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	Folder
17	4

Research papers. Planning notes and correspondence. Includes editorials of drafts and budget information, 1990.

Pages from this file are restricted and are not available online. Please contact the American Jewish Archives for more information.

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

MEMO TO: Annette Hochstein, Henry L. Zucker

FROM: Mark Gurvis

DATE: January 3, 1990

SUBJECT: Follow up with Barry Kosmin

I spoke with Barry Kosmin to clarify our previous discussion. Following is the information Annette asked for:

The sample for the CJF National Population Survey was built through a three-stage process as follows:

1. A large random digit dialing sample of 100,000 U.S. households was asked "what is your religion?" If the response was Jewish, they made it to the next stage. If the response was anything other than Jewish, follow-up questions were asked to determine if anyone in the household considered themselves Jewish, was raised Jewish, or had a Jewish parent. If so, that household was included in the next stage.

2. Two weeks later those households remaining in the study were called back to get a household inventory and to check their availability for a May-June 1990 interview call of 30-45 minutes expected length. At the completion of this second stage, about 4% of the original sample were still qualified for interviews. That is higher than expected but probably attributable to Jews being more likely to have telephones, being easier to find than other segments of the population, or more likely to respond.

3. The third stage will be the interviews in May and June of 2,500 households drawn as a random sample from the 4,000 qualified.

As regards analysis, Kosmin's role is basically to find interested researchers for different areas and to match those researchers with potential funders. There are overlapping areas of analysis when it comes to Jewish identity and Jewish education issues. Harold Himmelfarb was initially slated to do the Jewish education piece but is now in Washington, D.C. doing some work for the U.S. Government and it is unclear how much time he can give to this project. Barry hopes to match Himmelfarb up with another researcher to do the work. Sherri Israel from the Boston Federation has expressed interest, as has Leora Isaacs from JESNA.

The funding is not yet in place for the analysis of the Jewish education area, either for the time of researchers to do the work, or for the costs of dissemination. Perhaps it is something the IJE might want to pick up as part of its research agenda.

file research

INTER-OFFICE CORRESPONDENCE

TO: Virginia F. Levi
~~Henry L. Zucker~~
NAME

DEPARTMENT/PLANT LOCATION

FROM: Mark Gurvis
NAME

DEPARTMENT/PLANT LOCATION

DATE: 1/10/90

REPLYING TO YOUR MEMO OF: _____

SUBJECT: PROCESSING OF RESEARCH PAPERS

hold until people talk to Pol. Adv.

Annette and I talked yesterday to again review the processing of the research papers. There are some issues that we will need to resolve:

1. Panels -- Because of the research meeting in early December, Annette feels we will not need to screen the research papers through panels in addition to the senior policy advisors. The only exceptions I would raise are the professional members of the Commission who were invited but couldn't attend the December research meeting. David Dubin, Joshua Elkin, and Sara Lee might conceivably be asked to review the papers simultaneously with the policy advisors. Also, there are probably a few people (Robert Hiller, others) who should look at the community/financing paper before it goes to the Commission.

2 Policy Advisors Meeting -- As the timing now stands, we should have Isa Aron's paper on professionalism tomorrow or Friday. With clearance from Annette it should go immediately to senior policy advisors. By mid-week next week we should also have Isa's data-gathering work, Henry's paper on community/financing, and Aryeh Davidson's paper on training institutions. I doubt Joe Reimer's will be ready to go before the policy advisors meeting. We should consider whether we want to schedule time at the meeting to discuss the papers, or if policy advisors should individually provide reactions, etc. to Annette or directly to authors.

to check w/ VFL

3. Format -- Annette believes that when we share papers with commissioners, they should at least have the look of desk-top publishing, if not professionally type-set and printed. Final printed versions are probably unachievable in time to mail the papers before February 14. Would we want to have the word processing work done here, or at the Jerusalem office?

Jerusalem

We should get back to Annette immediately after reviewing this.

ARCHIVES

Research

TO: Morton L. Mandel, David S. Ariel, Seymour Fox, Mark Gurvis, Annette Hochstein, Stephen H. Hoffman, Martin S. Kraar, Virginia F. Levi, Joseph Reimer, Arthur Rotman, Herman D. Stein, Jonathan Woocher

FROM: Henry L. Zucker HLZ

DATE: February 1, 1990

SUBJECT: COMMISSION RESEARCH PAPERS

Enclosed is a revised version of section four of Isa Aron's paper on professionalization which was distributed to you earlier. Please replace the original section with the enclosed. Please let me know by February 8 whether you would like to suggest changes in the paper. The reactions of the senior policy advisors will determine how much time to set aside at a senior policy advisors' meeting to discuss this paper. If comments are generally favorable, we will distribute this paper to commissioners at the February 14 meeting.

Also enclosed for your review is a draft of Aryeh Davidson's paper on "The Preparation of Jewish Educators in North America: A Research Study." This is a first draft and may be revised somewhat before your feedback is requested.

Other papers are in progress and will be distributed to you as they are ready.

Also enclosed is the cover letter and background materials sent to commissioners.

Section 4

The Prospects for Professionalizing Jewish Teachers

Let us imagine that our goal is the professionalization of the entire Jewish teaching force. Is this goal attainable? If so, at what cost? If not, what goals are more realistic? And what steps ought the Jewish community to be taking to encourage this professionalization?

Three sets of obstacles stand in the way of professionalizing the entire force of Jewish teachers: The first set concerns the inherent limitations of teaching with regard to the criteria of professionalism discussed in this paper. The second set of obstacles derives from certain sociological realities; it includes all those factors which make teaching in general undesirable to potential recruits. The third set of obstacles is specific to Jewish education, encompassing the conditions that make the professionalization of Jewish teaching particularly difficult.

In this section I explore each set of obstacles in turn, summarizing the conclusions of the previous chapters, and adding new information, where relevant. In each case the discussion focuses on what it will take to overcome the obstacles in question. Because the obstacles are inter-related, the suggestions for research and experimentation offered in this section should be considered in concert. Any one, standing alone, can have only limited impact; taken together, they constitute a coordinated plan for upgrading the profession of Jewish teaching.

4.1 Translating the Criteria of Legitimacy and Autonomy into Practical Standards for the Teaching Profession

The discussion of legitimacy and autonomy in Section 1 revealed some of the problems which arise when these criteria are used as standards for improving teaching. To begin with, research on teacher knowledge in the secular field is fraught with controversies over methodology (Gage, 1989). Whether or not this research will yield reliable applications to both training and evaluation is still an open question. Moreover, only some of the research findings, those which deal with generic teaching skills in secular education, are directly transferable to Jewish education; identifying pedagogic content knowledge in subjects such as Hebrew, Bible, and Jewish history will require a good deal of new research.

Despite these problems, accepted standards for both training and evaluation are a necessary step in both legitimizing a profession and differentiating between poor, competent, and excellent practitioners. If Jewish teaching is to become a profession, the Jewish community has no choice but to invest in both research and experimentation in this area. The methodologies for this research have been honed at a number of major research centers, notably the Teacher Assessment Project at Stanford University, and by the National Center for Research on Teacher Education, at Michigan State University. Key figures at each of these centers have been involved with Jewish education in a variety of ways; it would make sense for any future research on Jewish teaching knowledge and evaluation to be conducted in coordination with one or both of these centers.

Concurrent with this research, a way must be found to adapt the findings of both past and future studies to training and evaluation, on an experimental basis. One possibility might be the creation of a national committee on teacher training and evaluation, which would act as a clearinghouse for research and instigate experimental projects, together with the AIHLJE (Association of Institutions of Higher Learning in Jewish Education) and central agencies.

