhood, special education, even family education. But a day school program, we'd have to do that on our own. We would need enormous resources.

---

## 2. Student Profile

---

The last comprehensive study of students enrolled in Hebrew Teachers Colleges was conducted by Alvin Schiff in 1965 (Schiff, 1967). He reported that a total of 1835 students were enrolled in all programs of the ten colleges studied. Of those, approximately 500, or 27% of the college population, preferred Jewish education as a career choice on the survey Schiff administered. (There is no follow-up data to indicate whether these students did indeed become Jewish educators.) By and large the majority of students enrolling in Hebrew Teachers Colleges during the early sixties, prior to the proliferation of Judaic studies programs at universities, chose these colleges because they wanted to study Judaica seriously on the undergraduate level, while pursuing a liberal arts degree. For most, Jewish education as a field of study and subsequent career was viewed as an option, but not the primary reason for entering the school.

On the basis of the survey responses from Hebrew College students, Schiff drew a profile of students most likely to pursue careers in Jewish education. They tended to be female (80%), 21 years or older, were products of day school education, and worshipped in Orthodox synagogues. They were satisfied with their previous Jewish learning experience, demonstrated strong Judaic and Hebraic backgrounds, desired positions teaching Jewish studies and Hebrew, and were motivated by idealism to promote Jewish life.

### 2.1 Demographic Factors

Analysis of the interviews and institutional literature yielded information for drawing in broad strokes a picture of the current student population of Jewish institutions of higher learning.

It is estimated that as of November, 1989, approximately 1500 students were enrolled as matriculating students in both the undergraduate and graduate programs of the 14 institutions under study. Of those, 358 students (refer to Table 2) or 24% of the total student population were enrolled in Jewish education degree programs, a percentage comparable to the 1965 survey. The teacher preparation programs are comprised primarily of women (75%). In contrast, the Judaica programs of these institutions are comprised of 35% males and 65% females. Although male/female ratios vary considerably from school to school, as in general education (Feistritzer, 1986), Jewish education programs have a disproportionate number of women.

The denominational and university-based programs draw students from a national pool, whereas the independent community schools primarily attract students on a

local or regional level. On the graduate level, the majority of students have had some prior work experience in either formal or informal Jewish education.<sup>7</sup> Although they tend to be in their mid-twenties, increasingly administrators report that students thirty and older, seeking a career change, are applying to their programs.

## **2.2 Jewish Educational Background**

With respect to students' Jewish background, there is considerable inter- and intra-institutional variation. Nevertheless, certain patterns are clear. Unlike the 1965 sample, current students generally do not come from Orthodox backgrounds, nor are they graduates of day schools. Many seem to be dissatisfied products of congregational schools who only began to take serious interest in Judaica in Jewish studies courses on the college level. While there has been a proliferation of day schools over the past two decades, their graduates have a disproportionately low representation in programs for preparing Jewish educators. Denominational institutions are increasingly attracting students who are not affiliated with a particular movement and view themselves as serving the Jewish community at large.

## **2.3 Motivation to Pursue Jewish Education as a Career**

There are no studies that examine why people enter Jewish education. Group interviews with students suggest that as with the 1965 student population (Schiff, 1967), idealism plays a prominent role in the decision to pursue a career in Jewish education. The following comments by students also point to the students' belief that their roles as Jewish educators center on identity development and the transmission of Judaism.

I chose Jewish education because I'm concerned about the future of the Jewish community, and being an educator is a way to make a difference.

For me, the transmission of knowledge and Jewish culture are the essence of being a Jewish educator.

I think that as an American Jewish educator my work must focus on transmitting Jewish values and shaping Jewish identity.

In choosing a program for graduate study in Jewish education students were keenly aware of their career options, which guide their choice of program. Programs which stress teaching tend to attract those who want to teach, whereas programs designed for administrators attract students who are primarily interested in affecting change in

Jewish educational systems. Nevertheless, when queried, students don't see themselves staying in teaching for more than a few years.

I love kids and teaching but you can't make ends meet on \$18,000 a year. I figure that after a year or two I'll become a principal.

My student teaching experience reinforced my decision to go teach in a day school next year. It's important to teach before you move on to administration.

I think the only way teaching in a Jewish school can become a real profession is if more people from our program go into teaching instead of administration. On the other hand I'll probably end up in administration in a few years.

Among all student groups interviewed a visit or period of study in Israel was noted as a factor contributing to the decision to pursue Jewish education.

Studying in Israel for a year helped me clarify that I wanted to pursue a career as a Jewish professional . . . improving the quality of Jewish life.

I think it was the people I met in Israel, charismatic, intellectual Jewish doers, who had the greatest impact on my decision to enroll in. . . .

I'm not sure if it was being in Israel, the country, or the people, that played the most significant role in my decision. But somehow, I don't think I would have made the decision in the same way if I would have been in the States.

Intensive study in Israel proved to me that I could do it. I felt confident, for the first time, in my ability to understand Jewish texts and teach Judaica.

## **2.4 Academic Performance**

Feistritzer (1986), in her comprehensive study of students enrolled in teacher education programs reported that education students, as compared to other graduate students, tend to be academically inferior, scoring below the 35th percentile on national test norms. Interviews with administration and faculty indicate that Jewish education students are by no means academically inferior and fall above the 60th percentile on standardized tests (GREs, MAT) when compared to other graduate students in the humanities. With respect to their academic performance, education students do as well or better than those enrolled in Jewish studies programs.

## **2.5 How Students Support Themselves**

Until recently, financing one's education in a Hebrew Teachers College was not considered a factor affecting student enrollment. In 1967, Ackerman reported that tuition costs in the teacher training institutions were nominal—ranging between \$5



and \$80 per credit. He commented "... no student will be denied the opportunity of studying because of his inability to pay the required tuition" (Ackerman, 1967, p. 51). To a large extent Ackerman was referring to full-time undergraduates and working teachers taking courses on a part-time basis. The realities of the 1980s present a different picture. Tuitions at the institutions studied are high (\$150- \$350 per credit). Depending on the particular school fees, a full-time student (12-15 credits per semester) can expect a tuition bill of \$3,600 to \$ 10,000 per year, exclusive of living expenses. Administrators know of several students who deferred admission or declined to come to the program because of its prohibitive costs. Some of the institutions do have small scholarships and a few fellowships are available. However, the majority of full-time students require financial aid in the form of government loans, which must be paid back once the student graduates. Full-time students take out loans ranging from \$2,000 to \$14,000 per year of study.

My wife and I are both students. When I complete my M.A. we will have between us \$45,000 in loans to pay back.

If I'm lucky I'll have a starting day school salary of \$22,000. I'll also have outstanding loans of \$18,000. Although I haven't graduated I'm beginning to get depressed about my ability to make ends meet.

The Wexner fellowships are great for those very few who are eligible. But for most of us there just isn't any scholarship money of significance.

Although I love school, I'm very angry that the Jewish community doesn't provide scholarship moneys for my schooling. It's just one more sign of the low priority Jewish education has on the community's agenda.

## 2.6 Summary

The profile of current students underscores the continuing changes within the institutions studied. In contrast to previous generations of students, they enter programs less Judaically knowledgeable, older, are interested in pursuing M.A. degrees as opposed to undergraduate degrees or teacher certification, come from different backgrounds and require significant financial aid in order to study full-time.

The findings raise a number of questions that require further investigation:

1. Given the student profiles, what are the best strategies for recruitment? What types of recruitment currently are most effective in attracting students?
2. What are those factors that deter people interested in graduate education training from entering Jewish education versus general education? Why is the field of Jewish education attracting relatively few graduates of day schools?

3. What are the most effective ways of preparing students with weak Judaica backgrounds? What role if any should an experience in Israel play in their education?
4. Do training programs affect the religious development of students?
5. What career paths do graduates of programs choose? How do graduates evaluate their training experiences?
6. How do the profiles of Jewish professionals in training, e.g., rabbinical students and communal service students, compare to graduate students in Jewish education?

---

### 3. Faculty Profile

---

Historically there have never been more than a handful of full-time Jewish education faculty members appointed to Jewish institutions of higher learning in North America. Most of those who taught education courses and had direct responsibilities for the preparation of teachers had rabbinical degrees and/or advanced degrees in the humanities.

For a variety of reasons education was not viewed as a rigorous discipline by (...). Although many of our students in the post-war years wanted to teach, the stress of the institution was on content—Judaica, text study. One could pick up techniques and methods the first or second year of teaching. It didn't make much sense to appoint a full-time educator to the faculty.

A glance at Table 3 shows that there are currently eighteen full-time faculty serving in departments or schools of Jewish education. They are full-time by virtue of having full-time academic appointments. However, only six have full-time teaching responsibilities. The other twelve, teach a partial load and assume significant administrative responsibilities. There are another 22 faculty who teach on a part-time basis and an additional 44 brought in on an adjunct basis.

The parallels between the field and academia are fascinating. The best teachers in the field last a year or two and then are pushed into administrative roles where many succeed but where an equal number fall prey to the Peter Principle. . . . In our departments of Jewish education the best pedagogues, teacher trainers, those who know the field, are generally assigned inordinate amounts of administrative responsibility and they are a real loss to the program. I also find they lose touch with the field and have a difficulty relating to students.

Part-time and adjunct faculty are generally recruited from schools and nearby institutions of higher learning. Many of the administrators interviewed are pleased that their respective institutions are able to attract the most prominent and knowledgeable academics and practitioners to teach a course or seminar.

In part our training program is superb because we can bring in local talent. The teaching stars from day schools, the resource people from the BJE and people like (...) and (...) from (...) University come to teach courses in special education and administration.

Having to rely extensively on part-time people, when we only have two full-timers of our own contributes to the sense that we aren't taken seriously in this institution. When I sit at faculty meetings it's clear that we are the only department where the part-time personnel outnumber the full-time faculty.

Full-time faculty have had their academic training in various areas. Eleven hold doctorates in education or allied fields (e.g., psychology, counselling); the others hold

doctorates in Judaica or the Humanities.<sup>8</sup> Seven of the eighteen are also ordained rabbis. All have had field experience in Jewish education prior to choosing an academic career path. This diverse group ranges in age from 40-60 with approximately 65% of the faculty under age 50. Salaries of faculty vary considerably from institution to institution. In the denominational and university setting, full-time instructional salaries range from \$26,000 to \$63,00 depending on rank and seniority. Among the independent community colleges salaries are appreciably lower, ranging from \$18,000-\$45,000 depending on rank and longevity. All administrators interviewed spoke of the need to increase faculty salaries to levels commensurate with comparable schools of higher learning. In some schools there are standing committees which keep abreast of university salary scales and inform administration and faculty of the relative standing of the institution.

Teaching loads vary considerably among the training institutions. In one institution full-time faculty members are expected to carry a load of six courses per term. At the other extreme, one institution requires full-time faculty to teach two courses per term. The average teaching load of faculty is 3.5 courses per semester.

Jewish educational faculty tend to publish articles but produce few books devoted to education. Unlike their colleagues in other departments, they engage in several forms of research having a direct bearing on Jewish education including curriculum development, working with schools, and special projects.

My colleagues in history and rabbinics have little understanding of educational research. Nor do they understand how Jewish education should relate to the institution as a whole. . . . Because the type of research we do is qualitatively different, we should be judged by a different set of criteria for promotion and tenure.

Attitudes reflected in the interviews of faculty and administrators correspond to the long-standing tensions between graduate programs and schools or departments of education in general universities (Clifford & Guthrie, 1988) which suggest deep biases concerning the role of research, the criteria for promotion and the seriousness of education courses.

Those interviewed have a variety of interests and belong to several different professional organizations. There is no one professional organization or conference which all attend. When presented with these data, a faculty member noted, "we are an interesting group of academicians but our diversity works against us in terms of becoming a professional group."

There was particular concern among several faculty about the need for educational research and the lack of support it receives from the community, foundations, and schools of higher learning.



(...) sends a mixed message about research in Jewish education. Lip service is given to its importance, but no significant financial support has come forth for educational research. Instead curricular projects, service projects, and in-service training take priority. Consequently education faculty, in contrast to my colleagues in other departments, are not really encouraged to engage in serious educational research projects.

### 3.1 Summary

The number of faculty members holding full-time positions in Jewish education is astonishingly small. They come from diverse backgrounds and training experiences, but all have had a long association with Jewish education. The interviews point to the need to increase the number of faculty in Jewish education if the field is to grow.

1. What strategies might be considered in order to increase the number of faculty?
2. What steps should be taken to improve the support of Jewish education faculty in the institutions of higher Jewish learning? What mechanisms or opportunities need to be developed to enable faculty to do more research? How can support and professional networks for faculty be built?
3. To what extent are the issues and concerns of faculties comparable to those in general education and those in Jewish studies? What motivates faculty to pursue academic careers in Jewish education?

---

## 4. Summary of Training Programs: Retrospect and Prospect

---

The patterns of training for Jewish education in North America reflect complex, diverse programs that cannot be easily reduced to a few categories or types. During the past two decades there has been a steady decline in the number of students choosing to major in Jewish education at the B.A. level, while there was a proliferation of M.A. level programs. Currently, there are 358 students enrolled in degree or teacher certification programs preparing for careers in Jewish education. Another 109 students are enrolled in post M.A. programs (doctoral or principal).

Students entering Jewish education programs come from varied backgrounds, they tend to be predominantly female, weaker than previous generations with respect to Judaica knowledge, highly motivated, and interested in pursuing a number of different career paths in Jewish education. The education faculties are exceedingly small. They are expected to function in a number of different arenas within the schools and few are able to devote sufficient time to research and training in Jewish education.

A number of specific questions and issues emerged from the analysis and discussion:

1. In order to meet the challenges of the next decade and chart a course of action, most of the institutions examined have or are currently conducting long-range planning studies. Their findings should provide data for better understanding their relative strengths and weaknesses, needs and resources. How might this information best be used in mapping out options for the training of Jewish educators?
2. Institutions fiercely want to maintain their autonomy and unique identity. Each needs to be understood within the context of its community, constituencies, and respective ideology. These realities require further exploration in order to understand how colleges might work together.
3. Despite their need for autonomy, Jewish institutions of higher learning are interested in working together. What mechanisms can be developed to facilitate collaboration among institutions? Is the AIHLJE (The Association for Institutions of Higher Learning for Jewish Education) a mechanism that will facilitate denominational, university, and independent programs in Jewish education to collaborate?

