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	7

Reisman, Bernard. "Informal Jewish Education in North America", 1990.

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

file Reisman

M E M O R A N D U M

April 4, 1990

TO: Mark Gurvis

FROM: Herman D. Stein

RE: Paper by Bernard Reisman

Reisman has produced an outstanding monograph--comprehensive, lucid, analytical -- and, most of all, encouraging. This should be a fine addition to the materials available to the Commission and to a wider audience who will read the report.

There are, however, some minor omissions and one major one, depending on interpretation. The omission is reference to joint degrees that now exists between some schools of social work and seminary colleges, which can be noted as a significant development, even though the number of such arrangements are few. I also feel there is insufficient attention to the importance of summer camps as a medium for informal Jewish education.

The large gap is any reference to mass communications media, or to the preparation of videotapes. This area of technology reinforces all kinds of education and, particularly, has implications for family life education. The fact that there may be no organization for people working in this medium for Jewish educational purposes, or that it is not a specified professional field, ought not to cause it to be omitted from the roster of valuable resources and instrumentalities for informal Jewish education.

Perhaps one can interpret "informal Jewish education" to exclude audiovisual technologies, but I frankly do not think this would be useful. If this area is not touched in this paper, a separate paper should deal with it, and be cross-referenced in this one.

HDS:mr

file Reisman

TO: Annette Hochstein

FROM: Mark Gurvis

DATE: April 20, 1990

SUBJECT: HLZ Reaction to Reisman Paper

Henry had one point he wanted to express on Bernie's paper. It relates to the characterization of the Federation movement's priority for Jewish education discussed at the bottom of page 27.

Henry's point is that Federation's change in priorities toward greater support for education has been evolutionary in nature. In the 1920-30s, it was not at all on the agenda of federations, and most federation leaders were indifferent or hostile. By the late 1940-50s that attitude had changed, and it suddenly was possible for day schools to begin receiving federation allocations.

The confluence of developments in the 1980s is remarkable and certainly important to recognize, but it builds upon 40 years of gradual growth in support for Jewish education among federations. Bernie may want to reflect this point in his discussion of historical factors.

Do you want me to fax this directly to Bernie?

file Reisman

April 22, 1990

MEMORANDUM

TO: Mark Gurvis

FROM: David S. Ariel

RE: Bernie Reisman's paper on informal education

This paper is a valuable, synoptic and comprehensive look at the subject. It is actually several papers in one and touches on a variety of issues which are interrelated. Its two strongest points are (1) that the educational methodology must be grounded in an accurate perception of the contemporary social context and (2) that informal education is inseparable from family education.

"The educational methodology must be grounded in an accurate perception of the contemporary social context." The contribution of the group-work field and other process-oriented methodologies is their sensitivity to the context in which they operate. They represent a consumer orientation which has been effective in addressing the human and social needs of their clients. Within the Jewish community, the community centers have built successfully on this approach. The greatest assets of community centers as social service contexts is their perceived ability to deliver services appropriate to the needs of their members and their sensitivity to their markets. The involvement of members and other users of their services in determining what services they offer is one of the keys to their success. Thus, their methodology in various areas of service is grounded in the social context of their members.

Jewish education can benefit from their experience in several ways. Jewish education suffers from the great dissonance between the values of the home and the values of the school. The school often attempts to educate children and transmit values that are alien to the parents and contrary to the values of the family. This is often true regarding religious practice, home observance, synagogue attendance, use of Hebrew and the value of Jewish learning itself. While family education provides one avenue for addressing this through educating the parents, this does not

solve the basic dissonance between the culture of the school and the family culture.

One thing which can be learned from Reisman's premise about consonance between educational method and social context and the experience of community centers is the importance of involving broad groups of families (parents and children) in helping to set realistic goals for the school. Serious, thoughtful and genuine cooperation among rabbis, educators and "users" of Jewish educational programs is generally absent. Often, this is replaced by school boards which act on behalf of families/consumers and which are neither serious, thoughtful, cooperative or representative. Bernie's paper is a strong reminder that unless we know what the families want (the social context), the methodology may not be effective.

This implies that we need to know more about the Jewish aspirations, frustrations and experiences of parents of children entering Jewish education. We know that 2/3 of them had unsatisfactory experiences themselves in Jewish education, but 99% of them want better for their children. We should learn more about want they want. I agree with Bernie (page 59) regarding a study of parental attitudes. I would go further to say that involving parents in defining their aspirations for their children is basic strategy.