With regard to teacher autonomy, it seems unlikely that teachers can achieve the degree of autonomy of some other professionals; but, as I argued in Section 3.4, this type of individualistic autonomy may not be desirable. Though the degree of autonomy most appropriate for teachers at varying levels of legitimacy may be open to question, the fact that teachers who have demonstrated their legitimacy deserve a good deal more autonomy is not. Since autonomy is intimately connected with the culture of the particular school, it cannot be mandated from above. Nonetheless, policy makers at the local and national level can contribute to the creation of a climate in which autonomy is encouraged. Autonomy does not mean free reign, but rather the creation of a culture of shared leadership in schools. Clearly there is much work to be done analyzing and experimenting with various levels of teacher autonomy. And, of course, the granting of autonomy to teachers must be linked to the creation of sophisticated, reliable evaluation techniques, as discussed above.

Too often a teacher's commitment is simply taken for granted, as though it is too obvious to mention. My own belief (and the belief of many of the early readers of this paper) is that commitment ought to be regarded as a necessary requirement for all teachers of Judaica, regardless of their legitimacy. The commitment of a teacher cannot be easily measured, nor can it be imparted by training, in the narrow, technical sense. Nonetheless, the expectation of commitment ought to be openly stated. More importantly, the teacher's initial sense of commitment, which probably lead to his or her choice of teaching in the first place, can be nurtured in the course of training, at both the pre-service (see Feiman- Nemser, 1989) and in-service levels. The development of commitment—to the tradition, the community, and to the students—should be one of the goals of all training programs. As discussed in Section 3.3, different schools may be interested in different types of religious commitment; this kind of pluralism is to be encouraged.

4.2 Making Teaching Attractive as a Profession

The second set of obstacles to upgrading the teaching profession arises out of the historical conditions in which teaching has been mired. The American public has always viewed its teachers with a mixture of admiration and disdain, acceptance and suspicion (Waller, 1932/1967; Sykes, 1983b). Low teacher salaries over the years indicate that disdain probably outweighed the other sentiments. For years American schools were granted a "hidden subsidy" from women who accepted, because they had little choice, their low pay and low status. With the rise of teachers' unions in the 1960s and early '70s, salaries rose, and began to compare favorably with those of many other occupations. Salaries have not, however, kept pace with inflation (Feistritzer, 1983), and this has contributed to a further decline of the status of teachers. Teaching is regarded as a less desirable career option than ever before. Surveyed in a nation- wide Gallup Poll in 1969, 75% of the responding teachers said they would like to have a child take up teaching in a public school as a career; in 1972 the percentage fell to 67%, and, in 1980, to 48% (Sykes, 1983b, p. 111). The "first wave" of Commission reports (e.g., *A Nation at Risk* [National Commission on Excellence in Education, 1983]) did nothing to raise the status of teachers; if anything, it contributed to their denigration (McDonald, 1986, pp. 356-357). The "second wave" of reform, exemplified by Carnegie (1986) and Holmes (1986) Commission reports, has focused attention on teacher professionalism, teacher status, and teacher salaries. It is too soon to tell if the efforts of these groups will, over the long run, entice a higher caliber of recruits to the field.

Though teachers in Jewish schools are not subject to the political vagaries of public school reform, their status and self-image are inextricably intertwined with that of public school teachers. Since efforts are currently underway to raise the salaries and status of public school teachers, this would be an opportune moment for the Jewish community to swim with the tide, linking its own efforts at recruitment to those of the society at large.

Both status and recruitment are influenced by salaries. However, raising teacher salaries is not a simple matter, even if it is assumed that the money can be found to do so. Which salaries should be raised, those of entry-level teachers (as a recruitment device) or those teachers already in the system (as a retention device)? It stands to reason that salary increases for those currently teaching should be linked, in some way, to merit. However, the instruments currently available for assessing teachers are either too subjective or too limited (Shulman, 1988), and await the results of the research discussed above. Moreover, various merit pay schemes instituted on an experimental basis have been found to be problematic (Murname and Cohen, 1986; Bachrach and Conley, 1986; Johnson, 1984). Finally, there is the question of how large a salary increase would be required in order to make a significant difference in recruitment. One study found that it would take an annual salary increase of $10,000 to make teaching more competitive with other jobs that require equivalent training, such as engineering and accounting (Feistritzer, 1983, p. 16). An assessment of various

mechanisms for upgrading teacher salaries is essential; such an assessment would require some complicated economic modeling and projections. Since fewer than a third of Jewish teaching slots carry medical, pension, and other benefits (Aron and Phillips, 1990), the issue of the Jewish community's obligation to provide benefits for its teachers should be considered concurrently. Providing higher salaries and benefits to teachers might well require the establishment of an educational endowment, at either a national or regional level.

Assuming that teachers' salaries could be increased significantly, an extensive, multi-faceted recruitment campaign would have to be undertaken. This should include: a) the recruitment of college students to training institutions through the use of scholarships and other incentives, and their placement in viable settings upon graduation; b) the recruitment and training of part-time teachers, for whom teaching might be either an avocation or a secondary occupation (Aron, 1988; Davidson, 1990).

4.3 Considering the Possibilities of Differentiated Staffing

The final set of obstacles to the professionalization of Jewish teachers derives from the part-time nature of much of Jewish teaching (see Section 2.3). Because the number of part- time positions is large, relative to full-time positions, Jewish teaching attracts individuals with a wide range of backgrounds and aspirations. There are three ways in which a teacher might think of his or her work: a) as a career; b) as a way of supplementing his or her household's income, either temporarily (while waiting to get married or have children) or on an ongoing basis; and c) as an avocation, an activity engaged in purely for a sense of service or satisfaction. Though I know of no study that has asked public school teachers this question, one can imagine that a majority see teaching as a career. In Jewish education the situation is very different. A recent study in Los Angeles (Aron and Phillips, 1990) found that only 39% of the teachers fell into the "career teacher" category; another 36% saw teaching as a way of earning supplementary income; the remaining 25% saw teaching as an avocation. These differences among teachers were related, though not entirely, to the number of hours in which they taught, and to their other occupations, as can be seen in Tables 4A and 4B.

Understanding the diversity among Jewish teachers, with regard to their self-perception as well as their educational background (referring back to Tables 2E and 2F) makes one question whether full professionalization ought to be our ultimate goal. Given that over two-thirds of all Judaica teachers teach in supplementary schools (See Table 4C), and given that supplementary schools may require a different type of teaching than day schools (Aron, 1987 and 1989), it may be necessary to have some supplementary school teachers who do not have the legitimacy and autonomy that one might expect in a day school.

Table 4A

HOW LOS ANGELES TEACHERS SEE TEACHING, BY NUMBER OF HOURS TAUGHT (% IN EACH CATEGORY)

	"A Career" (N=230)	*"A Way of Earning Supplementary Income"* (N=203)	*"Something I Do for the Satisfaction"* (N=142)	*Total*
1-3 Hours (N=141)	8	47	45	100%
4-9 Hours (N=171)	21	47	32	100%
10-20 Hours (N=152)	56	34	10	101%
21+ Hours (N=575)	88	4	8	100%

Table 4B

HOW LOS ANGELES TEACHERS SEE TEACHING, BY OTHER OCCUPATIONS (% IN EACH CATEGORY)

	"As a Career" (N=238)	*"As a Way of Earning Supplementary Income"* (N=223)	*"Something I Do for the Satisfaction"* (N=156)	*Total*
Full-time in Jewish education (N=181)	77	13	10	100%
Homemaker (N=99)	40	32	27	100%
Full-time student (N=65)	18	65	17	100%
Other part-time employment (N=149)	24	44	32	100%
Other full-time employment (N=123)	8	50	52	100%

(N=617); *Source:* Los Angeles: Aron and Phillips, 1990. Totals of 99 or 101% are due to rounding.

Table 4C

PERCENTAGE OF TEACHERS TEACHING IN DAY VS. SUPPLEMENTARY SCHOOLS IN SELECTED CITIES

	Day School	*Supplementary School*
Los Angeles	33	67
Miami	37	63
Philadelphia	11	89
Pittsburgh	25	75

Sources: Los Angeles: Aron and Phillips, 1990; Miami: Sheskin, 1988; Philadelphia: Federation of Jewish Agencies of Greater Philadelphia, 1989; Pittsburgh: United Jewish Federation of Greater Pittsburgh, 1986.