4. The articulation and maintenance of standards in the field of Jewish education is essential to its professionalization. Is it feasible and/or desirable to set national standards for the preparation of Jewish educators?
5. In what ways can each institution best serve Jewish education on a local, regional, national, and international level?
6. The recruitment and support of students is viewed as a primary factor in the shortage of personnel for Jewish education. Are trans-denominational recruitment efforts desirable and/or realistic? What new mechanisms or strategies for recruitment are the most appropriate for training institutions?
7. Financial resources are needed to support existing programs, develop new programs, hire additional faculty, attract students, and conduct research. What types of structures and strategies would enable all training institutions to share and distribute resources?
8. A profile of each institution detailing the way these factors affected their respective training programs would contribute to a better understanding of what supports and what hinders effective training of Jewish educators. Are these factors affected by the type and number of students and faculty? What role does the local Jewish community play in relation to these factors?
9. Given the complexity of the programs, which work best under what circumstances? What is the structure of good programs for training Jewish educators?

---

## 5. Alternative Training Programs

---

### 5.1 Short-Term Training Programs

In response to the shortage of qualified supplementary schools teachers (Bank & Aron, 1986), several communities have initiated short-term training programs for adults who may not have any formal training in education or Judaica. The investigator identified six communities (Long Island, Chicago, Pittsburgh, Providence, and Oakland) where Bureaus of Jewish Education, denominational agencies or federations have developed such programs. Approximately 80 students (90% female) are participating in these programs. They range in age from 21 to 65 years old and include university students, lawyers, public school teachers, social workers, home makers, and retired persons.

The programs characteristically consist of four, twelve-session courses over a one to two year period. Courses focus on Jewish thought, history, classical text study, and Hebrew language, and are taught by university or bureau instructors. Parallel to or upon completion of course work, students participate in a field experience. Chicago and Providence have instituted a mentor program where experienced teachers guide and work with trainees both in and outside of the classroom. Other communities have a more traditional supervised field experience.

The budgets of these programs provide stipends to both trainees and mentors (approximately \$150 per semester) and honoraria to the instructors. With the exception of Long Island, the local federation covers the costs of these programs, which are administered by the bureaus. Additional federations are planning to initiate similar programs in 1990-91. Short-term training programs are specifically designed for persons who are committed to Jewish education, desire part-time work, have little or no formal Jewish education training, and are highly motivated. No systematic follow-up studies have been reported that assess the effectiveness of these programs, but they have generated a good deal of enthusiasm and controversy. The instructors, trainees, and mentors are exceedingly enthusiastic about the programs.

*This program has been a very powerful experience for all concerned. The students are highly motivated and committed to Jewish education. It's refreshing to see bright, talented, energetic people become excited at the thought of teaching Hebrew school. For the mentors . . . it's given them new meaning in their work. They find that working with new teachers is stimulating and enriching. At the end of the program we all went on a weekend retreat where I observed the close bonds which had developed among program participants—it gives me hope about the future of Jewish education.*

On the other hand, administrators of training institutions have voiced their concern about the quality of the programs, the lack of standards, and the general "non-professional" tone of the programs.

Short-term training programs provide one strategy for dealing with the teacher shortage problem. However, follow-up studies are needed to determine their effectiveness. Are such programs effective for training teachers at all grade levels? Are there other training formats that might prove more effective, e.g., camp settings? How can established teacher training institutions contribute to these programs? What can be learned from alternative teacher training models in general education that may have application to short-term training programs for Jewish educators?

## **5.2 Senior Educator Programs**

Responding to the need for senior personnel in Jewish education, training initiatives based in Israel have taken a leading role in the preparation of mid-career Jewish educators who desire advanced preparation. The Jerusalem Fellows Program, an elite program for the training of Jewish leadership for education in the Diaspora, was established in 1981 by Bank Leumi and the Jewish Agency for Israel, and supported by public and private funding. It enables 12-18 educators to study intensively in Israel for periods of one to three years, engage in research, and participate in an international network of Jewish educational leadership. To date, 60 Fellows have completed the program and have assumed leadership positions in the Diaspora and Israel.

The Senior Educators Program at the Samuel Mendel Melton Centre of the Hebrew University, sponsored by the Jewish Agency for Israel and funded by public and private sources, selects approximately 20 Jewish educators each year from the Diaspora for graduate education study at the Hebrew University for one year. Graduates of the program return to school settings to teach or engage in administration. Approximately 100 educators have completed the program.

Although it is premature to assess the impact of these programs on the profession of Jewish education, they are perceived as generating excitement and confidence in the field. Many of those interviewed noted the value of these programs as models for advanced training in a pluralistic setting but also stressed the need to establish counterparts in North America, possibly in affiliation with the existing training institutions.

## **5.3 In-Service Training Programs**

Since the mid-1970s, in-service staff development programs have been implemented as a way of promoting professional growth and school improvement (Lieberman, 1982; Rand, 1979). Bureaus of Jewish Education, institutions of higher Jewish learning, and individual schools all conduct in-service activities, in which thousands of Jewish educators enroll each year. These programs vary with respect to their function, format and duration, content, participants, sponsors, and instructors.



*Function:* Most agencies and schools sponsor in-service activities as a way of providing professional growth for their staffs. Interviews with agency directors and principals suggest that the majority of educators employed in Jewish educational settings are required to participate in some form of in-service training on an annual basis. Administrators in particular view staff development as a way of promoting professionalism among staff.

A second function of in-service education is to train people in specific content or skill areas where personnel are needed. For instance, a number of bureaus have offered in-service programs to train individuals in special education, art education, values education, and family education. Most recently, some experimental work has been conducted in the area of retreats for Jewish educators. These in-service retreats are designed to promote personal and religious growth as they relate to one's role as an educator (Holtz & Rauch, 1987).

*Formats and duration:* The continuum of formats range from a single lecture to a year-long course. More intensive formats include three-week continuing education programs in Israel and multiple-day retreat programs. Although there have not been national surveys or studies of the quantity or quality of Jewish educational in-service programs, descriptions of programs (*Pedagogic Reporter*, JESNA) suggest that most in-service activities are short in duration and lack continuity. Many of those interviewed by the investigator were well aware of the shortcoming of their programs and the evaluation literature which cites the importance of duration and continuity for effectiveness (see Fullen, 1981; Lieberman, 1981).

Within (. . .), the only form of staff development we can provide consists of one-shot sessions. It's probably not very effective, in the long-term, even though the feedback is very good. . . . We just can't expect supplementary school teachers, who are part-time to begin with, to give of their time to participate in intensive staff development programs. On the other hand, if they would be willing, we don't have the financial resources to sponsor intensive programs.

One of the travesties in Jewish education is the use of the CAJE conference as the primary form of staff development in Jewish education. Unfortunately, I see more and more administrators and directors sending their staff members to CAJE and copping out on their responsibility to provide staff development programs. Don't misinterpret me, CAJE is great but it's being misused.

*Content:* The content for in-service education varies considerably as a function of the educational setting (e.g., informal education, day school) and practical considerations (e.g., budget, instructor availability). Perhaps more significant is the question of who determines the content of in-service education. Evaluation research findings point to the importance of the consumers, i.e., those receiving training, being invested and involved in determining the content and format of staff development programs (Lieberman, 1981). Within Jewish educational settings, as in general education, it is often the administrator or sponsoring agency who determines content without con-

sulting consumers. Consequently, there is often a feeling among Jewish educators that staff development programs are unresponsive to their needs, e.g., too theoretical, unrelated to what they are expected to do in the workplace (Davidson, 1982).

*Participants:* Most formal Jewish educational establishments mandate that all education staff participate in in-service activities on an annual basis. Bureau or agency directors view in-service days as opportunities to bring together personnel from all denominational backgrounds, educational settings, and age levels.

*Sponsors and Instructors:* Bureaus generally have personnel assigned to the coordination, planning, and execution of in-service education. All bureaus publish calendars or newsletters with schedules for in-service programs. A perusal of many such schedules suggests that, overall, programs are conducted by Jewish educators from within the system who have particular areas of expertise or by bureau personnel. Some of the larger bureaus also call upon experts from the university world.

In four communities, the bureaus have developed a special relationship with the independent colleges of Jewish studies. Teachers in Jewish educational settings affiliated with the bureau are encouraged to promote their own professional growth by taking courses at the Jewish institutions of higher learning. The teachers are given subventions by the the federation to pay for these courses. Approximately 250 teachers nation-wide receive subventions for enrollment in Jewish institutions of higher learning. In the majority of communities the institutions of higher learning do not work in a collaborative fashion with the bureaus and schools in providing in-service programs. One faculty member felt that the bureaus and schools tend to turn to secular schools and universities for "experts" before they approach the Jewish colleges.

Training institutions have also established branches and off-campus courses in areas which are far from their main campus. Branch programs serve both Jewish educators (in-service) and adults interested in studying Judaica.

Interview data and references to annual CAJE Conference (Reimer, 1986) suggest that it is viewed as a major center for in-service Jewish education. The 2,000 conference participants enroll in workshops, modules, and mini-courses focusing on all areas of Jewish life and education.

For the past several years, university-based programs in Israel (e.g., Samuel M. Melton Centre for Jewish Education in the Diaspora, Hebrew University) have offered summer institutes for Jewish educators. These institutes are intensive three-week seminars, held in Jerusalem, which focus on specific content areas: values education, Hebrew language, and the teaching of Israel. Teachers from all denominations have participated in these programs.

The denominational movements are also beginning to use Israel as a base for in-service educational programming. For example, the United Synagogue of America, in collaboration with the Jewish Theological Seminary and the Department of Torah Education and Culture of the WZO, has sponsored annual intensive winter workshops in Jerusalem focusing on the teaching of text, ideology, and values.

Yet another form of in-service education is sponsored by professional educational organizations of the denominations (The Jewish Educators Assembly, Conservative; National Association of Temple Educators, Reform; and The National Council of Torah Educators, Orthodox). These organizations sponsor national and regional conferences where workshops, modules, and mini-courses are offered.

The preceding superficial overview of in-service staff development in Jewish education illustrates its expansiveness and complexity. It is viewed by many in the field of Jewish education as the most dominant form of training, however, there is virtually no research to back this claim.

The interviews and documentation suggest that there are literally hundreds of opportunities for in-service and short-term training in North America and Israel. Accurate data concerning the number of participants, the overlap between programs, and their effectiveness is not available. A systematic study of in-service Jewish educational programs is needed to assess its current and potential impact on the professionalization of the field. Specific questions to be addressed include:

1. What is the scope and content of in-service Jewish education in North America? What are the costs of providing in-service programs? What is the effect of in-service education in different educational settings, i.e. informal, supplementary school, day school? What are the most effective formats for staff development programs within specific communities? Does in-service education contribute to the preparation of senior educators?
2. What role can Jewish institutions of higher learning play in providing staff-development programs? Do those who enroll in in-service courses at Jewish institutions of higher learning continue to study for degrees?
3. What unique benefits do in-service programs in Israel provide to North American Jewish educators?

---

## 6. Training Informal Jewish Educators

---

Whereas the boundaries between formal and informal Jewish education were once determined by setting, that is no longer the case (Reimer, 1989). Informal Jewish educational programming now occurs within the context of: camping, youth groups, community centers, schools and synagogues, adult study groups, college campuses, and museums. A theoretical analysis of the distinctions and commonalties between Jewish formal and informal education within the context of contemporary Jewish life would be most informative.

More germane to this study is the training of educators for informal Jewish education. There are no education programs at the training institutions studied specifically designed for preparing informal educators. However, many of the students interviewed indicated that they were planning careers in non-school settings as educators. The positions mentioned included family educators, adult educators, and out-reach. Moreover, faculty and administrators viewed informal education as a new and exciting frontier for Jewish educators. Statistics about the job placements of their graduates do not indicate how many do indeed enter informal education.

Given the lack of training programs, how are positions in informal Jewish education filled? Among the denominations, graduates of their respective training institutions are generally appointed to be camp directors, youth leaders, and adult education directors. They have degrees as rabbis, educators, and communal social service workers. Within the Jewish Community Center world there are a growing number of full-time positions in Jewish education. These positions are filled by rabbis, Ph.D.s in Judaica and persons holding M.S.W.s. Youth organizations such as Young Judea, B'nai Brith, and Hillel-JACY also tend to select graduates of rabbinical schools and schools of social work for their leadership positions for Jewish education.

Overall there is little contact between institutions of higher learning preparing Jewish educators and non-denominational programs where informal Jewish education is conducted. The lack of contact is coupled with ignorance and stereotypes about what the respective institutions do. (Exceptions to this rule are Brandeis University and Baltimore Hebrew University, which do collaborate with informal Jewish education programs.) However, there is clearly the desire of all concerned to learn more about each other and possibly work together.

The JWB, in response to the growing concern that its affiliated Jewish Community Centers lacked Jewish content, commissioned several studies over the years (JWB, 1948; 1968; 1982; 1984; 1988) addressing this issue. Its Mandate for Action (JWB, 1986) proposed upgrading professional staff through Jewish education, which led to the

development of a Jewish education guide (Chazan & Poupko, 1989); the initiation of staff development programs based in Israel; and the appointment of Jewish educators in JCCs.

An emphasis on staff development, i.e. involving JCC personnel in intensive Jewish content programs, may be an effective mode of training for informal education personnel.<sup>9</sup> Data were not available on the extent and nature of staff development programs for youth groups, family educators, etc.

In sum, the training of informal Jewish educators has not been systematically studied. It is not known how many personnel are involved, where they are trained, and who they are with respect to their Jewish and educational backgrounds. There is a good deal of interest on the part of Jewish institutions of higher learning to play a more active role in the preparation of informal Jewish educators. Similarly, service agencies such as community centers are interested in learning what these institutions can offer.

We haven't begun to explore the possibilities in informal education. We have some of the most sophisticated programs and systems in camping and adult education in both denominational and non-denominational settings. But the links between the formal and informal are non-existent.

We have young talented students who want to enter this area and there is a need for trained personnel. The appropriate structures may not be in place, but overall I'm very optimistic that we all can work together.