Even as we elevate their desires and aspirations, we have to help satisfy them by offering them rewarding Jewish educational experiences. I think that parents can only truly know what they want for their children if they have tasted it themselves. That is one of the reasons why parent and adult education are critical to raising the quality of Jewish education for children.

It is clear that if Jewish education would become more sensitive to the values and social context of Jewish families, it would have to overcome the dissonance between home and school values. At the same time, Jewish education is not reductionist and should not overcome the dissonance by capitulating to the lowest common understanding of Judaism. The standards of Jewish education cannot be determined by people who have little notion of Jewish civilization.

This implies a two-pronged approach: (1) Parents must be involved in the process of determining the goals and programs of their schools and (2) the same parents/families should be simultaneously involved in Jewish family education so that their choices and decisions will be informed by knowledge. The involvement of parents in Jewish learning might make it possible for Jewish education to overcome the dissonance between home and school and to develop educational methodologies appropriate to the social context.

If parents are genuinely involved in thinking through these issues from an informed and knowledgeable position, in cooperation with rabbis and educators, it should be possible to achieve the socially-responsive methodology which Bernie identifies.

"Informal education is inseparable from family education": Bernie's paper presents the notion of a continuum of Jewish education which includes a variety of elements including schooling, youth group, camping, retreats, and Israel experiences for the children and their families. If anything, this could be stated more forcefully (a la the American Dental Association's label on some toothpastes): "Jewish education has been shown to be effective in promoting Jewish identity when used as part of a conscientiously applied program of formal learning, youth group activity, summer camping, weekend retreats, and Israel experiences for the children and their families and regular involvement in Jewish activities in the home, synagogue and community."

The latter portion of Bernie's paper could benefit from a narrative description of what such a continuum might look like. John Woocher did this effectively in a recent article on what Jewish education might look like in the future. Bernie does this effectively by stressing the interrelatedness of informal and family education.

In order to complete the picture, the connecting links between formal education programs and informal education programs need to be drawn. The picture should include all of the elements of Jewish education in differing degrees of emphasis. Bernie's point is that the methodologies of Jewish education must be responsive to the social context. Responsive methodologies must then be employed in order to create a comprehensive program which touch people in a variety of ways, each of which is necessary as part of a comprehensive lifelong strategy.

It is important to also state, as Bernie did, that the supplementary school is not about to be replaced by JCCs as contexts in which Jewish education occurs. JCCs can certainly capitalize on their large and diverse membership and responsive programs by including greater opportunities for Jewish expression in pre-schools, camping, youth group and retreat programs. The greater challenge is to bring the responsive methodologies of the JCCs into the congregations in order to create more responsive, engaging and relevant educational experiences for congregants.

Training Issues: With reference to Susan Shevitz and the idea of a community educator, Bernie makes some important statements about the training of Jewish educators. Still, it is worth developing the idea that not only must Jewish educators be trained in "responsive methodologies," but that the goal of professional Jewish educator development should be to prepare educators who are skilled in a range of responsive methodologies (including formal, informal and family education) and approach the field with a developmental perspective of working with different populations (children, adolescents, parents and families) in a variety of institutional settings (schools, synagogues, centers, camps, etc.).

The issue of whether Jewish educators should be trained to work with specific methodologies and specific populations in specific settings or whether the preparation of educators should be broad and comprehensive arises out of Bernie's paper. It needs further development.

The issue of where center workers are to be trained needs further discussion. Most JCCs still prefer to hire social workers. Aside from the Jewish education specialist positions, few Jewish educators are working in centers. The venue of training is an issue because there is no real plan to train the people who are going to be responsible for making JCCs more effective. There is also still considerable resistance within JCCs to the idea of training JCC staff members in Jewish education programs.

Other Issues: The section on camping was too brief. This area has historically had a profound impact on a small number of people. It has also had a powerful impact on the career choice of many Jewish communal service professionals, rabbis and educators. Yet, this area has been in sharp decline in recent years and is in some danger of being undervalued in favor of Israel experiences. There is a great deal of thought which still needs to be given to how to strengthen Jewish summer camping. New professional positions could be created in this area combining youth activity positions, retreat specialists and summer camping personnel and appropriate training models developed.

There is also a danger in the euphoria over the role of informal Jewish education. While impressions are that JCCs, camps and Israel have had a strong impact on some people, there is no evidence that they have an impact on many people. While their methodology might be consistent with the values of their consumers, there is some notion that their influence has been overstated. Camp Ramah, for example, had a profound influence on the lives and careers of some

people, especially from 1963-1972, but it did not have a lasting influence upon the Conservative movement. Do we really know enough about the long-term effects of informal education especially when they are not tied to the ongoing life of the community? What has happened to the various camp movements in the last twenty years? There is much to be developed before we conclude that this area is as promising as it appears.