I believe that we have a good deal to learn, in this regard, from the reports of the Holmes (1986) and Carnegie (1986) commissions, both of which advocated differentiated staffing, as explained in Section 1.4. A differentiated staffing arrangement in a Jewish school would be more complicated than in a public school, because it would have to accommodate differences in the number of hours teachers teach, and how they perceive their work, as well as different levels of legitimacy and autonomy. A range of different staffing arrangements can be imagined, from a day school staff consisting entirely of full-time aspiring and/or accomplished professionals, to a supplementary school staff with mostly avocational teachers. The following hypothetical models are offered for illustrative purposes:

Aleph School: A "Professional Development" Day School

Following the model of the "professional development" school in public education (Darling-Hammond, 1989), the Aleph School aspires to support and nurture beginning teachers, most of whom will go on to other schools after three to five years. All of the schools' 20 Judaica teachers are employed full-time, though none of them teach full-time. Each of the school's 14 classes is co-taught by a Judaica and general studies teacher; the Judaica teachers are all graduates of a local Jewish teacher training institute, and range in experience from 0-5 years. The newest of the teachers teach

only 2/3 time; the remainder of their week is spent developing materials, observing other teachers, and conferring with their mentor-teachers. With each year of experience, the teachers spend more time in the classroom, though even those who have five years of experience spend a few hours a week on the other tasks. The remaining six teachers are an outstanding group of veteran teachers, who serve as mentors for the remaining 14, and for student teachers at the training institution mentioned above. The mentor teachers form the administrative core of the school, working closely with the principal to set policy. Each mentor teacher also spends at least ten hours per week in the classroom, either covering for the other teachers or working on special projects.

Bet School: A K-12 Day School

Bet School is a day school organized on more conventional (and fiscally conservative) lines, with half a day allotted to Judaica, and half to general studies. With 26 classes, the school has 26 half-time Judaica slots. Since the high school program is departmentalized, the school is able to arrange the schedule so that some of the high school Judaica teachers have full-time jobs. Four of the upper division teachers have chosen this full- time option, while two others work 3/4 time. This leaves a total of 15 teachers who teach at the school half-time. In cooperation with the local bureau of Jewish education, the school has sought to create as many full-time, or nearly full-time, "packages" as possible. Three teachers serve as mentors and curriculum developers, under a grant from the Bureau. An additional four teach and/or do programming in the supplementary school of a nearby synagogue; the two schools, with financial assistance from the Bureau, offer these teachers full-time salaries and benefits. Three other teachers have hybrid teaching arrangements; one works as the school librarian; two others work half-time at Jewish Family Service. Of the five remaining teachers, three prefer to work half-time; two would like to be working full-time, and the director is trying to work out some arrangement for them.

The educational background of the teachers varies. About half are graduates of Jewish teacher training programs, in either the U.S. or in Israel. The school encourages all its teachers, and requires those who are not graduates of a training program, to be working towards the fulfillment of a plan for professional development. Each teacher's plan has been worked out individually with one of the school's supervisory personnel, with an eye to those areas in which he or she either needs or desires more knowledge or skill. Teachers meet these requirements by taking courses at the Bureau or at local colleges (their tuition is subsidized by the Bureau), or by pursuing an independent study arrangement with a designated mentor. Each teacher also has a supervisor, who observes and confers with him or her on a regular basis.

Gimel School: A Large Congregational Supplementary School

Gimel School has a student population of 750, and a teaching staff of 20. The school has an integrated Hebrew and Judaica curriculum, which means that each teacher stays with his or her class six hours a week, with the exception of a few high school

teachers, whose classes are of shorter duration. Since the maximum number of hours that a teacher can teach in the supplementary school is 16, no teachers have full-time teaching positions. Five of the teachers fall into the avocational category; they include two housewives, one aspiring actor, and two full-time graduate students, who teach only six hours each. None of these teachers has a degree in Jewish education, though the graduate students have extensive Judaica and camping experience, and the housewives are both former public school teachers. For each of these teachers the principal has created an individualized professional growth plan which focuses on workshops, conferences and independent projects, rather than formal courses.

At the other end of the spectrum are ten teachers who are in the "professional track," and have full-time positions either in the synagogue, or through a hybrid-teaching arrangement: Three are employed by the school as mentors, curriculum writers and program developers; these are the most fully professional, and are enrolled in a part-time graduate program in education at a local college. Four others teach twelve hours each, and are employed elsewhere in the synagogue, as pre-school teachers, a *havurah* coordinator, and an administrative assistant. The last three teach half-time at a local day school; the day and supplementary school, together with the Bureau, pay them a full- time salary plus benefits. The professional development plan for each of these teachers is also individualized, but is more rigorous. It consists of a sequence of courses and requirements the teachers are expected to have taken in the past, or be accumulating, gradually, on a part-time basis.

The remaining five teachers might be considered more than avocational but less than professional. All teach twelve hours, and most would like to enter into some sort of full-time arrangement. This group has the most rigorous professional development schedule, with the promise that when the requirements are completed, every effort will be made to secure them full-time positions. Since their current positions are only part-time, these teachers are paid for time spent in courses and workshops.

Dalet School: A Medium-sized Supplementary School with Avocational Teachers

The Dalet School is located at a Jewish community center. It was founded fifteen years ago by parents looking to become more involved in their children's Jewish education. At the outset, the school had under 100 students, and all positions, whether teaching, administrative, secretarial, or janitorial, were volunteer. As the school grew, it hired a full-time education director and some mentor teachers, and began paying its other teachers an "honorarium" of $750 a year, but its participatory philosophy remained the same. Currently, the school has 350 students and a teaching staff of 40. Three of the teachers are highly-paid professionals, whose primary responsibilities are teaching training, mentoring and curriculum development. The remaining 37 teachers are all avocational, and range in age from 17 to 70. Most teach three to six hours a week, but a few teach only two.

All of the avocational teachers were trained in-house, in a program of two years' duration, prior to entering the classroom. This training program is on-going, with a new cycle beginning every two years, and each cohort numbering from two to six teachers-in-training. The low student-teacher ratio gives the school a good deal of flexibility. All classes are co-taught by at least two teachers, and there is a Hebrew language lab which is staffed by at least three teachers at all times. In addition, special projects, requiring special staff members, take place throughout the year.

The typical avocational teacher stays with the school from five to eight years, and the school has worked hard to put together a challenging program of in-service education. The school is particularly proud of three of its former teachers, who have gone on to enroll in full-time graduate programs in Jewish education.

In portraying four hypothetical schools, I have tried to show the different dimensions along which staffing arrangements can vary. The first dimension is setting: day vs. supplementary school is the most important difference; but the size of a school, and its location in or dependence on a larger institution can also be important. A second way in which schools differ is in their ideology: the Dalet School's emphasis on community participation lead to one staffing arrangement; the Gimel School's preference for an integrated Hebrew/Judaica curriculum has staffing limitations as well. The four schools vary in their institutional affiliations, as well: the Aleph School is closely linked to a Jewish teacher training institution; the Bet School has strong links to both the Bureau and another supplementary school; the Gimel School derives some of its flexibility in staffing from its location within a large congregation; the Dalet School is virtually independent of other institutions. Finally, the gap in per pupil expenditure between Aleph and Bet, on the one hand, and Gimel and Dalet, on the other, is quite large.

Despite these differences, the schools share certain commonalties, which distinguish them from the typical Jewish school:

1) The educational directors of all four schools see their role as extending beyond administration to include both training and staff development.

2) Each school has at least a few teachers who are compensated for tasks other than teaching, such as mentoring, supervision, and curriculum development. This policy allows the most professional teachers in the school an oppoftunity to expand their horizons and share their expertise with others.

3) It is unlikely that any of the schools, with the possible exception of the fourth, can raise sufficient funds to meet its payroll. Most schools with a number of fully professional teachers will require subsidies, possibly from an endowment fund.

4) All of the schools (including the fourth, if it requires external funds) have succeeded in upgrading the professional level of their faculties through forging links with other

institutions, including other schools, colleges, bureaus of Jewish education, and local social service agencies. As discussed in Section 2, this type of cooperation cannot be mandated; but it does seem to be a necessary ingredient for the professionalization of teachers.