## Notes

- 1 Throughout this paper the terms training and preparation will be used interchangeably when referring to the preparation of educators.
- 2 Personnel working in informal Jewish education seem to be prepared as formal Jewish educators, as Jewish communal workers, or in general areas of social service and education (Reisman, 1988). There are no training programs known to the investigator whose primary purpose is to prepare informal Jewish educators. For a fuller discussion, see section 6.
- 3 Depending on their availability, personnel associated with the Jewish Community Center, Bureau of Jewish Education and Jewish Federation were interviewed.
- 4 According to Sherwin (1987, p. 97), Magnus and his colleagues viewed Jewish education as a means for achieving Jewish group survival in an American environment and religious training aimed at the transmission of Jewish morals. Magnus made a direct link between the role of Jewish education and good American citizenship.
- 5 Gratz College, 1897  
Teachers Institute, Jewish Theological Seminary of America, 1909  
Teachers Institute, Yeshiva University, 1917  
Baltimore Hebrew Teachers College, 1919  
Hebrew Teachers College of Boston, 1921  
Herzliah Hebrew Teachers Institute, 1923  
College of Jewish Studies, Chicago, 1926  
Hebrew Teachers Training School for Girls, Yeshiva University, 1928  
Teachers Institute of the University of Judaism, 1947  
Stern College for Women, Yeshiva University, 1954  
Cleveland Teachers College, 1952
- 6 Because of the small numbers of institutions and training programs and the numerous differences among them, a typology for understanding their differences and commonalties is not feasible. In general teacher education, such typologies have been most helpful in developing a conceptual and practical understanding of teacher training programs (see Feinman-Nemser, 1989).



- 7 Students entering pre-service programs in general teacher education institutions have usually never had a paid teaching experience. This is a basic premise of pre-service programs, i.e., those entering have not had teaching experience. In Jewish education training programs virtually all students have taught in some Jewish educational setting or are engaged as Jewish educators, while enrolled in a graduate education program. It follows that general and Jewish education training programs are based on different premises with respect to the "pre-service" aspect of the students' experience.
- 8 The faculty who hold doctorates in education, on the whole, have done their academic training in the philosophy of education. There are no faculty who have concentrated on curriculum development, and very few who have a background in the social sciences.
- 9 In 1989, 565 lay people, staff and administrators from 20 Jewish community centers participated in staff development seminars held in Israel.

**Table 1**

**Institutions of Higher Learning Granting Jewish Education Degrees and Certificates**

<i>Institution</i>	<i>B.A.</i>	<i>Teacher Cert.</i>	<i>M.A.</i>	<i>Principal Cert.</i>	<i>Doctorate</i>
1. Baltimore Hebrew University	Yes	Yes	Yes		
2. Brandeis University Hornstein Program			Yes		
3. Cleveland College of Jewish Studies	Yes	Yes	Yes		
4. George Washington University/B.J.E.			Yes		
5. Gratz College	Yes	Yes	Yes		
6. Hebrew Union College, L.A.			Yes	Yes	Yes
Hebrew Union College, N.Y.			Yes		
7. Hebrew College Boston	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	
8. Jewish Theological Seminary	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
9. Midrasha Toronto		Yes			
10. McGill University		Yes	Yes		
11. Spertus College		Yes	Yes		
12. University of Judaism		Yes	Yes		
13. Yeshiva University Stern College	Yes	Yes			
Breuer College	Yes	Yes			
Azielli Institute			Yes	Yes	Yes
14. York University	Yes	Yes	Yes		

**Table 2**

**Enrolled and Graduating Jewish Education Students from Institutions of Higher Learning**

<b>Degrees or Certificates</b>	<b><i>Currently Enrolled Students</i></b>	<b><i>Number of 1989 Graduates</i></b>	<b><i>Total Number of Students</i></b>
B.A.	68	21	89
Teacher Certification	43	n.a.	n.a.
M.A.		62*	247
Full-time	76		
Part-time	171		(358)**
Principal Certification	42	10	52
Doctorate	67	7	74

\* Data giving the number of part-time and full-time M.A. graduating students were not available. A total of 62 students received M.A. degrees.

\*\* Total number of pre-doctoral students (M.A. students, B.A. students, Teacher certificate program students).

**Table 3**

**Distribution of Jewish Education Faculty in Institutions of Higher Learning**

Full-time Faculty	18
Part-time Faculty	22
Adjunct Faculty	44

## Appendix A

### Semi-structured Interview Schedule

#### *Introduction*

The purpose of the research; the purpose of the Commission.

#### *Setting and Context*

I've read and heard a good deal about your institution. Before we focus on education, I'd like to get a general sense of it. Within an historical context, what is its current direction and status? What lies ahead? Let's focus a bit on the current structure of the institution: relationship to other institutions, e.g., federation, universities, BJE....

#### *Students*

Who are the students attending the institution? Have there been recent changes in the profiles of your students? How are students recruited? What type of students would you like to attract in the future? What implications does this have for the curriculum, structure, etc.?

#### *Faculty*

In examining your bulletin, I noticed that you list faculty for education schools or departments. Would you please tell me about the school's faculty, the department's faculty? What constitutes a full-time faculty load? Who are your full-time faculty? Who are the part-time and adjunct faculty? What challenges do you see, from your perspective, with respect to education faculty? Please describe the tenure process in your institution. What place does research have in the lives of faculty? Who are the faculty in education? What are their responsibilities?

#### *Salaries*

We're going to move on now to another area — salaries. How would you describe the salaries of your faculty? How do faculty salaries in your institution compare to those of other institutions (locally, nationally)? What fringe benefits do faculty receive?

#### *Education Programs*

As I indicated to you earlier in our discussion, I'm primarily interested in the education programs you offer. Before we speak specifically about teacher training, would you please describe any programs you feel fall under the rubric of education. What

programs does the institution offer that ostensibly prepares or trains educators? How do you view the purpose of training Jewish educators? What are the needs of the education programs?

### *Visions and Dreams*

If major funding became available in the near future specifically earmarked for education projects, what would be your wish list?

## Appendix B

### Accreditation and Institutions of Higher Jewish Learning

Historically, four types of accreditation were sought in order to certify the quality of the programs as meeting certain standards.

1. All of the training institutions have authority through their respective state's Departments of Education to grant degrees. The areas state officials examine include: faculty, library facilities, admissions standards, the adequacy of course hours, and appropriate curricula. Obtaining state certification involved submitting required documentation and a site visit by department officials.
2. Regional accrediting associations such as Middle State Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools, the North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools and the Western College Association attempt to strengthen and increase the effectiveness of higher education. They do not grant permanent accreditation but review each institution once every ten years. As part of the review process institutions are required to conduct an extensive self-study.
3. The Iggud Batey Midrash le-Morim (Association of Hebrew Teachers Colleges) was founded in 1951 as the accrediting body for Hebrew Teachers Colleges. While requiring less elaborate procedures than state or regional accrediting associations, it aimed to assure the quality of Hebrew Teachers Colleges. The Iggud ceased to be a functioning organization in the early 1980s.
4. The National Board of License for Teachers and Supervisory Personnel in American Jewish Schools (NBL) was established in the 1940s to examine the qualifications of Hebrew teachers. According to an agreement between the Iggud and NBL (1955), any graduate of an Iggud affiliated Hebrew Teachers College will be automatically eligible to receive a Hebrew teachers license upon application to the NBL.

In 1986 the Association for Jewish Institutions of Higher Learning for Jewish Education (AJIHLJE) was established as an umbrella organization for North American institutions preparing Jewish educators. The NBL is in the process of determining whether to automatically award a teaching license to graduates of AJIHLJE affiliated schools who apply.



Members of AJIHLJE are:

Baltimore Hebrew University, Brandeis University, Cleveland College of Jewish Studies, Hebrew Union College, Gratz College, Hebrew College, Jewish Theological Seminary, McGill University, Spertus College of Judaica, Yeshiva University, University of Judaism.

## References

- Ackerman, W. (1967). "A profile of Hebrew Teachers Colleges." In O. Janowsky (Ed.), *The Education of American Jewish Teachers*, pp. 41-61. Boston, MA: Beacon Press.
- Aron, I. (1990). *Toward the Professionalization of Jewish Teaching*. Commission on Jewish Education in North America.
- Bank, A. & Aron, I. (1987). "Dealing with the shortage of teachers." In J. Reimer (Ed.), *To Build a Profession: Careers in Jewish Education*. Waltham, MA: The Hornstein Program in Jewish Communal Service, Brandeis University.
- CAJE (1989). "Professionalizing Jewish education," *Jewish Education News*. N.Y., NY: Coalition for the Advancement of Jewish Education.
- Carnegie Task Force on Teaching as a Profession (1986). *A Nation Prepared: Teachers for the Twenty-First Century*. N.Y., NY: Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy.
- Chazan, B. & Poupko, Y. (1989). *Guide to Jewish Knowledge for the Center Professional*. N.Y., NY: JWB.
- Clifford, C.J. & Guthrie, J.W. (1988). *Ed School*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Cutter, W. (1974). *Jewish Education*, 3, 7-11.
- Davidson, A. (1982). *Collaboration for School Improvement: Charles E. Smith Jewish Day School Staff Development Program* (Evaluation Report). N.Y., NY: Jewish Theological Seminary of America.
- Ettenberg, S.C. & Rosenfield, G. (Eds.) (1989). *The Ramah Experience: Community and Commitment*. N.Y., NY: Jewish Theological Seminary & National Ramah Commission.
- Feinman-Nemser, S. (1980). *Teacher Preparation: Structural and Conceptual Alternatives (Issue Paper 89-5)*. East Lansing, MI: The National Center for Research on Teachers Education, Michigan State University.
- Feistritzer, E. (1984). *The Making of a Teacher: A Report on Teacher Education and Certification*. Washington, D.C.: National Center for Education Information.
- Feistritzer, E. (1986). *Profile of Teachers in the U.S.* Washington, D.C.: National Center for Education Information.
- Fullan, M. (1982). *The Meaning of Educational Change*. N.Y., NY: Teachers College Press.
- Hochstein, A. (1986). *Senior Personnel for Jewish Education: Progress Report*. Jerusalem, Israel: The Jewish Education Committee of the Jewish Agency.

- Holmes Group (1986). *Tomorrow's Teachers: A Report of the Holmes Group*. East Lansing, MI.
- Holtz, B. & Rauch, E. (1986). "Education for change: toward a model of Jewish teacher education." In J. Aviad (Ed.), *Studies in Jewish Education*, Vol. 3. Jerusalem, Israel: Magnes Press.
- Honor, L. (1935). "Comparative study of Hebrew teacher training schools in the United States," *Jewish Education*, 2, pp. 71-90.
- Hurwich, L. (1949). "Survey of Hebrew Teacher Colleges in the United States," *Jewish Education*, 1-2, pp. 73-96.
- Janowsky, O. (1967). "The education of American Jewish teachers: pattern and prospect. In O. Janowsky (Ed.), *The Education of American Jewish Teachers*, pp. 317-347. N.Y., NY: Beacon Press.
- JWB (1984). *Maximizing Jewish Educational Effectiveness of Jewish Community Centers*. N.Y., NY: JWB.
- JWB (1986). *Mandate for Action—Final Report to the JWB Board of Directors of the Committee on Implementation*. N.Y., NY: JWB.
- Kaplan, M. & Crossman (1949). "The Kaplan-Crossman Report," *Jewish Education*, 3, pp. 113-116.
- Lieberman, A. & Miller, L. (Eds.) (1978). *Staff Development: New Demands, New Realities, New Perspectives*. N.Y., NY: Teachers College Press.
- Lukinsky, J. (1974). "The education program at the Jewish Theological Seminary—basic distinctive assumptions," *Jewish Education*, 3, pp. 11-14.
- Mirsky, D. (1981). *Report on Hebrew Teacher-Preparation Programs in Member Institutions*. N.Y., NY: Council on Hebrew Teacher Colleges in America.
- Margolis, I. (1964). *Jewish Teacher Training Schools in the United States*. N.Y., NY: National Council for Torah Education of Mizrachi-Hapoel Hamizrachi.
- National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (1989). *Toward High and Rigorous Standards for the Teaching Profession*. Washington, D.C.: National Board for Professional Teaching Standards.
- Rand Corporation (1978). P. Berman & M. McLaughlin, "A model for educational change," *Federal Programs Supporting Educational Change*, Vol. 4. Santa Monica, CA: Rand Corporation.
- Reimer, J. (1989). "Changing educational strategies in Ramah." In S. Ettenberg & G. Rosenfield (Eds.), *The Ramah Experience*, pp. 57-63. N.Y., NY: Jewish Theological Seminary & the National Ramah Commission.
- Reisman, B. (1988). *Social Change and Response—Assessing the Efforts to Maximize Jewish Educational Effectiveness in Jewish Community Centers in North America*. N.Y., NY: JWB.

- Schiff, A. (1967). "The students of the Hebrew teachers colleges." In O. Janowsky (Ed.), *The Education of American Jewish Teachers*, pp. 83-111. N.Y., NY: Beacon Press.
- Schiff, A. (1974). "Overview of programs for the preparation of Jewish educational personnel," *Jewish Education*, 3, pp. 5-7.
- Sherwin, B. (1987). *Contexts and Content: Higher Jewish Education in the United States*. Chicago, IL: Spertus College of Jewish Studies.
- Shevitz, S. (1988). *Field Work Guide for the Jewish Education Concentration*. Waltham, MA: Benjamin B. Hornstein Program in Jewish Communal Service, Brandeis University.
- Wachs, S. (1974). "The Phillip W. Lown Graduate Center for Contemporary Jewish Studies," *Jewish Education*, 3, pp. 14-21.
- Woolfolk, A. (1988). "Graduate preparation of teachers: The debate and beyond." In A. Woolfolk (Ed.), *Research Perspectives on Graduate Preparation of Teachers*, pp. 11-47. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Zeichner, K. (1988). *Understanding the Character and Quality of the Academic and Professional Components of Teacher Education* (Research Report 88-1). East Lansing, MI: The National Center for Research on Teacher Education, Michigan State University.