Just as he developed a theoretical understanding for informal education, Bernie could do the same for family education. I realize that JFE is not the subject of this paper, but I think Bernie correctly integrated it with informal education. The next step, here or elsewhere, would be to discuss the theory and practice of family education from a conceptual basis rather than as the result of special persons around the country.

Further thought should be devoted, here or elsewhere, to the issues raised on page 6 (about the relationship of progressive education to traditional education) and how informal education relates to formal education: What is the place and meaning of subject-matter within informal education? What is the relationship between person- and experience- oriented education and the norms of Judaism? What is the relationship between responsive methodology and the notion of Jewish obligations or mitzvah?

The statement that "Jews growing up today have no opportunity to experience organic Jewish culture" (page 53 etc.) is incorrect. The point about the third and fourth generation can be made effectively without that statement. In some cases, the paper was too kind in describing the current state of affairs: Do practitioners in the field increasingly draw on formal and informal methodologies (page 8)? Has the track record of Jewish youth groups really been impressive (page 52)? Bernie was generous in giving credit to various groups for their work.

This was an excellent read and a real contribution to the issues. The paper should certainly be appended to the final report with some additional discussion about family education and camping.

C:\WORD\REISMAN.DOC

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

Mark - JUL 10 1990

I assume my paper on Informal Education is moving ahead + also that it will be distributed to those I interviewed.

Thanks for the check.

Bernie

June 29, 1990

Rabbi Paul Freedman
USY
Israel Pilgrimage
POB 7546
Jerusalem, ISRAEL

Dear Paul,

As you know, I have just returned from a month's visit in Australia and New Zealand. Those are very impressive Jewish communities and I very much enjoyed my work there. I trust your summer work in Israel will be gratifying for you.

Before I left I sent an edited final version of the paper on "informal Jewish education" to the National Commission on Jewish Education in Cleveland. The reassured me that when it was finally printed, it would be made available to people who helped shape the content of that position paper, such as you and your colleagues from the National Jewish Youth Movements.

I know the process takes some time because a number of the Commission people need to read and comment on the report before it is finally printed. But I assure you that you will, in time, receive a copy and I hope it will be of help to you in your important work.

In any event, I do hope we will have other occasions to collaborate before too long.

Warm regards.

Sincerely,

Bernard Reisman
Director

cc: Mark Gurvis
ng

UNIVERSITY
OF JUDAISM

ACADEMIC AFFAIRS
OFFICE OF THE DEAN

April 8, 1991

Professor Bernard Reisman
Hornstein Program in Jewish Communal Service
Brandeis University
Waltham, MA 02254

Dear Bernie,

I've just finished your Mandel Commission paper, "Informal Education in North America," and wanted to share with you how wonderful I thought it was. You were quite right to begin with Dewey's Democracy and Education. Indeed, to the best of my knowledge Dewey was the first to use the term "informal education" in the second chapter of that volume.

Your survey of frames of reference and recent developments were most useful and helped me to better understand the variety of developments that have contributed to this complex field.

Thanks for consulting me and for the nice reference, and congratulations on a fine product.

In friendship,

Hanan Alexander
Dean of Academic Affairs

HA/as

Sunny and Isadore Familian Campus
15600 Mulholland Drive, Los Angeles, California 90077
(213) 879-4114/476-9777

Jewish Community Center on the Palisades
411 East Clinton Avenue, Tenafly, New Jersey 07670 / (201) 569-7900 / Executive Director, David Dubin, ACSW
FAX # (201) 569-7448 V/TDD # (201) 569-6248

March 26, 1991

Mr. Bernard Reisman
Director, Hornstein Program
Brandeis University
Waltham, MA 02254

Dear Bernie:

I want to commend you on your excellent document on informal Jewish education. We really need this kind of presentation.

One senses a real synthesis between education and social work philosophy in your thinking. You have established an important conceptual framework in the development of informal Jewish education theory and you have also identified the critical issues involved as we consider educational strategies for the future.

This paper is a real contribution to our field.