One can imagine any number of other differentiated staffing configurations, each responding to a different set of circumstances and each reflecting a different ideological perspective. However, it would be difficult for a school or a community to decide on a particular staffing arrangement (or whether, in fact, a differentiated staffing structure would be feasible at all, unless it could see a reasonably accurate projection of the costs involved. Research into the economics of differentiated staffing arrangements needs to be conducted. Concurrently, a series of feasibility studies exploring ways to increase school budgets through endowments, communal allocations, and other means should be embarked upon, to see how highly professional a staff various schools and communities can afford.

4.4 Conclusion

I have tried to delineate (as simply as possible, given the complexity of the issues), what professionalism in teaching, as a concrete reality rather than an honorific slogan, entails. Since the body of research on Jewish teachers is so limited, we have only a rudimentary sense of what level of professionalism the current pool of Jewish teachers has attained. Thus, a number of important questions remain: What percentage of our current pool of teachers can be considered professional, potentially professional, or unlikely to become professional? What would it take, in terms of training, supervision, and support, to move the potential professionals up the ladder? How professional a teaching staff can different Jewish communities afford? How professional a staff do they desire? These questions can only be answered once the research, experimentation and consciousness-raising outlined in the above proposals has begun. As I indicated above, I do not see these proposals as independent of one another; each is a necessary step towards the solution of a complicated, interlocking puzzle.

Writing in 1983 about public school teachers, Donna Kerr observed that it was time for Americans to acknowledge collective responsibility for the quality of teachers.

> There is a disturbing duplicity in a society that itself fails to create the conditions that would foster teacher competence, and then complains of incompetent teachers. Our teaching corps can be no more competent than we make it.
>
> [1983b, p. 131]

Today, in 1990, the same can be said for the Jewish community's responsibility to take ownership of the problems of Jewish teachers. Let us hope that the community will rise to accept the challenge.

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

AMERICAN JEWISH ARCHIVES

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

REFERRENCES

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.1 Although Jewish educators are currently associated with both formal and informal educational settings (Hochstein,1986; Ettenberg & Rosenfield, 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. 2 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 personnnel 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 in dividuals 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.3 Between 1897 and 1954 eleven such institutions were established.4

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 instituions 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 personnel5.

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, Philadephia
Baltimore Hebrew University
Spertus College of Jewish Studies, Chicago
Cleveland College of Jewish Studies
Hebrew College,Boston
Midrash (Teaher 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-Azrielli 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 columnn 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 amd 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, knowlegeable 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 alot to learn from our colleagues in American education.

Interestingly, analysis of the data found that most program goals or mission statements, relected 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 religous meaning, from the text, from the experience.... We have alot 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 referrence 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 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 infantalized 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 placeed 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. <u>The tension between theory and practice</u>

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 exascerbated 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. <u>The role of the practicum</u>

According to the guidlines 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 positons 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 infantalizing.
>
> 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 betwen 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 enthusiam 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 BJEs. 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 (Feistritzer,1986), Jewish education programs have a disproportianate 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.7 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 carrer 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

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 becuse 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 virture 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 deparment where the part-time personnel out number 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.8 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 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?

AMERICAN JEWISH ARCHIVES

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 form 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?

AMERICAN JEWISH ARCHIVES

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 Educaton, 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 an 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 effectivess 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 educatonal in-service programs one receives the impression from descriptons 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 (Leiberman, 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 an 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, adn the Teaching of Israel. Teachers from all denominations have participated in these programs.

The denominational movements are 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 preceeding 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, their 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 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 do 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 kowledge and skills which underlie Jewish identity and knowlege (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 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.

ARCHIVES

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 Univerisity, 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 availablity 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 conmonalities 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.

AMERICAN JEWISH ARCHIVES

Table 1

Institutions of Higher Learning Granting Jewish Education Degrees and Certificates

Institution	B.A.	Teacher Cert.	M.A.	Principal	Doctorate	Cert.
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 Univerisity	x	x	x			

AMERICAN JEWISH ARCHIVES

Table 2.

Enrolled and Graduating Jewish Education Students from Institutions of Higher Learning

Degrees or Certificates	Currently Enrolled Students	Number of 1989 Graduates	Total Number of Students
B.A.	68	21	89
Teacher Certification	43	n.a.	n.a.
M. A.		62 *	247
Full-time	76		
Part-time	171		
			(358)a
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.

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

AMERICAN JEWISH ARCHIVES

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 their 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 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 decribe the tenure process in your institution. What does 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 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 eduction? What programs does _____ offer that ostensively prepares or trains educators? How do you view the purpose of training Jewish educators? What are the needs of the education programs?

Visions and dreamsIf 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 progrms 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 officicial 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 instituions 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 of 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 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 atomatically eligible to receive a Hebrew teachers license upon appplication 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 AJIHJE 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

AMERICAN JEWISH ARCHIVES

REFERRENCES

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, 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.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.

COMMISSION
ON JEWISH EDUCATION
IN NORTH AMERICA

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

Commissioners

Morton L. Mandel
Chairman
Mona Riklis Ackerman
Ronald Appleby
David Arnow
Mandell L. Berman
Jack Bieler
Charles R. Bronfman
John C. Colman
Maurice S. Corson
Lester Crown
David 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

In Formation

Senior Policy Advisors

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

Director

Henry L. Zucker

Staff

Mark Gurvis
Virginia F. Levi
Joseph Reimer

February 1, 1990

Dear

I am pleased to enclose background materials for our February 14th meeting in New York. The materials outline a series of recommendations that we will discuss at the meeting. As I reviewed the materials, I was very excited about the scope of what we have discussed during the past year and one-half, and the opportunities that present themselves out of our work together.

We have asked for an extended meeting date from February 14th because of the volume of material and the range of ideas that need to be digested. No matter how much time is available, however, I am concerned that some points might be missed. Therefore, we welcome your written comments on the entire document, both substantive and editorial, in advance of February 14.

Remember, we will be starting the meeting promptly at 9:30 a.m. at the New York Federation office. Coffee, tea, and pastries will be available at 9:00 a.m.

Morton L. Mandel
Chairman

file search

February 4, 1990
David S. Ariel

NOTES ON ARYEH DAVIDSON'S PAPER ON TRAINING INSTITUTIONS

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

C:\DAVIDSON.DOC

PREMIER INDUSTRIAL CORPORATION

REQUEST FOR TELEX/MAILGRAM/FAX

72343 (REV. 2/88) PRINTED IN U.S.A.

TYPE (USING DOUBLE SPACES) OR PRINT CLEARLY

SPECIFY HOW TO SEND MESSAGE

- ☐ TELEX NO. _____
- ☐ MAILGRAM _____
- ☒ FAX NO. 9722699951
- NO. OF PGS. (INCL. COVER SHEET) 7

DATE REQUESTED 2/21/90

- ☒ URGENT - Time sensitive - must go at once
- ☐ REGULAR - Send at time rates are most economical

TO: ANNETTE HOCHSTEIN

NAME SEYMOUR FOX

COMPANY NATIV

STREET ADDRESS _____

CITY, STATE, ZIP JERUSALEM

PHONE NUMBER _____

FROM:

NAME MARK GURVIS

COMPANY PREMIER

DEPARTMENT _____

COST CENTER 090

216 361 9962

TELEX NO.: 6873015 PREMI UW | **FAX NO.: ~~2163918327~~** | **TIME SENT:**

MESSAGE:

Sent 2/21 2:25 P

MEMO TO: David S. Ariel, Seymour Fox, Annette Hochstein, Stephen H. Hoffman, Martin S. Kraar, Virginia F. Levi, Morton L. Mandel, Joseph Reimer, Arthur Rotman, Herman D. Stein, Jonathan Woocher, Henry L. Zucker

FROM: Mark Gurvis MG

DATE: February 21, 1990

SUBJECT: Process for Reviewing Research Paper

Based on our recent policy advisors meeting, the following will be the process for reviewing the research papers as they become available.