The Preparation of Jewish Educators in  
North America: A Research Study

A Research Study prepared for the  
Commission on Jewish Education in North America

January 22, 1990

Aryeh Davidson, P.hD.  
Jewish Theological Seminary of America

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

RESEARCH QUESTIONS

METHODOLOGY

DATA ANALYSIS

LIMITATION OF THE STUDY

BACKGROUND: THE CONTEXT FOR JEWISH EDUCATOR TRAINING PROGRAMS

THE CURRENT PICTURE

### 1. TRAINING PROGRAMS

- 1.1 B.A. programs
- 1.2 M.A. programs
  - 1.21 Program philosophies and goals
  - 1.22 Program standards
  - 1.23 Program curricula
  - 1.24 Part-time/full-time students
- 1.3 Doctoral programs
- 1.4 Administrative certification programs
- 1.5 Special programs

### 2. STUDENT PROFILE

- 2.1 Demographic factors
- 2.2 Jewish educational background
- 2.3 Motivation to pursue careers in Jewish education
- 2.4 Academic performance
- 2.5 How students support themselves
- 2.6 Summary statement

### 3. FACULTY PROFILE

- 3.1 Summary statement

### 4. SUMMARY - TRAINING PROGRAMS, RETROSPECT AND PROSPECT

### 5. ALTERNATIVE TRAINING PROGRAMS

- 5.1 Short-term training programs
- 5.2 In-service training programs
- 5.3 Training informal educators

### FOOTNOTES

#### TABLES

- Table 1- Institutions of Higher Learning Granting Education Degrees and Certificates
- Table 2- Currently Enrolled and Graduating Jewish Education Students from Institutions of Higher Learning
- Table 3- Distribution of Jewish Education Faculty in Institutions of Higher Learning

### APPENDIXES

- Appendix A Semi-structured Interview Schedule
- Appendix B Accreditation and Jewish Institutions of Higher Learning

### REFERENCES



## INTRODUCTION

The preparation of Jewish educators, perhaps more than any other area of Jewish education, reflects the complexity of issues, problems and needs confronting the future of Jewish education in North America. The recruitment of students, the development of appropriate training programs, the placement of graduates, the preparation of prospective faculty, the professionalization of the field, the relationships among the academy, the community and the school, are all issues that embody many of the challenges for Jewish education in the 1990's.

Recognizing the centrality of these issues, the Commission for Jewish Education in North America commissioned this study to assess the nature and scope of the training of Jewish educators in institutions of higher learning in North America.<sup>1</sup> Although Jewish educators are currently associated with both formal and informal educational settings (Hochstein, 1986; Ettenberg & Rosenfeld, 1988; Reissman, 1988), Jewish institutions of higher learning almost exclusively train personnel for formal settings, i.e., there are no institutions of higher learning that specifically train students for work in informal education.<sup>2</sup> Consequently this study primarily focuses on the training of those entering and engaged in formal Jewish education.

## RESEARCH QUESTIONS

The study was designed with the input of the staff of the Commission to examine four areas in depth:

1. The nature and scope of training -- What institutions of higher learning are preparing personnel for Jewish education? How do these institutions perceive their mission vis-a-vis Jewish education? What are the funding patterns for these programs? What is the range of educational preparation programs offered by these institutions?
2. A profile of those students studying to become Jewish educators How many students are being trained to become Jewish educators? What motivates students to pursue training in Jewish education? How much does it cost to complete one's training as a Jewish educator?
3. A profile of faculty engaged in preparing future Jewish educators -- How many faculty members prepare Jewish educational personnel and who are they?
4. The identification of issues and problems confronting Jewish institutions of higher learning -- What do these institutions see as the issues and roles they will confront in the next decade? Are the issues confronting these institutions comparable to those in general education?

Some attention will also be given to identifying issues relating to the preparation of Jewish educators serving in informal Jewish

educational settings.

## METHODOLOGY

Initially, school bulletins, program descriptions and published and unpublished reports were examined in order to identify historical and current problems and issues confronting these institutions. For each institution, a series of on-site interviews were then conducted with individuals involved with the training of Jewish educators. Appendix A contains the semi-structured interview schedule that guided each interview.

## DATA ANALYSIS

Qualitative analysis will identify the problems and issues relating to the training of Jewish educators that emerged from the interview data, relating them to previous research findings from Jewish and general education. Analysis of quantitative data, where available and appropriate, will describe the distribution of students, faculty members, and training programs.

## LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

There are limitations on the comprehensiveness of this study and the conclusions that may be drawn from it due to the following:

1. The narrow time frame and limited budget required reliance on existing available data, which is incomplete;
2. The promise and need for confidentiality for interviews and individual institutional identity. No detailed profiles of individual institutions appear in this study. The data are reported and discussed in aggregate form, and the discussion presents an overview of the field and those issues relating to all training institutions.

## BACKGROUND: The historical context

From 1870 onward, Jewish leaders such as Kaplan, Magnus, and Benderly (Kaplan & Crossman, 1949; Margolis, 1968; Sherwin, 1987), and the organized Jewish community, were concerned with the education of large immigrant Jewish populations. They worked towards establishing teacher training institutions in large urban areas to prepare a generation of Hebrew teachers particularly suited for educating American Jewish youth on the elementary and high school levels.<sup>3</sup> Between 1897 and 1954 eleven such institutions were established.<sup>4</sup>

Although some were established as community institutions and others were denominational, differences in ideology and orientation did not prevent them from being perceived as having as their primary function the training of Hebrew teachers, thereby ensuring continuity from one generation to the next (Honor, 1935; Hurwich, 1949). When Leo Honor (1935), examined the curricula of eight Hebrew Teachers Colleges he found them to share three

characteristics: an emphasis on the study of classical Jewish texts; Hebrew language /cultural Zionism and the assumption of additional functions beyond their original mission of training Hebrew teachers. The additional functions included adult education, advanced Hebrew studies, and the training of Sunday School teachers.

Fourteen years after Honor's study, Hurwich (1949) reported that the Hebrew Teachers Colleges were moving further away from their mission of training Hebrew teachers. He found that only 20 to 25 percent of the annual need for new teachers was met by the training institutions. Moreover, the schools actively encouraged students to pursue a full course of study in secular colleges, leading to professional careers other than Hebrew teaching.

In the years that followed, these institutions continued to expand their course offerings and programs to meet the broad Jewish educational needs of the community. Several established joint degree programs with secular colleges and universities (e.g., Jewish Theological Seminary and Columbia University; Spertus College of Jewish Studies and Roosevelt University; Gratz College and Temple University). New programs in Judaic studies, Jewish communal service, adult education and high school education programs were also established under the sponsorship of these institutions of higher learning. When Mirsky (1981) examined the eleven accredited institutions that constituted the Iggud Batay Midrashot (Association of Hebrew Teachers Colleges, refer to Appendix B), he reported that all but one had removed "Teachers" from its name and that Hebrew, as the language of instruction, was used in only 20% of the courses.

Over a seventy year period the Hebrew Teachers Colleges, institutions originally established for the sole purpose of preparing Hebrew teachers, began to expand their roles within the Jewish community and focus less on the training of Jewish educators. They currently have thousands of students enrolled in adult education courses, in-service education courses and secondary level programs. A perusal of their course bulletins shows that they offer a variety of degrees in Judaica liberal arts, social service, and administration. However, this shift in mission should not be misinterpreted as abandonment of teacher training. These bulletins also describe graduate departments, and in some instances schools, devoted to Jewish education and offering programs in teacher training and educational leadership.

#### THE CURRENT PICTURE

There are currently fourteen Jewish institutions of higher learning offering programs for the preparation of Jewish educators. Between September 15 and November 20, 1989, the investigator visited eleven of these institutions. These visits consisted of a tour of the facilities and meeting with various administrators, faculty and students. Where possible, personnel involved with the community were also interviewed. A total of 70 one to two and one-half hour interviews were conducted with college and other personnel.

Seventy-three students participated in group and individual meetings led by the investigator at the training institutions.

These institutions fall into three categories: 1) Independent community colleges established by the Jewish Community; 2) Denominational schools established by religious movements as part of their respective seminaries; 3) University-based programs established by the community and/or individuals within the framework of a general university.

#### Independent community based colleges

Gratz College, Philadelphia  
Baltimore Hebrew University  
Spertus College of Jewish Studies, Chicago  
Cleveland College of Jewish Studies  
Hebrew College, Boston  
Midrash (Teacher Training Institute), Toronto

#### Denominational schools

Hebrew Union College - Rhea Hirsch School of Education, Los Angeles  
The School of Education, New York  
Jewish Theological Seminary of America, Graduate School, Department  
of Jewish Education, New York  
Yeshiva University, New York-Azrieli Graduate Institute  
Isaac Breuer College  
Stern College  
University of Judaism, Fingerhut School of Education, Los Angeles

#### University-based programs

Brandeis University, Hornstein Program for Jewish Communal Service  
George Washington University, School of Education (in association with  
the College of Jewish Studies), Washington, D.C.  
York University, Department of Jewish Studies, Toronto  
McGill University, Department of Judaic Studies, Montreal

Before addressing the major questions of the research relating to the Jewish education training components of the institutions, some general findings, resulting from the site visits, will be presented.

#### Physical plants

The facilities of each institution are comfortable, well maintained and generally perceived by school personnel and students as providing adequate space. Both the denominational and university-based programs provide housing for students, whereas none of the independent community colleges have housing facilities. Each institution has a library of Judaica, including an education collection, which meets the standards of the respective regional accrediting associations for institutions of higher learning.

## Funding

The operating budgets of the institutions vary significantly. The independent community colleges report budgets ranging from approximately \$ 400,000 to \$2,000,000. Income is generated through tuition, gifts and local federations, which contribute between 20-90% of the budget. It is difficult to assess what percentage of the total budgets of the denominational and university based schools are allocated for their training programs. Their income is generated through tuition, relatively small endowments, grants and fundraising. None of the Denominational institutions are not eligible for Jewish community (e.g., federation) funding because of their sectarian status. University based programs, in contrast, do receive considerable community support in the form of federation allocations, grants and tuition subventions.

## Governance

All of the institutions have independent Boards of Trustees. The amount of authority and control a board exerts is contingent on the status of the institution ( university-based, denominational, independent community) and its dependence on the federation. All independent community schools must have their budgets approved by the federation and are included in the long-range planning activities of the federation. University-based programs often have rather complicated relationships with their respective federations and departments of Jewish studies.

## Accreditation

The institutions listed in Table 1, all have some form of state (U.S.) or provincial (Canada) accreditation. Most are also accredited by regional accrediting associations and accepted by the NBL as institutions preparing educators for Jewish schools. (Appendix B, provides a description of each type of accreditation.)

## Mission

Examination of the mission statements of the respective institutions and the interview data indicate that the institutions share common goals in the following areas:

1. The preservation and perpetuation of Jewish culture
2. The preparation of Jewish professionals
3. The support and promotion of Jewish scholarship

Independent community colleges, in addition to supporting these goals, stress their commitment to serving the needs of their respective local communities through various forms of outreach and direct service, including secondary school Jewish education, inservice teacher education programs and adult education programs.

The denominational schools, by virtue of their ideological affiliation, emphasize their commitment to the specific needs of their religious movements through programs, outreach and

scholarship. They also view themselves as serving the needs of national and international constituencies.

The missions of university-based programs focus on the preparation of educators and communal professionals uniquely trained to serve Jewish communities. They stress an interdisciplinary approach to training and scholarship, as part of a university and a pluralistic attitude towards developing leadership.

#### Programs and activities

Although a profile of each school's program activities is beyond the scope of the present study, each institution sponsors programs in some or all of the following areas:

Training programs: Pre-service and in-service programs are designed to prepare and provide continuing education to rabbis, Jewish communal service workers, cantors and Jewish educators,

Jewish Studies programs: Academic degree programs in Judaica,

Adult education: Courses, lectures, workshops and retreats designed for local and regional Jewish communities,

Secondary level supplementary schools: intensive Jewish studies programs designed for motivated adolescents,

Special projects: Museum programs, joint programs with universities, library training workshops and research institutes,



## 1. TRAINING PROGRAMS

As indicated above, each of the institutions offers programs to prepare Jewish educators, but the type and orientation of the programs differ significantly, depending on the particular degree and institution. Table 1 lists the training institutions and the various programs they offer in Jewish education. Most offer degree programs at the B.A. and M.A. levels. A growing number are also beginning to offer advanced degrees (doctorates) and principal certification. After each degree program is examined, the common issues confronting training institutions will be reviewed. However, since most students are involved in M.A. degree programs, this section has a more extensive discussion.

### 1.1 B.A. level programs

Those institutions which offer a concentration or major in Jewish education are listed in the column marked B.A. level (Table 1). These programs by and large conform to the requirements of the NBL (National Board of License for Teachers and Supervisory Personnel in American Jewish Schools) for licensing teachers at the elementary and secondary level. Requirements include 42 credits of of Judaica (Bible, literature, history, customs and prayer); Hebrew language proficiency; 18 credits in Jewish Education including a student teaching experience. To be eligible for licensing, students must also earn 90 points of credit in the liberal arts and education from a secular college or university. As indicated in Table 1 only the denominational and community based colleges offer B.A. level programs or certification programs.

There are a total of 68 (Table 1) students currently enrolled in B.A. degree programs who major or concentrate in Jewish education. Although, accurate comparisons with previous enrollment figures are not available, it is clear that there has been a steady decline in the number of B.A. education majors over the past twenty years (Mirsky, 1981; Schiff, 1974). Declining education enrollments at the B.A. level have also been reported for secular colleges and universities. They are attributed in part to poor salaries and the low status of the teaching profession (Carnegie Forum, 1986; Feistritzer, 1984). Aside from these factors Jewish institutions of higher learning are encouraging students considering careers in education to complete a liberal arts education and then pursue an M.A. in Jewish education.

In response to your question, we are trying to phase out the B.A. major in Jewish education at \_\_\_\_\_ in Jewish education. In order to professionalize the field we need educators with graduate degrees..... It also doesn't make sense for us to place undergraduates in the same courses with graduate students. We don't have the budget

to run parallel courses at the B. A. and M.A. levels.

Most of the institutions listed in Table 1 and all of the Canadian based programs, offer courses on the undergraduate level to meet NBL teacher license requirements. Forty-three students are enrolled in teacher certification programs ( refer to Table 2) as non-matriculating students. They generally enroll in the school for the requisite 18 credits in Jewish education courses and take Judaica courses in other institutions. Several interviewees felt this approach to teacher certification worked against the professionalization of the field.

Students who come here to take a few courses in education, may not even be acceptable candidates for our degree programs. Since they are here as non-matriculating students we aren't supporting their candidacy for a license , we's just letting them take courses. We need to rethink, on a national level, the whole area of teacher certification.