As soon as papers are cleared for distribution by Seymour and Annette, they will be sent to the policy advisors. Within a week you should write or call me with your comments. If you have a major substantive response, it will be easier if you provide it in writing. You should be prepared in your response to offer your opinion on whether a paper should be shared with commissioners as is, or if it requires further consideration of specific issues.

After checking with each policy advisor, I will share the responses requiring follow up with Seymour and Annette and arrange any conference calls that may be necessary to resolve outstanding issues. Assuming that issues can be resolved in this manner, a paper will then be forwarded to the commissioners. If there are any issues that require fuller discussion by the full senior policy advisors group, we will hold the paper for substantive discussion at a future meeting.

Please feel free to call me any time on the review process or about specific papers. At this point you have Isa Aron's paper on professionalism and Aryeh Davidson's paper on training. Please let me know if you have any further questions to raise on either of those papers. *Enclosed is the material from the CAJE work groups on five of the programmatic areas. Further papers should be on their way to you shortly.

* FIELD NOTES BY
ROBERTA GOODMAN AND RON REYNOLDS

THE COMMISSION'S RESEARCH PROGRAM:

Status Report and Assignments

1. **Walter Ackerman: The Structure of Jewish Education**

   Status: Draft completed. Needs minor revisions prior to review by Senior Policy Advisors.

   Assignments: (a) SF to ask WA for revisions.
   (b) WA to revise and send draft.
   (c) MG to send to Senior Policy Advisors for review.

2. **Isa Aron: Finding of the L.A. BJE Teacher Census**

   Status: Draft completed.

   Assignments: (a) SF and AH to review and send to MG.
   (b) MG to send to Senior Policy Advisors for review.

3 **Isa Aron: Studies of Personnel in Jewish Education: A Summary Report**

   Status: Draft completed. Collection of background data for report. Not to be distributed.

   Assignments: None.

4. **Isa Aron: Towards the Professionalization of Jewish Teaching**

   Status: Draft completed. Paper sent for review to Senior Policy Advisors.

   Assignments: MG to collect responses and forward to AH.

5. **Aryeh Davidson: The Preparation of Jewish Educators in North America: A Research Study**

   Status: Draft completed. Paper sent for review to Senior Policy Advisors.

   Assignments: MG to collect responses and forward to AH.

6. **J. Fox: Federation-Led Community Planning for Jewish Education, Identity and Continuity**

   Status: Completed.

   Assignments: SF to consider with HLZ if changes required.

7. **J. Reimer: The Synagogue as a Context for Jewish Education**

   Status: Phase I draft completed.

   Assignments: JR to research and write phase II.

8. **B. Reisman: Informal Jewish Education**

   Status: Draft to be completed by 3/1.

9. **Israel Scheffler & Seymour Fox: The Relationship Between Jewish Ed and Jewish Continuity**

   Status: Transcripts completed.

   Assignments: SF and IS to edit first draft -- 3/15.

10. **H.L. Zucker: Community Organization for Jewish Education in North America; Leadership, Finance and Structure**

    Status: Completed.

    Assignments: SF to consider with HLZ if changes required.

MEMO TO: Annette Hochstein

FROM: Mark Gurvis MJ

DATE: February 26, 1990

SUBJECT: A. Comments on Aron's and Davidson's papers
B. Update on Reisman

A. Following are comments I have received on Isa Aron's and Aryeh Davidson's papers to date. We will need to think through how to proceed based on these comments:

1. David Ariel--He has no concerns or issues to raise on Isa's paper. He has numerous concerns about Aryeh's paper, which he has committed to paper, and which I gave you a few weeks ago in Cleveland. In general, he is concerned that the paper does not capture enough of the future plans of the institutions. He believes the paper does need additional work before distribution to the commissioners.

2. Herman Stein--He has no concerns on Aryeh's paper, but believes that Isa's paper bogs down on the problem of defining professionalism. He would look for a more nuts and bolts paper on the steps needed to move the field in the right direction. While he might have structured the assignment differently, he believes she has responded to her assignment well, and that the paper need not be held up from distribution to commissioners. He might feel more strongly about tightening up the beginning section on definition before the paper is published. a letter from Herman is appended to this memo.

3. Jon Woocher--Jon has no concerns to raise on Isa's paper. He finds Aryeh's paper somewhat confusing to read because of the constraints Aryeh faced in not being able to identify particular situations or institutions. More importantly, he believes there are some important in-service education models missing from the paper, and which would be important to include. He would be glad to have his staff (Paul Flexner) help identify additional information to include.

There were no other comments from policy advisors.

B. I spoke with Bernie Reisman today. His paper is in two parts. First is a review of background and history of informal education, which runs about 45 pages. This is complete. The second section, which is about 2/3 complete, is a more nuts and bolts analysis of settings, techniques, principles, and recommendations for policy and program direction. This will run about another 40 pages. Bernie will send the whole package by overnight mail on Monday, March 5, and I will forward it to you immediately.

His paper is being typed on IBM wordprocessing equipment, and he is prepared to send the discs if needed. Please let me know if this would facilitate the production of the desk top publishing quality version your office will have to produce.

cc: Henry L. Zucker and Virginia F. Levi

Brandeis University

Benjamin S. Hornstein Program in Jewish Communal Service

Philip W. Lown School of Near Eastern and Judaic Studies

P.O. Box 9110
Waltham, Massachusetts
02254-9110

617-736-2990

617-736-3009
(TTY/TDD)

March 5, 1990

Annette Hockstein
c/o NATIV
10 Yehoshafat St.
Jerusalem, 93152, ISRAEL

Dear Annette,

I'm pleased to send you my paper and disks on "Informal Education." It was exciting to work on the paper, although I could have used at least two more weeks, given that it proved to be a bigger project that I anticipated.

I didn't get to share the paper with some of my Brandeis colleagues before sending it to you so as to benefit from their comments, but I will do that now. If I get some ideas from them which I would like to incorporate, and there is time, I'll send them on to you. If there is not time, the paper will stand on as. Of course, you and Seymour may want to do some editing.

The one piece not included is Appendix II (full results of my survey on Jewish Family Education) which I will have in two days and will send you.

I look forward to hearing from you.

Sincerely,

Bernie

Bernard Reisman
Director, Hornstein Program in
Jewish Communal Service

The information on the disk : the text is in WP 4.1 and also in ASCII file.

cc: Mark Gurvis

enc.

nb

May 5-7, 1990

Twentieth Anniversary

Brandeis University

Philip W. Lown
School of
Near Eastern and
Judaic Studies

Benjamin S. Hornstein
Program in Jewish
Communal Service
617-736-2990

Waltham, Massachusetts
02254-9110

file research

March 6, 1990

Mark Gurvis
Mandel Commission on Jewish Education
4500 Euclid Ave.
Cleveland, OH 44103

Dear Mark,

Sorry for the delay in getting this paper to you. It proved to be a major project and the computer production of the final copy got complicated.

The only piece missing is Appendix II, which I will send you in another day.

I have sent the same copy to Annette Hochstein via "overnight" (72 hours) mail.

Call me if you need anything else.

Sincerely,

Bernie

Bernard Reisman, Director

enc.

ng

AMERICAN JEWISH ARCHIVES

MEMO TO: David Ariel, Seymour Fox, Annette Hochstein, Stephen H. Hoffman, Martin S. Kraar, Virginia F. Levi, Morton L. Mandel, Joseph Reimer, Arthur Rotman, Herman D. Stein, Jonathan Woocher, Henry L. Zucker

FROM: Mark Gurvis MG

DATE: March 13, 1990

Enclosed is a copy of Isa Aron's second paper, an analysis of the Los Angeles BJE Teacher Census. As usual, please share any reactions with me as soon as possible.

Also enclosed are summary notes from the outreach meetings held with educators from the Conservative and Reform movements.

AMERICAN JEWISH ARCHIVES

PREMIER INDUSTRIAL CORPORATION

REQUEST FOR TELEX/MAILGRAM/FAX

72343 (REV. 2/88) PRINTED IN U.S.A.

TYPE (USING DOUBLE SPACES) OR PRINT CLEARLY

SPECIFY HOW TO SEND MESSAGE

- ☐ TELEX NO. _____
- ☐ MAILGRAM _____
- ☒ FAX NO. 212 678-8947
- NO. OF PGS. 7 (INCL. COVER SHEET)

DATE REQUESTED: 3/19/90

- ☒ URGENT - Time sensitive - must go at once
- ☐ REGULAR - Send at time rates are most economical

TO:

NAME Aryeh Davidson
COMPANY Jewish Theological Seminary
STREET ADDRESS _____
CITY, STATE, ZIP New York
PHONE NUMBER _____

FROM:

NAME Mark Gurvis
COMPANY Premier
DEPARTMENT _____
COST CENTER 090
216 361 9962

TELEX NO.: 6873015 PREMI UW | **FAX NO.: ~~2163918327~~** | **TIME SENT:**

MESSAGE:

sent 3/19 2:58

PREMIER INDUSTRIAL CORPORATION

REQUEST FOR TELEX/MAILGRAM/FAX

72343 (REV. 2/88) PRINTED IN U.S.A.

TYPE (USING DOUBLE SPACES) OR PRINT CLEARLY

SPECIFY HOW TO SEND MESSAGE

- ☐ TELEX NO. _____
- ☐ MAILGRAM _____
- ☒ FAX NO. 972 2 699951
- NO. OF PGS. (INCL. COVER SHEET) 7

DATE REQUESTED: 3/19/90

- ☒ URGENT - Time sensitive - must go at once
- ☐ REGULAR - Send at time rates are most economical

TO:

NAME Seymour Fox
COMPANY Nativ
STREET ADDRESS _____
CITY, STATE, ZIP Jerusalem
PHONE NUMBER _____

FROM:

NAME Mark Gurvis
COMPANY Premier
DEPARTMENT _____
COST CENTER 090
216 361 9962

TELEX NO.: 6873015 PREMI UW | **FAX NO.: ~~2163918327~~** | **TIME SENT:**

MESSAGE:

I spoke with Alvin Schiff about Mervin Schick. In Alvin's view there is not much point to meeting with Schick. He is not viewed favorably by the moderate or centrist Orthodox community, and has a solid reputation for being anti-community and anti-federation. If we feel we need to reach out to Torah U'nesorah as a response to Schick's column, this isn't the right guy.

Let me know what you think our next step ought to be.

Sent 3/20 2:00

file - Research

cc: Henry L. Zucker

TO: Seymour Fox, Mark Gurvis, Annette Hochstein

FROM: Virginia F. Levi

DATE: March 23, 1990

SUBJECT: HIGHLIGHTS OF TELEPHONE CONVERSATION OF MARCH 22, 1990

Below is a brief summary of our telephone conversation of March 22, including reminders of assignments each of us has agreed to.

1. Research Status

   A. Ackerman--AH will Federal Express a copy to us for distribution to senior policy advisors.

   B. Aron on professionalization--AH has sent a revised list of senior policy advisors and instructions for printing. This will be ready to duplicate and distribute after SF calls Herman Stein and reviews and comments on the proposed cover letter.

   C. Aron--Teacher Census--Comments have been received from some senior policy advisors. MG will check with others. SF and AH are still considering whether or not this should be published.

   D. Davidson--He has comments from senior policy advisors. The next step is for SF to talk with him about the changes to be incorporated in the next draft. MG will check with Davidson on convenient times for a teleconference on March 27, 28, or 30 and will fax that information to SF.

   E. Zucker and Fox papers--It was agreed that these will not be reproduced and distributed to commissioners at this time.

   F. Reimer--SF will call and reinforce a deadline several days in advance of the April 22 senior policy advisors meeting.

   G. Reisman--MG will circulate the paper to policy advisors for comments.

   H. CAJE--This paper will not be published, but will provide useful material for lead communities. AH will discuss this with Elliot Spack.

   I. Fox/Scheffler paper--On schedule; should be in Cleveland by April 5, 1990.

   J. If we have not heard from MLM about the printing of report covers by the end of the day today (March 23), VFL will fax a copy of the memo recommending this process to SF for his use in talking with MLM on March 26.

K. VFL and MG will send SF a summary of the research budget.

2. Finn--SF reported that he had had a long meeting with Finn and his staff last week and has a teleconference scheduled for today. He and HLZ will talk in detail about Finn's progress on the final report. Following HLZ's return to Cleveland, we will talk concretely about a schedule for that report.

3. Interview Schedule--SF and AH agreed that this would be completed after Passover, in advance of the senior policy advisory meeting of April 22.

4. Plans for Meeting of April 22--We will decide during the teleconference on April 12 whether or not to proceed with the meeting. Current agenda items include:

   A. Review interview schedule and assignments to commissioners

   B. Status of final report

   C. Time line and MO from April 1, 1990 to December 31, 1990

   D. Funding

   E. Update on IJE activity

   F. Plans for June meeting

5. VFL agreed to call Loup's secretary to ensure that the correct Commission date is on his calendar.

RESEARCHERS

Dr. Hanan Alexander
University of Judaism
15600 Mulholland Drive
Los Angeles, CA 90077

Dr. David Ariel
College of Jewish Studies
26500 Shaker Boulevard
Beachwood, OH 44122

Dr. Isa Aron
Hebrew Union College
Jewish Institute of Religion
3077 University Avenue
Los Angeles, CA 90007

Rabbi Jack Bieler
Hebrew Academy of Greater Washington
2010 Linden Lane
Silver Spring, MD 20910

Dr. Sharon Feinman-Nemser
Department of Education-Ericson Hall
Michigan State University
East Lansing, MI 48824

Mr. Alan Hoffman
1322 Brooklyn Street
Ann Arbor, MI 48104

Dr. Barry Holtz
Melton Research Center
Jewish Theological Seminary of America
3080 Broadway
New York, NY 10027

Professor Michael Inbar
Chelsmore Apartments
205 West 15th Street, Apt. 4G
New York, NY 10011

Dr. Joseph Reimer
Benjamin S. Hornstein Program
Brandeis University
Waltham, MA 92254

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

Dr. Jonathan Woocher
JESNA
730 Broadway
New York, NY 10003-9540

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

AMERICAN JEWISH ARCHIVES

MEMO TO: Annette Hochstein

FROM: Mark Gurvis MG

DATE: March 20, 1990

SUBJECT: Additional comments on research paper

---

1. CAJE -- Although they have not provided anything in writing, both David Ariel and Stephen Hoffman have expressed that the CAJE material is not suitable for publication, or for dissemination under the Commission's auspices.

2. Aron -- On Isa's second paper, Jon Woocher has some reactions to share. He believes the work is very competently done. However, Jon was expecting more of a comparison between Los Angeles and the other cities (Miami, Philadelphia). Without more extensive comparisons, Jon is concerned that the paper's use is limited for the Commission, since it reflects a picture of one community with some unique characteristics. In that sense, the paper is an initial effort requiring follow-up analysis.

MEMO TO: Annette Hochstein

FROM: Mark Gurvis

DATE: April 2, 1990

SUBJECT: Isa Aron's Paper

Having had an opportunity to review Isa's paper on the L.A. teacher census, I thought I would share a couple of my own reactions. In general, I would echo Jon Woocher's concern about the limited value of the study because of its focus on only one community's data. Comparisons across Los Angeles, Philadelphia, and Miami might have yielded a richer picture less subject to a single community's idiosyncracies.

I was very surprised that over half of the teachers are between 25-39 years old. I would have expected more college-age students, and more older teachers. I think it would be very interesting to look in greater depth at the 25-39 population and their characteristics.