#### 1.2 M.A. program

The M.A. program has become the primary vehicle for preparing Jewish educators in North America. With the exception of the undergraduate colleges and the Toronto Midrasha, all institutions now offer an M.A. in Jewish education. Most Jewish education programs are registered by their respective State Departments of education as part of the institution's graduate school of Judaica., Consequently, a student enrolled in an M.A. program in Jewish education will also need to meet the requirements of the particular graduate division of the school. All students receiving M.A. degrees in Jewish education from an accredited institution are automatically eligible for a teaching license from the NBL (refer to Appendix B).

The majority of programs make provisions for both full and part-time study. The exceptions, Brandies, HUC, Los Angeles and the University of Judaism, will only accept full-time students. Full-time students complete the program in two to three years, depending on their background and the program . Part-time students take between three to five years for completion of the degree. As indicated in Table 2, in June, 1989, 62 students received M.A. degrees in Jewish education. Of those approximately 40 were full-time students and 22 attended part-time.

The M.A. programs differ substantially from each other in numerous ways. Unfortunately, these differences cannot be easily classified into a typology 6 and a detailed analysis of each program is beyond the scope of this study. Despite these differences, the data analyses indicate that there are several foci or issues around which programs may be better understood and discussed. Three such issues emerging from the data, which also have relevance to the literature

on teacher training, are the programs' philosophical orientation, standards and curricula.

#### 1.21 Program philosophies and goals

The various programs reflect different educational philosophies and models of teacher training. At a symposium entitled - New Models for Preparing Personnel for Jewish Education ( Jewish Education, 1974), leading Jewish educational thinkers discussed their respective programs. Three distinctive models of training were discussed:

##### 1) Generalist

The educator prepared as the generalist (Cutter, 1974) should be familiar with classical texts, fluent in Hebrew, knowledgeable about the worlds of both Jewish and general education, have experience in curriculum writing, teaching and supervision. The generalist is prepared to serve as both a resource to the Jewish educational community and a leader in a variety of settings including the Congregational school, the day school, the bureaus of Jewish education, JCC and camps.

##### 2) Critical translator

Lukinsky ( Lukinsky,1974), discussing the program at the Jewish Theological Seminary, decribed a model or approach to training that emphasizes Jewish scholarship and its translation to the classroom; provides educational experiences that stress struggling with real problems in our world; and prepares Jewish educators to think critically.

##### 3) Reflective educator

The model developed at Brandeis University described by Wachs (Wachs, 1974) and elaborated by Shevitz (Shevitz, 1988), underscored the training of the Jewish educator through self-awareness and reflection; socialization within a community of faculty and students; focused field experiences in the Jewish community; and the development of professional competence.

##### 4) Practitioner

A fourth model, not addressed in the symposium but clearly reflected in the literature of several of the institutions under study focuses on preparing the practitioner -- a Jewish educator committed to and expert in the art and science of teaching.

These four models: the generalist, the critical translator, the reflective educator and the practioner, are not pure models in theory or practice. However each, by virture of providing a vision and model of the Jewish educator, guides the preparation of educators, provides direction to students and faculty and helps to inform the Jewish community of the purpose and goals of Jewish education. Implicit in each model is the notion of the Jewish educator as a religious educator, however, this emphasis varies depending on the institution and its ideological orientation.

In reality, few of the schools preparing educators have clearly articulated a philosophy of Jewish teacher education. Many of the programs refer to themselves as eclectic borrowing, combining and applying concepts from a number of areas. However, it is questionable to what extent this eclecticism has been integrated into a Jewish philosophy of education.

There is a clear and burning need for classroom teachers, persons who are grounded in the study of text and fluent Hebrew speakers. Theories and philosophies aren't all that helpful when fires need to be put out...Quite honestly, developing a clear philosophy is a luxury we can't afford at this time.

We (students) often sit around talking about the lack of direction in our program. Some of the courses are excellent but the parts don't hold together. I couldn't tell you what the philosophy of this program is.

We've prided ourselves on the development of a clear statement of what kind of educators we want to prepare at \_\_\_\_\_. But, it's required an inordinate amount of work on the part of faculty and administration. We spend three hours per week in weekly meetings to discuss goals, philosophy and the more mundane stuff.

These quotes, from the investigator's interviews, capture some of the problems and issues training programs face in relationship to the development of a program philosophy. Most programs just do not have the resources, with respect to time and personnel, to do the needed work in this area. Many interviewees observed that when there is a lack of vision and guiding philosophy of training, all aspects of the program suffer and contribute to the sense that Jewish education is not a real profession.

In the general world of education a good deal of attention is being focused on Commissions (Carnegie Forum, 1986; Holmes Group, 1986) that advocate reconceptualizing teacher preparation programs and their philosophies of training. Referring to this work a faculty member concluded the interview with the following comment:

American education has been struggling with the purpose and philosophy of its ed schools for decades.... It's taken seriously, and every ten to fifteen years, after considerable research and deliberation, reports are issued which lead to proposed reforms that are heard both by the educational community and Washington. We've been struggling with comparable issues for hundreds, thousands of years, but we haven't in recent years taken Jewish education seriously enough to give it

the thought and reformulation it needs. We have a lot to learn from our colleagues in American education.

Interestingly, analysis of the data found that most program goals or mission statements, reflected little explicit concern with the religious dimension of the educator. With the exception of the denominational schools, course descriptions, self-studies and interviews suggested ambivalence about identifying Jewish education training programs as religious education.

Let me outline our missions: providing a quality educational program of Judaic and Hebrew studies; the training of Jewish educators and communal service workers; serving as a cultural resource, serving as a scholarly resource, housing a Jewish library; and providing a community Hebrew high school. Religious development per se, is not part of our mission. To the extent that adults seeking meaning take our course....I guess you could say we are involved in religious education.

As one engaged in the development of Jewish educators, I am very concerned with their spiritual life. As Jewish educators they are first and foremost crafting learning opportunities where learners can create personal religious meaning, from the text, from the experience.... We have a lot to learn from religious educators in the Christian world who are doing some fantastic things in this area.

#### 1.22 Program standards

The development of rigorous standards to improve the profession of education is high on the agenda for reform of the American educational system (Clifford & Guthrie, 1988; National Board for Professional Teaching Standards, 1989). Similarly, the establishment and enforcement of standards for Jewish educators is viewed as necessary to the professionalization of the field (Aron, 1990). In the course of data collection, standards were often mentioned with reference to two issues: the perceived low status of teacher training institutions (see page ), addressed by accrediting and licensing agencies (Appendix B); and standards within individual programs relating to admission criteria, Judaica background and Hebrew language proficiency.

With the exception of two schools, all administrators and Jewish professionals interviewed desire training programs to increase their enrollments, and out reach to untapped potential student populations. In fact, several schools have begun to recruit bright, motivated people who desire careers in Jewish education but who lack extensive backgrounds in Jewish education. This tension between attracting new blood to the field and maintaining standards was expressed repeatedly in the interviews. Schools have responded in

different ways. A few have developed Mechina (preparation) programs in Israel; two, have initiated special summer institutes enabling students to study Judaica and Hebrew; one school requires weak students to spend a "remedial" year of study at the institution before they are formally accepted into the program. None send the message --- "students with weak Judaica backgrounds need not apply;"

The overall results of these strategies are questionable. The Mechina and special programs receive mixed reviews from faculty, students, and administration, with respect to their ability to compensate for weak backgrounds. They impose serious financial burdens on students and often discourage them.

\_\_\_\_\_ was a good program, it gave me some of the basic skills, but I feel that breaking my teeth over Talmud isn't exactly what I need in order to teach kids in Hebrew school. I don't know if I can make it through another two and one half years.

Psychologically I never expected it to be so difficult to be in a learning situation where I feel infantilized because the material is so foreign, and from my current vantage point, utterly useless for my intended career, working as a Jewish family educator.

Standards are also an issue with respect to teaching competency. Although all schools have some type of practicum most have not developed effective forms of evaluation to assess a student's ability to teach.

A few programs zealously adhere to self-imposed standards, but that does not mean that their programs conform to the standards of the NBL (refer to Appendix B).

We have committed ourselves to a quality program meeting self-imposed criteria. We will maintain the requirements of full-time study, numerous field placements, study in Israel, because they all flow from our vision of what is required to train a Jewish educator. We realize that our standards inhibit growth of the program but that is how we maintain standards of excellence for ourselves and the field.

### 1.23 Program curricula

Issues of curriculum, i.e., the content of training programs appear to be directly influenced by institutional positions towards standards and philosophical orientation. Programs which have clearly articulated goals and a guiding educational philosophy are perceived by students and faculty as having courses and practica experiences which complement each other and help create a unified program.

By way of contrast, programs which are not grounded in a philosophy are often perceived as diffuse, a collection of courses that don't hang together. This sense of diffusion was particularly obvious within programs which primarily served part-time students.

In contrast to my work at \_\_\_\_\_ where I deal mostly with students who have a full-time commitment to graduate study, the students here check-in and out, hardly know each other, seem to be taking courses in any sequence that meets their schedule and have very little sense of what it means to be a professional Jewish educator. I certainly don't have a sense of a program, where students and faculty fully participate, and I don't know if students perceive it any differently.

Irrespective of the students and faculty perception of the curricula of the programs, analysis of the program and course descriptions do indicate specific areas of curricular content and emphasis. All programs require courses in three areas of concentration:

Judaica -- classical Jewish text study (Bible, rabbinic literature), Jewish literature, Jewish history, liturgy, customs and ritual;

Jewish education-- foundations (philosophy of Jewish education, human development), methodology skills, specialization courses ( e.g., informal education, special education, adult education)

Supervised practicum experience -- student teaching or internship (paid training experiences tailored to the needs and career aspirations of each student).

Aside from these core areas of concentration programs may require courses on: contemporary Jewry; administration and supervision, departmental seminars.

All programs also require that students demonstrate proficiency in Hebrew language. " Proficiency" is determined and evaluated by each institution.

A program's course requirements play a large role in determining its duration. Programs which emphasize all of the aforementioned areas are three year programs requiring approximately 60 credits. Programs comprised of the three areas of concentration generally consist of 35-40 credits.

The curricula of training programs vary significantly with respect to the relative emphases that are placed on the areas of concentration and the additional areas noted above. Although a detailed curricular analysis of each program would be useful it is beyond the scope of this study.

Program specialization also affects the curricular models adopted by each school. From their inception, teachers colleges focused on



training of the Hebrew school teacher. The term connoted a rather specific type of occupation that resulted in a rather narrow conception of training. In response to community needs, occupations in Jewish education have burgeoned to include day school teachers, early childhood specialists, special educators, resource personnel, curriculum specialists, supervisors, family educators, community center Jewish educators, and summer camp educators. Many of the faculty interviewed felt that their institutions have not kept pace with the changing needs of the Jewish community.

Tinkering with a training model designed for preparing supplementary schools teachers may not be an appropriate response to the need for new training programs. What are those training models most appropriate for preparing family educators, day school teachers, etc.?

Two curricular issues were repeatedly mentioned in the interviews: the tension between theory and practice and the nature of the role of the practicum.

#### 1. The tension between theory and practice

Schools and departments of education are continually faced with the problem of balancing the theoretical aspects of teaching and learning with their practical components ( Zeichner, 1988). Jewish educators are keenly aware of the need to integrate these elements. At many of the training institutions this issue frequently appears as an agenda item for faculty meetings. Students often clamor for more practical courses that will provide them with teaching skills, whereas faculty members are prone to stress a theoretical approach to understanding practice. Few schools have taken an either/ or position, i.e, stressing either a practical or theoretical orientation to the detriment of the other. Most programs, however, reflect a tension between the two. The tension is exacerbated by the significant Jewish content of programs, which also has its theoretical and practical aspects. The tension between theory and practice is also reflected in the various practica and student teacher experiences of the programs.

#### 2. The role of the practicum

According to the guidelines of the NBL, all students are required to complete a supervised field experience (practicum) to be eligible for a teaching license. The nature and design of the practicum in Jewish schools depends on a variety of factors, including: the orientation of the program, its ideological affiliation, student schedules, geographic locations of educational facilities, the availability of master educators and economic realities. For those preparing to assume positions in supplementary schools, there is a good deal of flexibility in arranging the field placement. Students take their courses in the morning and use their afternoon teaching jobs to fulfill their practicum requirement. Such accommodation is not feasible for those training to become day school



educators. They must be available during the day time for their placement and also take courses. This affects only two training programs which have day school tracks. One has developed an internship model which reduces the student's course load, the other has students take course work during the summers.

Students enrolled in general education programs rate their practicum experience as the most significant, interesting and helpful part of their training (Feiman-Nemser, 1989). Among Jewish educators in training this often is not the case:

When I hear the words 'field placement' the first thing that comes to mind is commuting, getting in the car driving 10 hours a week for a 14 field hour placement. Overall, I feel the placement looms too large in our program. I've had a good deal of experience in Jewish education, I need more basic Judaica knowledge, not more field experience.

The kids are great, but the administration just doesn't use me properly. I'm the gofer, the substitute, the small group teacher, and lowest person on the totem pole, it's infantilizing.

The administration just doesn't realize how labor and time intensive the supervision of student teachers is. We should have a ratio of one faculty person to five students. I currently supervise 8 students and teach an additional three courses per semester.

The quality of the practicum experience is significantly influenced by the supervision a student receives. General programs for teacher training tend to borrow from several models of supervision (e.g., peer supervision, on-site supervision, university-based supervision), (See, Woolfolk, 1988). All of the models require trained personnel to provide supervision. Many students and faculty discussed with the investigator their concern about the lack of supervision in their field placements. In most instances on-site supervisors, burdened with their own job responsibilities, visit students infrequently. Faculty who supervise students spoke of their frustrations in finding enough time to provide adequate supervision. In contrast, programs which have full-time requirements do not have the same degree of difficulty in supervision since they have adequate staff to supervise.

#### 1.24 Part-time/full-time students

Issues relating to the the differences between full and part-time students were raised repeatedly during the interviews. Those who invested in full-time study clearly felt it was superior to part-time enrollment with respect to the overall quality of the training experience.

When students are part of a full-time program they form a learning community, a sense of professionalism, and a strong knowledge and skill base....It also makes a difference for me -- when working with part-time students, I feel they sort of squeeze my course into their busy schedules. I also feel I have to be more sympathetic to their external pressures outside of my class. Consequently, I'm embarrassed to say, I tend to be less demanding of part-time students.