The other item that really caught my eye was the level of satisfaction by type of school. I suspect that Orthodox day schools and Reform supplementary schools experience higher levels of teacher satisfaction because there is greater confluence between what those schools expect of their families, and vice versa. Perhaps in these schools there is general agreement on either high or low expectations, and therefore teachers are less likely to be caught in a conflict over expectations. This may, in fact, point to one of the significant differences between Reform and Conservative supplementary schools. Conservative schools may still be articulating higher expectations for observance, parental participation, religious observances, etc. than Reform supplementary schools, but are probably finding that their constituency is no more likely than Reform synagogue members to agree with such levels of expectations. Therefore, teachers in Conservative schools would experience a higher degree of dissonance between what they are teaching and the support for it in the home.

I expect to be able to share more comments from senior policy advisors on the various papers next week.

MEMO TO: Annette Hochstein

FROM: Mark Gurvis

DATE: April 4, 1990

SUBJECT: Reaction to Ackerman and Reisman Papers

I have gotten initial reactions from Joe Reimer and Jon Woocher on the papers by Walter Ackerman and Bernie Reisman. You should note that we seem to be missing a sheet between pages 3 and 4 in Ackerman's paper that makes the reading somewhat difficult. I am appending those two sheets with this memo so you can identify what might be missing.

Reimer -- Comments are appended to the memo.

Woocher -- On Ackerman:

1. In general, Jon finds the paper to be a solid, judicious, intelligent overview.

2. He suggests a 1-2 page summary or synthesis which identifies the various issues raised throughout the paper and lists them in one place. All of these issues are open discussion topics in today's Jewish education scene and it would be helpful to bring them all into one place and focus attention upon them. Examples of issues surfaced by the paper include: the role and mission of central agencies; how federations can play a most useful role in the Jewish education arena; the lack of a professional association for teachers as a block in the professionalization of the field, etc.

3. There should be consistent references to JWB throughout the paper by the organization's current title. Similarly, on page 10 the National Council for Jewish Education is now called the Council for Jewish Education.

4. On page 8 there is reference to the Association of Institutions of Higher Learning in Jewish Education having "not yet succeeded in developing its defining characteristics." The Association is so new that it is not a matter of having tried and failed, but rather of a new organization in its nascent stages. Softening the language here would help.

5. On page 9, Jon feels the situation between Jewish academia and Jewish education is more complicated than is reflected in the paper. Many Jewish academics play substantial roles in adult Jewish education, as school board members, as consultants, etc. The formal connection may be lacking, but they are connected in many ways.

6. On page 10, Jon believes the reference to CAJE falls short of the mark. CAJE is an organization, not just an annual conference, and although it is not a teacher organization, it has emerged in the last decade as the major Jewish education organization involving teachers.

Woocher -- On Reisman:

1. In general, Jon believes Bernie has done a fairly thorough job providing a conceptual framework for understanding informal education.

2. He takes some issue with the characterizations of JESNA on page 40. JESNA is funded by allocations from individual federations; it is not funded by CJF. It should not be cast simply as the coordinating council of central agencies; it's mandate goes far beyond that role. The regional conferences each focused on a different thematic area--one on adult education and one on family education.

3. Jon believes the section on camping is disproportionately thin. Given the depth with which other settings and frameworks are explored, this critically important area suffers by comparison.

4. The reference to the number of colleges in the Association of Institutions of Higher Learning in Jewish Education is not consistent throughout the paper. In some places Bernie notes twelve colleges; in others, thirteen.

cc: Virginia F. Levi ✓
Henry L. Zucker

Kehillah for the "improvement and promoting of Jewish religious primary education in the city."[4] The Bureau under the inspired leadership of Dr. Samson Benderly and the coterie of American born young men attracted to him and the cause of Jewish education forged a pattern of programs and activities which until this day frames the work of similar agencies subsequently established in cities all over the United States and Canada.

In the years between its establishment in 1910 and its affiliation, upon the virtual dissolution of the Kehillah in 1917, with the Federation for the Support of Jewish Philanthropic Societies, the Bureau had demonstrated the advantages of a centralized effort at the same time as it had gained a new place for Jewish education in American Jewish life. Benderly's report to the Kehillah in 1915 noted that the Bureau "... directs, supervises, or cooperates with 179 schools. 521 teachers and 31,300 teachers."[5] Even though income from the initial gift, never ending fund raising and tuitions collected by the Bureau's Department of Collection and Investigation from the families of pupils in affiliated schools always ran behind the cost of the ambitions and imaginative programs designed by Benderly and his staff, the Bureau engaged in an impressive range of activities — supervision of schools, curriculum development, teacher training and licensing, production of text books and other teaching aids, a professional journal, extra-curricular activities, youth organizations and more. These activities were rooted in a particular conception of the function of a community office of education.

Aside from emphasizing the importance of professional expertise and scientific method — concepts which were central to the campaigns for "good government" led by progressives of the time — Benderly and his associates established the principle of community support for Jewish education. In their view Jewish education like education in general could not be left to the partisan efforts of neighborhood groups. The perpetuation of Jewish life in the demanding circumstances of the American environment required "...a system of education... under *community control* ". This

study employed in these surveys had an effect as important as the findings themselves; thousands of people were given an opportunity to think about Jewish education and its purposes.

Today JESNA is "considered the organized Jewish community's planning, coordinating and service agency for Jewish education." It is funded by allocations from local federations and private contributions. Among other things the agency provides consultation services to communities, conducts research, disseminates information, conducts a placement service, organizes regional and national conferences for professional educators and lay leaders, works with Israeli educational agencies, operates a Visiting Teachers Program which places Israeli teachers in schools throughout North America and initiates experimental programs. Not the least of its functions is that of advocacy for Jewish education in federation circles.

It would be a mistake to think of what has been described here as a progression evolving from some unalterable inner logic. It would similarly be an error to think of the relationship between an individual school, the local bureau and the national educational agency as in any way comparable to the hierarchical structure — neighborhood, city, district, state — which defines relationship in the public school system. A suggestive alternative to the pattern we know today can be found among the recommendations of a study conducted by Dr. Isaac B. Berkson in 1935-36 in order to determine how to best use a gift of $1,000,000 contributed for the purpose of fostering Jewish religious education in New York City. According to Berkson the primary function of the new Jewish Education Committee, the amalgam of the Bureau of Jewish Education and the lay Association of Jewish Education which resulted from the study, was research and experimentation. In his view, a central agency would best serve the community by developing a common minimum curriculum for Jewish schools of all kinds; model schools would provide the setting for experimenting with that curriculum, developing new instructional methods and producing textbooks and other materials. Once the effectiveness of these methods and materials had been demonstrated, they

Brandeis University

Philip W. Lown School of Near Eastern and Judaic Studies

Benjamin S. Hornstein Program in Jewish Communal Service 617-736-2990

Waltham, Massachusetts 02254-9110

TO: MARK GURVIS

FROM: JOE REIMER 4/3/90

RE: W. ACKERMAN'S "THE STRUCTURE OF JEWISH EDUCATION"

I read Professor Ackerman's paper with great interest. It certainly elicited much reaction which I will try to capture in these notes.

1) While the description of structure offered in the opening paragraph may well describe some structures, I'd suggest a possible set of structures that evolve (as part of a system) that are not as clearly or consciously goal-oriented as suggested here. Family structures would be one example. My point in practical terms is what Susan Shevitz calls "organized chaos" -- that some situations that look non-structured are examples of "organized chaos": seeming disorder that is structured around other than rational, linear principles. If Jewish education "is without a compelling framework", it does not necessarily follow that each of its units are "autonomous" and "free to develop as it sees fit." By analogy: two independent nations living side by side without even diplomatic relations (e.g. Israel and Syria in Lebanon) may not have a "framework" for working out their relations, but yet may exist in a "structure" such that each knows that its behavior will activate a reciprocal reaction from its neighbor and so heavily influence one another. The same may be true for several synagogues in one community or two communities within the same geographic area, or several training institutions in one field. "Lacking all power of enforcement" does not equal "being without mutual influence". If there is no power of enforcement in Jewish education, there may yet be mutual influence.

2) Is something missing between pp. 3 & 4? -- because I miss the continuity at that point. When halfway down p. 4, the author writes "A suggestive alternative to the pattern we know today...", I'm not sure he's spelled out that pattern, or something is missing from my copy?

3) a) On p.7, in writing wonderfully about the curious relation between BJE's and denominational commissions, the author makes two statements I find unclear: (1) In what sense did the "statements of broad educational policy" become "a standard by which the work of individual schools may be judged"? Does he mean that is their intended or actual objective? In whose eyes are they a standard? What is the relation between a central agency's setting a standard and the "autonomy" of the individual unit?

b) Which or what kind of "transcendent authority" is alluded to at the end of the third paragraph? The reference is too elliptical for me to understand as written.

4) On p. 8, the issue of setting standards arises again. While the colleges may once have set standards, I doubt that they still do so today. Is the author suggesting that as their currently appropriate role? If so, why and how? Also, is he suggesting on the same page that bureaus are not the appropriate address for in-service training? Should universities be looked to for in-service? This quick reference is alluring, but not well-developed.

5) On p. 9: I miss much of the point about Israeli agencies. The paragraph says too much too briefly such that it simply passes me by. I also wonder if the word in the third line is "personnel" or "personal".

6) On p. 10, I cannot be satisfied with the quick, dismissive treatment of CAJE. I'm neither a CAJE member nor supporter, but I cannot see how all that can be said about CAJE is that it is not a professional organization. First, I am not clear as to what kind of teacher's organization the author has in mind (teacher unions)? Second, the founding and spread of CAJE, to which he himself alludes on p. 15, begs interpretation. With Agudat Hamorim only a historical memory, with denominational bodies only weak sisters, how can the growth of CAJE be dismissed in one line? Does it not tell us something of value and interest about the structure of Jewish education in the last decade? Does it not relate to the later discussion of federations and to the ongoing discussion of national-local interaction?

7) On p. 13, I like very much the author's attempt to suggest contacts between "the two worlds" of formal and informal education. But in paragraph 3, who is the "we" referred to twice? And more broadly, what does the general lack of contact tell us about the structure of Jewish education? Is the structure -- such as it is -- primarily designed for formal education? Are there more systemic ways to think about how the structure might evolve to be more inclusive? Is that a specific federation agenda?

8) The final thoughts about planning not being a "neutral" activity are crucial. Yet the full implications of that -- which I think essential for this Commission -- are not spelled out. Please do not leave us without further elaboration on this point. (Is the last sentence on p. 14 a healthy one?)

In summary, I feel Professor Ackerman's paper is full of promising insights on the structure of Jewish education, but is too brief and often elliptical to be fully satisfying. I'd particularly wish fuller treatments of current phenomena - such as CAJE and Federation involvement and their relation to the <u>evolving</u> structure of Jewish education.

JR:ls

* * * * *

Mark:

I've carefully read and reviewed B. Reisman's paper. I think it is too long and needs some re-ordering to help the reader through. Bernie may draft me to help in that editing.

Joe

AMERICAN JEWISH ARCHIVES

COMMISSION
ON JEWISH EDUCATION
IN NORTH AMERICA

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

Commissioners

Morton L. Mandel
Chairman
Mona Riklis Ackerman
Ronald Appleby
David Arnow
Mandell L. Berman
Jack Bieler
Charles R. Bronfman
John C. Colman
Maurice S. Corson
Lester Crown
David 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. Miller
David Hirschhorn
Carol K. Ingall
Ludwig Jesselson
Henry Koschitzky
Mark Lainer
Norman Lamm
Sara S. Lee
Seymour Martin Lipset
Haskel Lookstein
Robert E. Loup
Matthew J. Maryles
Florence Melton
Donald R. Mintz
Lester Pollack
Charles Ratner
Esther Leah Ritz
Harriet L. Rosenthal
Alvin I. Schiff
Lionel H. Schipper
Ismar Schorsch
Harold M. Schulweis
Daniel S. Shapiro
Margaret W. Tishman
Isadore Twersky
Bennett Yanowitz
Isaiah Zeldin

In Formation

Senior Policy Advisors

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

Director

Henry L. Zucker

Staff

Mark Gurvis
Virginia F. Levi
Joseph Reimer

April 20, 1990

Information copy.
Sent to all commissioners.

Dr. Mona Ackerman
Riklis Family Foundation
595 Madison Avenue
New York, NY 10022

Dear Mona:

As you know, a series of papers were commissioned during the past year to provide background information for our process and final report. The papers are nearing completion, having undergone extensive review by our staff and senior policy advisors. I am pleased to forward the first of the papers to you, titled "Towards the Professionalism of Jewish Teaching" prepared by Dr. Isa Aron, professor at the Rhea Hirsch School of Education of Hebrew Union College in Los Angeles.

Isa had two assignments. First was an explanation of how the goal of "professionalism" relates to the field of Jewish education. The second assignment was an analysis of data from the field on characteristics of the people now working in Jewish education.

The first three sections of this paper define the profession in terms of three commonly accepted criteria, and analyze the ways in which Jewish teaching meets those criteria. Section three, which looks at the criterion of commitment, encompasses an interesting discussion of the unique dimensions of Jewish teaching. Finally, the last section points toward ways in which policy-makers in Jewish education can work to increase professionalism.

I hope you will share your thoughts with me or our staff.

Please continue to hold June 12, 1990 for our final Commission meeting. Details on time and place will be sent as soon as possible. Warmest regards.

Mort

Morton L. Mandel

THE COMMISSION'S RESEARCH PROGRAM:

Status Report and Assignments

1. **Walter Ackerman: The Structure of Jewish Education**

   Status: Draft completed. Needs minor revisions prior to review by Senior Policy Advisors.

   Assignments: (a) SF to ask WA for revisions.
   (b) WA to revise and send draft.
   (c) MG to send to Senior Policy Advisors for review.

2. **Isa Aron: Finding of the L.A. BJE Teacher Census**

   Status: Draft completed.

   Assignments: (a) SF and AH to review and send to MG.
   (b) MG to send to Senior Policy Advisors for review.

3 **Isa Aron: Studies of Personnel in Jewish Education: A Summary Report**

   Status: Draft completed. Collection of background data for report. Not to be distributed.

   Assignments: None.

4. **Isa Aron: Towards the Professionalization of Jewish Teaching**

   Status: Draft completed. Paper sent for review to Senior Policy Advisors.

   Assignments: MG to collect responses and forward to AH.

5. **Aryeh Davidson: The Preparation of Jewish Educators in North America: A Research Study**

   Status: Draft completed. Paper sent for review to Senior Policy Advisors.

   Assignments: MG to collect responses and forward to AH.

6. **J. Fox: Federation-Led Community Planning for Jewish Education, Identity and Continuity**

   (UPDATE

   Status: Completed.

   Assignments: SF to consider with HLZ if changes required.

7. **J. Reimer: The Synagogue as a Context for Jewish Education**

   Status: Phase I draft completed.

   Assignments: JR to research and write phase II.

8. **B. Reisman: Informal Jewish Education**

   Status: Draft to be completed by 3/1.

9. **Israel Scheffler & Seymour Fox: The Relationship Between Jewish Ed and Jewish Continuity**

   Status: Transcripts completed.

   Assignments: SF and IS to edit first draft -- 3/15.

10. **H.L. Zucker: Community Organization for Jewish Education in North America; Leadership, Finance and Structure**

    Status: Completed.

    Assignments: SF to consider with HLZ if changes required.

Highlights of Meeting with Jonathan Woocher

Purpose of the meeting was to determine progress on his assignment to develop a strategy paper related to the commission linking to national networks and organizations on formal education. Woocher and Ariel were to have a paper by November 1; however, they appear to have gotten stuck and were unable to produce the paper. John and I talked about developing a mechanism within JESNA such as a lay committee in which we could begin to share the progress of the Commission and establish a process internally within JESNA. I also spoke with Woocher about putting together a committee made up of himself, Art Rotman, possibly Carmie Schwartz and David Ariel to develop an overall strategy for dealing with formal and informal education, as well as networks in the community related to the Commission. He agreed with that approach and felt that once the task forces are organized and the Commission becomes more substantive, it would be possible for JESNA to prepare input papers for each of the task forces.