I just love the opportunity to be in school full-time. It's not just the learning, it's the fellowship I feel part of. Jewishly, socially and academically its very supportive.

The superiority of full-time study is by no means a matter of consensus. Most of the training institutions are invested in programs for part-time students (see section 2.5). Historically, Hebrew teacher colleges always had students who attended on a part-time basis ( Margolis, 1968; Janowsky, 1967) while they taught in Hebrew schools and attended secular universities. Aside from tradition, several of those interviewed felt that it would not be economically viable for students preparing to be supplementary school teachers to attend a full-time training program.

From my perspective an education program that is designed for full-time students in this community is neither possible nor desirable. Those interested in studying at \_\_\_\_\_ generally have families, and need to work. Even with fellowship money they would not be able to study full-time. Secondly, I'm not at all convinced that the preparation of Jewish educators for supplementary schools requires one to study full time.... We produce some excellent teachers who teach in schools and take one or two courses a year. The work and study complement each other.

### 1.3 Doctoral programs

There are 67 students (Table 2) enrolled in doctoral programs -- (Ph.D., D.H.L. (Doctor of Literature), and Ed.D. (Doctor of Education) at three institutions. The majority (58) are part-time, taking between one and three courses per year. However, schools offering a Ph.D. in Jewish education have a two year full-time study residency requirement. Course requirements for all doctoral students include taking approximately 35 credits beyond the M.A. and the writing of a dissertation; the Ph.D. also has foreign language requirements.

Doctoral students may be classified into three overlapping categories:

1) Continuing education. The majority of students (55%) view a doctorate as a way of continuing their studies and improving their skills. Students in this category hold full-time positions as educational leaders. Although they associate the title "Doctor" with status, its attainment will not affect their marketability or economic situation. These "continuing education" students are most likely to complete their course work in four years, but often do not complete writing a dissertation.

2) Career advancement. About 30% of the doctoral students view the degree as a credential for improving their professional status and marketability. The majority of career advancement students are Israelis who study full-time and complete all course work and their dissertations in four years or less.

3) Scholarship. This category includes doctoral students who have academic and research interests (approximately 15%). They are generally full-time students who view doctoral study as preparing them to assume leadership responsibilities in academic or research settings. They are perceived by many as representing the cream of the crop and therefore assume teaching and administrative responsibilities before completion of their dissertations. Students in this category often take upwards of eight years to complete their dissertations.

There are also many who enroll in doctoral programs because they are continuing to take course work past the M.A. level and decide to have those courses count towards a degree. Many do not complete their degrees, they stop short of writing the dissertation.

Unlike most schools of general education the doctoral education students in Jewish institutions of higher learning do not tend to function as active members of the school, i.e., they do not assume roles as research assistants, instructors or supervisors. To a large extent this seems to be a function of their part-time status and economic pressures to maintain full-time positions outside of the institution.

#### 1.4 Administrative certificate program

Four institutions currently sponsor programs to certify school principals. The programs require course work during the summers, courses in administration at secular universities and an internship. Approximately half of the 42 students enrolled in these programs (Table 2) already hold administrative positions. The schools and Bureaus of education feel these programs should be expanded to prepare more senior educators and to fill informal and formal education positions. Most of the programs seemed to be modelled after programs observed in general education (Clifford & Guthrie, 1988).

There was a good deal of enthusiasm voiced by Jewish professionals and faculty for the expansion and reinforcement of principal and educational leadership programs.

These programs provide us with opportunities to create new models specifically tailored to the needs of the Jewish community.

### 1.5 Special programs

The growing needs in the field of Jewish education have created new positions for personnel -- day school teachers, special educators, family educators, and early childhood specialists (Hochstein, 1985; CAJE Newsletter, 1989). Interviewees maintain that the training institutions are not able to adequately respond to those needs. The data indicate that among the 14 institutions three have begun early childhood programs in conjunction with local universities or BJE's. Although five have courses in special education, none have comprehensive training programs. With respect to family education none have developed programs in this area.

Although day schools have flourished in the past decade, there are only four institutions that have developed a capacity to train educators in this area. Those interviewed suggest that the preparation of day school personnel presents unique challenges. Day school teachers need extensive knowledge of Jewish texts, fluency in Hebrew language, and a willingness to work for low salaries (See Aron, 1990). Paradoxically, the training required for school administrators and "generalists" assuming leadership positions involves fewer demands in these areas (text study and Hebrew language) but results in significantly higher salaries. The issues in the development of day school programs are directed related to the student applicant pool, financial support and personnel.

It's very unlikely we will ever be in a position to develop a training program for day school educators. Even if the demand is there, and that's debatable, we don't have the personnel. I doubt if we could recruit students to enroll in a three or four year program with the hope of going out and earning \$25,000. It makes more sense for them to consider an administrative program. Theoretically, we could develop a joint program with \_\_\_\_\_ in early childhood, special education, even family education. But a day school program, we'd have to do that on our own. We would need enormous resources.

## 2. STUDENT PROFILE

The last comprehensive study of students enrolled in Hebrew teachers colleges was conducted by Alvin Schiff in 1965 (Schiff, 1967). He reported that a total of 1835 students were enrolled in all programs of the ten colleges studied. Of those approximately 500, or 27% of the college population, preferred Jewish education as a career choice on the survey Schiff administered. (There is no follow-up data to indicate whether these students did indeed become Jewish educators.) By and large the majority of students enrolling in Hebrew Teachers Colleges during the early sixties, prior to the proliferation of Judaic studies programs at universities, chose these colleges because they wanted to study Judaica seriously on the undergraduate level, while pursuing a liberal arts degree. For most, Jewish education as a field of study and subsequent career was viewed as an option, but not the primary reason for entering the school.

On the basis of the survey responses from Hebrew college students indicating a career preference in Jewish education, Schiff drew a profile of students most likely to pursue careers in Jewish education. They tended to be female (80%), 21 years or older, motivated by idealism to promote Jewish life, products of day school educations, worship in Orthodox synagogues, satisfied with their previous Jewish learning experience, demonstrated strong Judaic and Hebraic backgrounds, and desired teaching positions teaching Jewish studies and Hebrew.

### 2.1 Demographic factors

Up to date, reliable data on the current student populations of Jewish institutions of higher learning were not available. However, analysis of the interviews and institutional literature did yield information for drawing in broad strokes a picture of the current student population.

It is estimated that as of November, 1989, approximately 1500 students were enrolled as matriculating students in both the undergraduate and graduate programs of the 14 institutions under study. Of those, 358 students (refer to Table 2) or 24% of the total student population were enrolled in Jewish education degree programs, a percentage comparable to the 1965 survey. The teacher preparation programs are comprised primarily of women (95%). In contrast, the Judaica programs of these institutions are comprised of 35% males and 65% female. Although male/female ratios vary considerably from school to school, as in general education (Feistritz, 1986), Jewish education programs have a disproportionate number of women.

The denominational and University-based programs draw students from a national pool, whereas the independent community schools primarily attract students on a local or regional level. On the graduate level, the majority of students have had some prior work experience

in either formal or informal Jewish education.<sup>7</sup> Although, they tend to be in their mid-twenties, increasingly administrators report that students thirty and older, seeking a career change, are applying to their programs.

## 2.2 Jewish educational background

With respect to students' Jewish background, there is considerable inter and intra-institutional variation. Nevertheless, certain patterns are clear. Unlike the 1965 sample, current students generally do not come from Orthodox backgrounds, nor are they graduates of day schools. Many seem to be dissatisfied products of congregational schools who only began to take serious interest in Judaica in Jewish studies courses on the college level. Although there has been a proliferation of day schools over the past two decades their graduates have a disproportionately low representation in programs for preparing Jewish educators. Denominational institutions are increasingly attracting students who are not affiliated with a particular movement and view themselves as serving the Jewish community at large.

## 2.3 Motivation to pursue Jewish education as a career

There are no studies that examine why people enter Jewish education. Group interviews with students suggest that, as with the 1965 student population (Schiff, 1967) idealism plays a prominent role in the decision to pursue a career in Jewish education. The following comments by students also point to the students' belief that their roles as Jewish educators center on identity development and the transmission of Judaism.

I chose Jewish education because I'm concerned about the future of the Jewish community, and being an educator is a way to make a difference.

For me the transmission of knowledge and Jewish culture are the essence of being a Jewish educator.

I think that as an American Jewish educator my work must focus on transmitting Jewish values and shaping Jewish identity.

In choosing a program for graduate study in Jewish education students were keenly aware of their career options, which guide their choice of program. Programs which stress teaching tend to attract those who want to teach, whereas, programs designed for administrators attract students who are primarily interested in affecting change in Jewish educational systems. Nevertheless, when queried, students don't see themselves staying in teaching for more than a few years.

I love kids and teaching but you can't make ends meet on \$18,000 a year. I figure that after a year or two I'll become a principal.

My student teaching experience reinforced my decision to go teach in a day school next year. It's important to teach before you move on to administration.

I think the only way teaching in a Jewish school can become a real profession is if more people from our program go into teaching instead of administration. On the other hand I'll probably end up in administration in a few years.

Among all student groups interviewed a visit or period of study in Israel was noted as a factor contributing to the decision to pursue Jewish education.

Studying in Israel for a year helped me clarify that I wanted to pursue a career as a Jewish professional... improving the quality of Jewish life.

I think it was the people I met in Israel, charismatic, intellectual Jewish doers, who had the greatest impact on my decision to enroll in ....

I'm not sure how, if it was being in Israel, the country, or the people, that played the most significant role in my decision. But somehow, I don't think I would have made the decision in the say way if I would have been in the States.

Intensive study in Israel proved to me that I could do it. I felt confident, for the first time, in my ability to understand Jewish texts and teach Judaica.

#### 2.4 Academic performance

Feistritz (1986), in her comprehensive study of students enrolled in teacher education programs reported that education students, as compared to other graduate students tend to be academically inferior, scoring below the 35th percentile on national test norms. Interviews with administration and faculty indicate that Jewish education students are by no means academically inferior and fall above the 60th percentile on standardized tests ( GREs, MAT) when compared to other graduate students in the humanities. With respect to their academic performance , education students do as well or better than those enrolled in Jewish studies programs.

#### 2.5 How Students support themselves

Until recently, financing one's education in a Hebrew Teachers College was not considered a factor affecting student enrollment. In



1967, Ackerman reported that tuition costs in the teacher training institutions were nominal -- ranging between \$ 5 and \$80 per credit. He commented "...no student will be denied the opportunity of studying because of his inability to pay the required tuition." (Ackerman, 1967, p.51). To a large extent Ackerman was referring to full-time undergraduates and working teachers taking courses on a part-time basis. The realities of the 1980's present a different picture. Tuitions at the institutions studied are high (\$150- \$350 per credit). Depending on the particular school fees, a full-time student (12 -15 credits per semester) can expect a tuition bill of \$3,600 to \$ 10,000 per year, exclusive of living expenses. Administrators know of several students who deferred admission or declined to come to the program because of its prohibitive costs. Some of the institutions do have small scholarships and a few fellowships are available. However, the majority of full-time students require financial aid in the form of government loans, which must be paid back once the student graduates. Full-time students take out loans ranging from \$2,000 to \$14,000 per year of study.

My wife and I are both students. When I complete my M.A. we will have between us \$45,000 in loans to pay back.

If I'm lucky I'll have a starting day school salary of \$22,000. I'll also have outstanding loans of \$18,000. Although I haven't graduated I'm beginning to get depressed about my ability to make ends meet.

The Wexner fellowships are great for those very few who are eligible. But for most of us there just isn't any scholarship money of significance.

Although I love school, I'm very angry that the Jewish community doesn't provide scholarship monies for my schooling. It's just one more sign of the low priority Jewish education has on the community's agenda.

## 2.6 Summary-- Students enrolled in Jewish education programs

The profile of current students underscores the continuing changes within the institutions studied. In contrast to previous generations of students, they enter programs less Judaically knowledgeable, older, interested in pursuing M.A. degrees as opposed to undergraduate degrees or teacher certification, come from different backgrounds and require significant financial aid in order to study full-time.

The findings raise a number of questions that require further investigation:

1. Given the student profiles, what are the best strategies for recruitment? What types of recruitment currently are most effective

in attracting students?

2. What are those factors that deter people interested in graduate education training from entering Jewish education versus general education? Why is the field of Jewish education attracting relatively few graduates of day schools?
3. What are the most effective ways of preparing students with weak Judaica backgrounds? What role if any should an experience in Israel play in their education?
4. Do training programs affect the religious development of students?
5. What career paths do graduates of programs choose? How do graduates evaluate their training experiences?
6. How do the profiles of Jewish professionals in training e.g. rabbinical students and communal service students compare to graduate students in Jewish education?

### 3. FACULTY PROFILE

Education faculty members in large institutions have tended to have a history of being regarded with some enmity by other departments. Questions of the academic quality of research and standards for tenure characterize the history of departments and schools of education in the United States (Clifford and Guthries, 1988).

In Jewish education it is unclear how faculty are viewed, in part because they are so few. A glance at Table 3 shows that there are currently eighteen full-time faculty serving in departments or schools of Jewish education. They are full-time by virtue of having full-time appointments in education. However, only six have full-time teaching responsibilities. The other twelve, teach a partial load and assume significant administrative responsibilities. There are another 22 faculty who teach on a part-time basis and an additional 44 brought in on an adjunct basis.

Part-time and adjunct faculty are generally recruited from schools and near-by institutions of higher learning. Many of the administrators interviewed are pleased that their respective institutions are able to attract the most prominent and knowledgeable academics and practitioners to teach a course or seminar.

In part our training program is superb because we can bring in local talent. The teaching stars from day schools, the resource people from the BJE and people like \_\_\_\_\_ and \_\_\_\_\_ from \_\_\_\_\_ University to teach courses in special education and administration.

Having to rely extensively on part-time people, when we only have two full-timers of our own contributes to the sense that we aren't taken seriously in this institution. When I sit at faculty meetings it's clear that we are the only department where the part-time personnel outnumber the full-time faculty.

Full-time faculty have had their academic training in various areas. Eleven hold doctorates in education or allied fields ( e.g., psychology, counseling); the others hold doctorates in Judaica or the Humanities.<sup>8</sup> Seven of the eighteen are also ordained rabbis. All have had field experience in Jewish education prior to choosing an academic career path. This diverse group ranges in age from 40-60 with approximately 65% of the faculty under age 50. Salaries of faculty vary considerably from institution to institution. In the denominational and university setting full-time instructional salaries range from \$26,000 to \$63,00 depending on rank and longevity. Among the independent community colleges salaries are appreciably lower, ranging from \$18,000-\$45,000 depending on rank and longevity.

Teaching loads also vary considerably among the training institutions. In one institution full-time faculty members are expected to carry a load of six courses per term. At the other extreme, one institution requires full-time faculty to teach two courses per term. The average teaching load of faculty is 3.5 courses per semester.

Although a comprehensive look at their publications was not available, Jewish educational faculty tend to publish articles but produce few books devoted to education. Unlike their colleagues from other departments, they engage in a several forms of research having a direct bearing on Jewish education including curriculum development, working with schools, special projects.

Those interviewed have a variety of interests and belong to several different professional organizations. There is no one professional organization or conference which all attend. When presented with these data a faculty member noted, "We are an interesting group of academicians but our diversity works against us in terms of becoming a professional group."

### 3.1 Summary- Faculty profile

The number of faculty members holding full-time positions in Jewish education is astonishingly small. They come from diverse backgrounds and training experiences, but all have had a long association with Jewish education. The interviews stress the need to increase the number of faculty in Jewish education if the field is to grow.

1. What strategies might be considered in order to increase the number of faculty?

2. What steps should be taken to improve the support of Jewish education faculty in the institutions of higher Jewish learning? What mechanisms or opportunities need to be developed to enable faculty to do more research? How can support and professional networks for faculty be built?

3. To what extent are the issues and concerns of faculties comparable to those in general education and those in Jewish studies ? What motivates faculty to pursue academic careers in Jewish education?

#### 4. SUMMARY - TRAINING PROGRAMS, RETROSPECT AND PROSPECT

##### The Training of Jewish Educators: Issues Confronting Training Institutions

The training of Jewish educators in the institutions that were examined is comprised of complex diverse programs that cannot be easily reduced to a few categories or types. In the past two decades there has been a steady decline in the number of students choosing to major in Jewish education at the B.A. level. During the same time period there was a proliferation of M.A. level programs. Currently, there are 358 students enrolled in degree or teacher certification programs, preparing for careers in Jewish education. Another 109 students are enrolled in post M.A. programs (Doctoral or principal).

The students entering institutions for training in Jewish education are coming from variety of backgrounds, they tend to be predominantly female, weaker than previous generations with respect to Judaica background, highly motivated, and interested in pursuing a number of different careers paths in Jewish education.

The education faculties of the institutions are exceedingly small. They are expected to function in a number of different arenas within the institutions and few are able devote sufficient time to the training of Jewish educators.

A number of specific questions and issues emerge from the analysis and discussion:

1. In order to meet the challenges of the next decade and chart a course, most of the institutions examined in this study, have or are currently conducting long range planning studies. Their findings should provide data for better understanding their relative strengths and weaknesses, needs and resources. How might this information best be used in mapping out options for the training of Jewish educators?
2. Institutions fiercely want to maintain their autonomy and unique identity. Each needs to be understood within the context of its community, constituencies, and respective ideology. These realities require further exploration in order to understand how colleges might work together.
3. Despite their need for autonomy Jewish institutions of higher learning are interested in working together. What mechanisms can be developed to facilitate collaboration among institutions? Is the AIJHLJE a mechanism that will enable denominational, university based and independent schools to collaborate?

4. The articulation and maintenance of standards in the field of Jewish education is essential to its professionalization. Is it feasible and/or desirable to set national standards for Jewish educators studying in training institutions?

5. In what ways can each institution best serve Jewish education on a local, regional, national and international level ?

6. The recruitment and support of students is viewed as critical to addressing personnel issues in Jewish education. Are national trans-denominational recruitment efforts desirable and realistic? What new mechanisms or strategies for recruitment are the most appropriate training institutions?.

7. Financial resources are needed to: support existing programs, develop new programs, hire additional faculty and attract students. What types of structures and strategies would enable all training institutions to share and distribute resources?

## 5. ALTERNATIVE TRAINING PROGRAMS

### 5.1 Short-term Training Programs

In response to the shortage of qualified supplementary schools teachers (Bank & Aron, 1986), several communities have initiated short-term training programs for adults who may not have any formal training in education or Judaica. The investigator identified six communities (Long Island, N.Y.; Chicago, Pittsburgh, Providence, and Oakland) where Bureaus of Jewish Education, denominational agencies or federations have developed such programs. Approximately 80 students, (90% female) are participating in these programs. They range in age from 21 to 65 years old and include university students, lawyers, public school teachers, social workers, home makers and retired persons.

The programs characteristically consist of four, twelve session courses over a one to two year period. Courses focus on Jewish thought, history, classical text study, and Hebrew language, and are taught by University or Bureau instructors. Parallel to or upon completion of course work, students participate in a field experience. Chicago and Providence have instituted a mentor program where experienced teachers guide and work with trainees both in and outside of the classroom. Other communities have a more traditional supervised field experience.

The budgets of these programs provide stipends to both trainees and mentors (approximately \$150 per semester) and honoraria to the instructors. With the exception of Long Island, the local federation covers the costs of these programs, which are administered by the Bureaus. Additional federations are planning to initiate similar programs in 1990-91.

Short-term training programs are specifically designed for persons who are committed to Jewish education, desire part-time work, have little or no formal Jewish education training and are highly motivated. No systematic follow-up studies have been reported that assess the effectiveness of these programs. However, they have generated a good deal of enthusiasm and controversy. The instructors, trainees and mentors are exceedingly enthusiastic about the programs.

This program has been a very powerful experience for all concerned. The students are highly motivated and committed to Jewish education. It's refreshing to see bright talented energetic people become excited at the thought of teaching Hebrew school. For the mentors.... it's given them new meaning in their work, they find that working with new teachers is stimulating and enriching. At the end of the program we all went on a weekend retreat



where I observed the close bonds which had developed among program participants --- it give me hope about the future of Jewish education.

On the other hand, administrators of training institutions have voiced their concern about the quality of the programs, the lack of standards and the general "non-professional" tone of the programs.

Short-term training programs provide one strategy for dealing with the teacher shortage problem. However, follow-up studies are needed to determine their effectiveness. Are such programs effective for training teachers at all grade levels? Are there other training formats that might prove more effective, e.g. camp settings? How can established teacher training institutions contribute to these programs? What can be learned from alternative teacher training models in general education that may have application to short-term training programs for Jewish educators?

## 5.2 In-service Training Programs

Since the mid-1970's in-service staff development programs have been implemented as a way of promoting professional growth an school improvement (Lieberman, 1978; Rand, 1978).

Bureaus of Jewish education, Institutions of higher Jewish Learning and individual schools all engage in in-service activities. There are thousands of Jewish educators who enroll in in-service programs each year. These programs vary with respect to their function, format and duration, content, participants, sponsors and instructors.

Function: Most agencies and schools sponsor in-service activities as a way of providing professional growth for their staffs. Interviews with agency directors and principals suggest that the majority of educators employed in Jewish education settings are required to participate in some form of in-service training, on an annual basis. Administrators in particular view staff development as a way of promoting professionalism among staff.

A second function of in-service education is the training of personnel in specific content or skill areas where personnel are needed. For instance a number of Bureaus have offered in-service programs to train individuals in special education, art education, values education, and family education.

Most recently, some experimental work has been conducted in the area of retreats for Jewish educators. These in-service retreats are designed to promote personal and religious growth as they relate to one's role as an educator (Holtz & Rauch, 1987).

Formats and duration Formats range in duration (lectures, courses) and in intensity (retreats, three month Israel seminars). Although there have not been national suveys or studies of the quantity or

quality of Jewish educational in-service programs one receives the impression from descriptions of programs (Pedagogic Reporter, JESNA) that most in-service activities are short in duration and lack continuity. Many of those interviewed by the investigator were well aware of the shortcoming of their programs and the evaluation literature which cites the importance of duration and continuity for effectiveness (see Fullan, 1979; Lieberman, 1978).

Within the \_\_\_\_\_ the only form of staff development we can provide consists of one-shot sessions. Its probably not very effective, in the long term, even though the immediate feedback is very good.....We just can't expect supplementary school teachers, who are part-time to begin with, to give of their time to participate in intensive staff development programs. On the other hand if they would be willing, we just don't have the financial resources to sponsor intensive programs.

One of the travesties in Jewish education is the use of the CAJE conference as the primary form of staff development in Jewish education. Unfortunately, I see more and more administrators and directors sending their staff members to CAJE and copping-out on their responsibility to provide staff development programs. Please don't misinterpret me, CAJE is great but its being misused.

Content. The content for in-service education varies considerably as a function of the educational setting (e.g., informal education, day school) and practical considerations ( budget, staff and instructor availability. Perhaps a more significant question is -- who determines the content of in-service education? Evaluation research findings point to the importance of the consumers, i.e., those receiving training, being invested and involved in determining the content and format of staff development programs ( Lieberman, 1981). Within Jewish educational setting , as in general education, it is often the administrator or sponsoring agency who determine content without consulting consumers. Consequently, there is often a feeling among Jewish educators that staff development programs are unresponsive to their needs, e.g., too theoretical, unrelated to what they are expected to do in the workplace (Davidson, 1982).

Participants. Most formal Jewish educational establishments mandate that all education staff participate in in-service activities on an annual basis. Bureau or agency directors view in-service days as opportunities to bring together personnel from all denominational backgrounds, educational settings and age levels.

Sponsors and Instructors. Bureaus generally have assigned personnel to coordinate, plan and execute in-service education. A perusal of several calendars and newsletters of bureaus reveals that in-service instructors are drawn from the bureau schools, bureau staff, and local expertise. Some of the larger bureaus also call

upon experts from the University world.

In four communities the Bureaus have developed a special relationship with the independent colleges of Jewish studies. Teachers in Jewish educational settings affiliated with the bureau are encouraged to take courses, to promote professional growth, at the Jewish institutions of higher learning. The teachers are given subventions by the federation to pay for these courses. Approximately 350 teachers, nation-wide receive subventions for enrollment in Jewish institutions of higher learning.

Interview data and references to the annual CAJE Conference (Coalition for the Advancement of Jewish Education) ( Reimer, 1986) suggest that it is viewed as a major center for in-service Jewish education. It's 2000 participants enroll in workshops, modules and mini-courses focusing on all areas of Jewish life and education.

For the past several years university-based programs in Israel (e.g. Samuel M. Melton Centre for Jewish Education in the Diaspora, Hebrew University) have offered summer institutes for Jewish educators. These institutes are intensive, three-week seminars, held in Jerusalem, which focus on specific content areas: Values education, Hebrew language, and the Teaching of Israel. Teachers from all denominations have participated in these programs.

The denominational movements are also beginning to use Israel as a center for in-service educational programming. For example, the United Synagogue of America, in collaboration with the Jewish Theological Seminary and the Office of Torah Education of the WZO has sponsored annual intensive winter workshops in Jerusalem focusing on the teaching of text and ideology.

Yet another form of in-service education is sponsored by professional educational organizations of the denominations (The Jewish Educators Assembly (Conservative); National Association of Temple Educators (Reform); and The National Council for Torah Education (Orthodox)). These organizations sponsor national and regional conferences where workshops, modules and mini-courses are offered.

The preceding superficial overview of in-service staff development in Jewish education, illustrates its expansiveness and complexity. It is viewed by many in the field of Jewish education as the most dominant form of training, however, there is virtually no research to back this claim.

1. A systematic study of in-service Jewish educational programs is needed to assess its current and potential impact on the professionalization of the field. Specific questions to be addressed include: What is the scope and content of in-service Jewish education in North America? What are the costs of providing in-service programs? What are the effects of in-service education in different educational settings i.e., informal, supplementary school,

day school? What are the most effective formats for staff development programs within specific communities? Does in-service education contribute to the preparation of senior educators?

2. What role can Jewish institutions of higher learning play in providing staff-development programs? Do those who enroll in in-service courses at Jewish institutions of higher learning continue to study for degrees?

3. What unique benefits do in-service programs in Israel provide to North American Jewish educators?

### 5.3 Training Informal Jewish Educators

Whereas the boundaries between formal and informal Jewish education were once determined by setting, that is no longer the case (Reimer, 1989). Informal Jewish educational programming now occurs within the context of: camping, youth groups, Jewish community centers, schools and synagogues, adult study groups, college campuses, and museums. A theoretical analysis of the distinctions and commonalities between Jewish formal and informal education within the context of contemporary Jewish life would be most informative.

More germane to this study is the training of educators for informal Jewish education. There are no programs at the training institutions examined specifically designed for preparing informal educators. And statistics about the job placements of their graduates do not indicate how many enter informal education settings. Among the denominational organizations involved in informal Jewish education, directors, youth leaders, and adult education directors tend to be rabbis and educators, and communal service workers who are alumni of the movement's training institutions. Within the Jewish community center world there are a growing number of full-time positions in Jewish education. These positions are filled by rabbis, Ph.Ds in Judaica and persons holding MSWs. Youth organizations such as Young Judea, B'nai Brith and Hillel-JACY also tend to select graduates of rabbinical schools and schools of social work for their leadership positions for Jewish education.

Overall there is little contact between Jewish institutions of higher learning preparing Jewish educators and non-denominational programs where informal Jewish education is conducted. (Exceptions include Brandeis University and Baltimore Hebrew University, which do work cooperatively with informal Jewish education programs.)

Part of the difficulty in identifying how and how many informal educators are trained is a conceptual issue. It is unclear what training they require in order to be competent in their work. What are those bodies of knowledges and skills that all informal educators have in common? Extensive research with Jewish community centers sponsored by JWB (JWB, 1948, 1968, 1984, 1988) suggests that Jcc workers need to share common bodies of knowledge and skills which underlie Jewish identity and knowledge (JWB, 1984). JWB

recognizing that many of its staff did not have the knowledge and skills, initiated an extensive plan to "maximize" Jewish educational effectiveness in the centers. Through Jewish educational materials (Chazan & Poupko, 1989) ; professional staff development in Israel 9 and the appointment of Jewish educators in Jccs, a model for training informal Jewish educators is being developed. Evaluation findings indicate that this model appears to be quite effective for maximizing Jewish education in the centers ( Reissman, 1988).

In sum the training of informal Jewish educator has not been systematically studied. It is not known how many personnel are involved, where they are trained, and who they are with respect to their Jewish and educational backgrounds. Major training efforts in informal Jewish education tend to be intensive, in-service seminars, retreats and study programs, often held in Israel. On the pre-service level, it is unclear what role Jewish institutions of higher learning can play in the training of informal Jewish educators. However, each institution does have resources for transmitting Jewish knowledge which may be appropriately applied to in-service forms of training. These issues which emerged from the data analysis, require further investigation.

## FOOTNOTES

1. Throughout this paper the terms training and preparation will be used interchangeably when referring to the preparation of educators.

2. Personnel working in informal Jewish education seem be prepared as formal Jewish educators, as Jewish communal workers or in general areas of social service and education (Reissman, 1988.) There are no training programs known to the investigator whose primary purpose is to prepare informal Jewish educators. For a fuller discussion see section 5.3.

3. According to Sherwin (1987,p.97 ) Magnus and his colleagues, viewed Jewish education as a means for achieving: Jewish group survival in an American environment and religious training aimed at the transmission of Jewish morals. Magnus made a direct link between the role of Jewish education and good American citizenship.

3.

Gratz College, 1897

Teachers Institute, Jewish Theological Seminary of America, 1909

Teachers Institute, Yeshiva University, 1917

Baltimore Hebrew Teachers College, 1919

Hebrew Teachers College of Boston, 1921

Herzliah Hebrew Teachers Institute, 1923

College of Jewish Studies, Chicago, 1926

Hebrew Teachers Training School for Girls, Yeshiva University, 1928

Teachers Institute of the University of Judaism, 1947

Stern College for Women, Yeshiva University, 1954

Cleveland Teachers College, 1952

5. Depending on their availability personnel associated with the Jewish community center, Bureau of Jewish education and Jewish federation were interviewed.

6. Because of the small numbers of institutions and training programs and the numerous differences among them, a typology for understanding their differences and commonalities is not feasible. In general teacher education such typologies have been most helpful in a developing a conceptual and practical understanding of teacher training programs, ( see, Feinman-Nemser, 1989).

7. Students entering pre-service programs in general teacher education institutions have usually never had a paid teaching experience. This is a basic premise of pre-service programs, i.e., those entering have not had teaching experience. In Jewish education training programs virtually all students have taught in some Jewish educational setting or are engaged as Jewish educators, while enrolled in a graduate education program. It follows that general

and Jewish education training programs are based on different premises with respect to the "pre-service" aspect of the students' experience.

8. The faculty who hold doctorates in education, on the whole have done their academic training in the philosophy of education. There are no faculty who have concentrated on curriculum development, and very few who have a background in the social sciences.

9. In 1989, 565 laypeople, staff and administrators from 20 Jewish Community Centers participated in staff development seminars held in Israel.



Table 1

Institutions of Higher Learning Granting Jewish Education  
Degrees and Certificates

<u>Institution</u>	<u>B.A. Teacher</u>		<u>M.A. Principal</u>		<u>Doctorate</u>	
		<u>Cert.</u>		<u>Cert.</u>		
1. Baltimore Hebrew University	x	x	x			
2. Brandeis University Hornstein Program				x		
3. Cleveland College of Jewish Studies	x	x	x			
4. George Washington University/ B.J.E.				x		
5. Gratz College	x	x	x			
6. Hebrew Union College-L.A.				x	x	x
Hebrew Union College-N.Y.				x		
7. Hebrew College Boston	x	x	x	x		
8. Jewish Theological Seminary	x	x	x	x		x
9. Midrasha-Toronto		x				
10 McGill University		x	x			
11. Spertus College		x	x			
12 University of Judaism		x	x			
13 Yeshiva University Stern College	x	x				
Breuer College	x	x				
Azrielli Inst.			x	x		x
14. York University	x	x	x			

Table 2.

Enrolled and Graduating Jewish Education Students from  
Institutions of Higher Learning

<u>Degrees or Certificates</u>	<u>Currently Enrolled Students</u>	<u>Number of 1989 Graduates</u>	<u>Total Number of Students</u>
<u>B.A.</u>	<u>68</u>	<u>21</u>	<u>89</u>
<u>Teacher Certification</u>	<u>43</u>	<u>n.a.</u>	<u>n.a.</u>
<u>M. A.</u>		<u>62 *</u>	<u>247</u>
<u>Full-time</u>	<u>76</u>		
<u>Part-time</u>	<u>171</u>		
			(358)a
<u>Principal Certification</u>	<u>42</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>52</u>
<u>Doctorate</u>	<u>67</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>74</u>

\* Data giving the number of part-time and full-time M.A. graduating students were not available. A total of 62 students received M.A. degrees.

a.Total number of pre-doctoral students ( M.A. students, B. A. Students, teacher Certificate Program students)

Table 3

Distribution of Jewish Education Faculty in  
Institutions of Higher Learning

Full-time Faculty	18
Part-time faculty	22
Adjunct faculty	44

## APPENDIX A

### Semi-structured Interview Schedule

Introduction The purpose of the research, the purpose of the Commission

#### Setting and context

I've read and heard a good deal about \_\_\_\_\_. Before we focus on education I'd to get a general sense of \_\_\_\_\_. Within an historical context what is the current direction and status of \_\_\_\_? What lies ahead for \_\_\_\_? Let's focus a bit on the current structure of the institution: relationship to other institutions e.g., Federation, universities, BJE...

#### Students

Who are the students attending the institution? Have there been recent changes in the profiles of your students? How are students recruited? What type of students would you like to attract in the future to \_\_\_\_? What implications does this have for the curriculum, structure, etc.?

#### Faculty

In examining your bulletin I noticed that you list faculty for \_\_\_\_\_ schools or departments, would you please tell me about the school's faculty, the department's faculty? What constitutes a full-time faculty load? Who are your full-time faculty? Who are the part-time and adjunct faculty? What challenges do you see, from your perspective, with respect to education faculty? Please describe the tenure process in your institution. What does research have in the lives of faculty? Who are the faculty in education? What are their responsibilities?

Salaries We're going to move on now to another area salaries. How do you describe the salaries of your faculty? How do faculty salaries in your institution compare to those of other institutions? (locally, nationally) What fringe benefits do faculty receive?

#### education programs

As I indicated to you earlier in our discussion I'm primarily interested in the education programs you offer. Before we speak specifically about teacher training would you please describe any programs you feel fall under the rubric of education? What programs does \_\_\_\_\_ offer that ostensibly prepares or trains educators? How do you view the purpose of training Jewish educators? What are the needs of the education programs?

Visions and dreams If major funding became available in the near future specifically earmarked for education projects what would be your wish list?

## APPENDIX B

### Accreditation and Institutions of Higher Jewish Learning

Historically four types of accreditation were sought in order to certify the quality of the programs as meeting certain standards.

1. All of the training institutions have authority through their respective State Departments of Education to grant degrees. The areas state officials examine include: faculty, library facilities, admissions standards, the adequacy of course hours and appropriate curricula. Obtaining state certification involved submitting required documentation and a site visit by department officials.
2. Regional accrediting associations such as Middle State Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools, the North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools and the Western College Association attempt to strengthen and increase the effectiveness of higher education. They do not grant permanent accreditation but review each institution once every ten years. As part of the review process institutions are required to conduct an extensive self-study.
3. The Iggud Batey Midrash le-Morim (Association of Hebrew Teachers Colleges) was founded in 1951 as the accrediting body for Hebrew teachers colleges. While requiring less elaborate procedures than state or regional accrediting associations, it aimed to assure the quality of Hebrew teacher colleges. The Iggud ceased to be a functioning organization in the early 1980s.
4. The National Board of License for Teachers and Supervisory Personnel in American Jewish Schools (NBL) was established in the 1940s to examine the qualifications of Hebrew teachers. According to an agreement between the Iggud and NBL (1955) any graduate of an Iggud affiliated Hebrew Teachers College will be automatically eligible to receive a Hebrew teachers license upon application to the NBL.

In 1986 the Association for Jewish Institutions of Higher Learning for Jewish Education (AJIHLJE) was established as an umbrella organization for North American institutions preparing Jewish educators. The NBL is in the process of determining whether to automatically award a teaching license to graduates of AJIHLJE affiliated schools who apply.

Members of AJIHLJE are:

Baltimore Hebrew University  
Brandeis University  
Cleveland College of Jewish Studies  
Hebrew Union College  
Gratz College  
Hebrew College

Jewish Theological Seminary  
McGill University  
Spertus College  
Yeshiva University  
University of Judaism

## REFERENCES

- Ackerman, W.(1967). A profile of hebrew teachers colleges. In O. Janowsky (Ed.). The Education of American Jewish Teachers (pp.41-61). Boston, MA. : Beacon Press.
- Aron, I. (1990). Professionalism and jewish education. (Commission on Jewish Education in North America).
- Bank, A. & Aron, I. (1987). Dealing with the shortage of teachers. In J.Reimer (Ed.). To Build a Profession: Careers in jewish education. Waltham, MA.: The Hornstein Program in Jewish Communal Service, Brandeis University.
- CAJE.( 1989). Jewish Education News.professionalizing jewish education. N.Y, NY: Coalition for the Advancement of Jewish Education.
- Carnegie Task Force on Teaching as a Profession.(1986).A Nation Prepared: teachers for the twenty-first century. New York: Carnegie Forum on Education and The Economy.
- Chazan, B. & Poupko, Y.(1989). Guide to Jewish Knowledge for the Center Professional. New York, NY.: JWB.
- Clifford, G.J. & Guthrie, J. W. (1988). ED School. Chicago, IL: Univeristy of Chicago Press.
- Cutter, W.(1974). Jewish Education .3. 7-11.
- Davidson, A. (1982). Collaboration for School Improvement: Charles E.Smith Jewish Day School Staff Development Program (Evaluation Report). New York: N.Y.: Jewish Theological Seminary of America.
- Ettenberg. S.C. & Rosenfield, G. (Eds.). (1989).The Ramah Experience: Community and Commitment.New York:NY.: Jewish Theological Seminary & National Ramah Commission.
- Feinman-Nemser, S.(1989). Teacher preparation:structural and conceptual alternatives. (Issue Paper 89-5). East Lansing,MI: The National Center for Research on Teachers Education, Michigan State University.
- Feistritzer, E.(1984). The Making of a Teacher:A Report on Teacher Education and Certification. Washington, D.C.:
- Feistritzer, E.(1986). Profile of Teachers in the U.S. Wachington, D.C.: National Center for Educatin Information.
- Fullan, M.(1982). The Meaning of Educational Change. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Hochstein, A.(1986). Senior Personnel for Jewish Education Progress Report. Jerusalem, Israel: The Jewish Education Committee of the Jewish Agency.
- Holmes Group. (1986) Tomorrow's Teachers: A Report of the Holmes Group. East Lansing, MI.
- Holtz, B & Rauch, E.(1986). Education for change: toward a model of jewish teacher education. In. Studies in Jewish Education. Vol. 3. J. Aviad. (Ed). Jerusalem, Israel: Magnes Press.
- Honor, L.(1935). Comparative study of hevrew teacher training schools in the united states.Jewish Education .2. pp 71-90.
- Hurwich ,L.(1949). Survey of hebrew teacher colleges in the united states.Jewish Education. 1-2. pp. 73-96.
- Janowsky, O.(1967). The education of american jewish teachers: pattern and prospect. In. O. Janowsky (Ed.). The Education of American Jewish Teachers New York, NY: Beacon Press. pp. 317-347.
- JWB.(1984). Maximizing Jewish Educational Effectiveness of



- Jewish Community Centers. New York, NY.: JWB.
- JWB. (1986). Mandate for Action- final report to the JWB borad of directors or the committee on implementation. New York, NY. JWB.
- Kaplan, M. & Crossman.(1949). The Kaplan-Crossman report. Jewish Education. 3. pp. 113-116.
- Lieberman, A. & Miller, L. (Eds.). (1978). Staff Development: New demands, new realities, new perspectives. New York, NY.: Teachers College Press.
- Lukinsky, J. (1974). The education program at the jewish theological seminary- basic distinctive assumptions. Jewish Education. 3. pp. 11-14.
- Mirsky,D. (1981). Report on Hebrew Teacher-Preparation Programs in Member Institutions. New York, NY: Council on Hebrew Teacher Colleges in America.
- Margolis, I. (1964). Jewish Teacher Training Schools in the United States.New York, NY: Natinal Council for Torah Education of Mizrachi-Hapoel Hamizrachi.
- National Board for Professional Teaching Standards. (1989) Toward High and Rigorous Standards for the Teaching Profession. Washington, D.C.: National Board for Professional Teaching Standards.
- Rand Corporation.(1978). P.Berman & M. Mclaughlin. Federal Programs Supporting Educational Change. Vol.4: a model for educational change. Santa Monica , CA.: Rand Corpotation.
- Reimer, J. (1989). Changing educational strategies in ramah. In S. Ettenberg & G. Rosenfield. (Eds.). The Ramah Experience. New York, NY: Jewish Theological Seminary & the National Ramah Commission.pp. 57-63.
- Reissman, B. (1988). Social Change and Response- Assessing the Efforts to maximize Jewish Educational Effectiveness in Jewish Community Centers in North America. New York, NY:
- Schiff, A. (1967). The students of the hebrew teachers colleges. In. O. Janowsky.(Ed.). The Education of America Jewish Teachers. New York, NY: Beacon Press.pp. 83-111.
- Schiff, A. (1974). Overview of programs for the preparation of jewish educational personnel. Jewish Education. 3. pp. 5-7.
- Sherwin, B. (1987). Contexts and Content : Higher Jewish Education in the United States. Chicago, 11: Spertus College of Jewish Studies.
- Shevitz, S. (1988). Field Work Guide for the Jewish Education Concentration. Waltham, MA: Benjamin B. Hornstein Program in Jewish Communal Service, Brandeis University.
- Wachs,S. (1974). The phillip w. lown graduate center for contemporary jewish studies. Jewish Education.3. pp 14-21.
- Woolfolk, A. (1988). Graduate preparation of teachers: The debate and Beyond. In A. Woolfolk (Ed.) Research Perspectives on Graduate Preparation of Teachers.Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.pp. 11-47.
- Zeichner,K. (1988). Understanding the character an quality of the academic and professional components of teacher education. (Research Report 88-1). East Lansing, MI.: The National Center for Research on Teacher Education, Michigan State University.