Sincerely,

Dave

David Dubin
Executive Director

DD/gc

Brandeis University

Philip W. Lown
School of
Near Eastern and
Judaic Studies

Benjamin S. Bernstein
Program in Jewish
Communal Service
Waltham, Massachusetts
02254-9110

617-736-2990
FAX: 617-736-2070

file

Reisman paper

Mort -
I thought you would be interested in my response to Allan Smith. I also received several very positive responses - 2 are enclosed.
Regards.
Bernie

April 17, 1991

Rabbi Allan L. Smith, Director
UAHC Youth Division
838 Fifth Ave.
New York, NY 10021-7064

Dear Smitty,

I feel badly about your reactions to my monograph on Informal Jewish Education in North America. As we both agree it is important that the Commission on Jewish Education in North America made the commitment to devote one of its publications to informal education. That is a serious commitment and one which I know the leadership of the newly established Council on Initiatives in Jewish Education shares. I am hopeful that as CIJE gets its work underway there will be tangible evidence which will demonstrate the importance they attach to informal Jewish education. But I would have felt better if you thought favorably about the monograph.

I certainly tried to be thorough and inclusive in my treatment of informal Jewish education. It is, as you can appreciate, a big subject. The last thing I would want to do is to inadequately report on the excellent work you and your UAHC colleagues have been doing in your informal education work. I have worked on several projects with UAHC and several of its units and have the highest respect for the organization and certainly for the Reform Movement. I am aware that there have been occasions in Jewish communal life where the Reform Movement has been slighted and I have been troubled by these occurrences. So, I feel particularly bad when a project for which I bear responsibility, such as the informal Jewish education monograph, seems to have the same effect. At least, I want to assure you that was not in any way intended.

Concerning the information on Jewish camps in the Commission monograph, I have carefully checked my notes. The information I included about the summer camps under Reform auspices was provided by people from the UAHC. I called your office on April 30, 1990 and you were away so they referred me to Arie Gluck, the National Director of Camping and Youth. It was from his office that I obtained the information about camp programs under UAHC auspices, just as it was that I received the information about camp programs from Shelly Dorph about the Untied Synagogue and from Meier Frischman of the Association of Jewish Camp Operators

about Orthodox camps. You are fully correct in calling to my attention an error in the column on the total different camper figure listed for Ramah camps (on pg. 45). That is a typo; the correct figure should be 3,146. I will arrange for a correction to be noted in any future copies of the monograph which are distributed.

I agree with the comments you make about the significance of the Reform Movement in America. But I think you could appreciate that in a publication which seeks to cover the full gamut of informal Jewish education programs in North America, and which has space constraints, it is not possible to cover all phases as fully as one would like. So, for example, I could not devote special attention to all aspects of informal education of the three major Jewish religious denominations.

I would be pleased to pursue further with you any of these issues. Above all, I do hope you will have confidence that the people involved with the Commission on Jewish Education in North America and the Council on Initiatives in Jewish Education are serious and sincere in their commitment to be helpful to all the Jewish organizations involved in formal and informal Jewish education in America.

I look forward to our working together in the future.

Sincerely,

Bernard Reisman

Bernard Reisman, Director
Hornstein Program in
Jewish Communal Service

cc: Rabbi Alexander Schindler
Morton Mandel
Stephen Hoffman

nb

COMMISSION ON JEWISH EDUCATION IN NORTH AMERICA

Informal Jewish Education in North America

Bernard Reisman

December 1990

Convened by Mandel Associated Foundations, JWB and JESNA in collaboration with CJF

Informal Jewish Education in North America

Bernard Reisman

December 1990

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

Bernard Reisman is Professor of American Jewish Communal Studies and Director of the Hornstein Program in Jewish Communal Service at Brandeis University, Waltham, MA 02254.

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

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

Commissioners

Morton L. Mandel
Chairman
Mona Riklis Ackerman
Ronald Appleby
David Arnow
Mandel 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
Ismar Schorsch
Daniel S. Shapiro
Margaret W. Tishman
Isadore Twersky
Bennett Yanowitz

Senior Policy Advisors

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

Director

Henry L. Zucker

Research & Planning

Seymour Fox, Director
Annette Hochstein, Associate Director

Staff

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

Contents

Page

Introduction

The objective of this monograph is to provide information about *informal Jewish education* in North America with the intention of helping to guide leaders of the American Jewish community involved in making policy and program decisions in the broad realm of Jewish education. The material is presented in two Parts: Part I —*History and Social Context* and Part II—*Policy and Program Issues and Recommendations*.

Part I addresses the changing social and political forces over the past 75 years which have shaped the challenges and aspirations of individual American Jews and of the organized Jewish community in its efforts to assure Jewish continuity. Attention is focused on the changing streams of intellectual thought and of the professional methodologies which have influenced informal Jewish education. The key assumption is that if Jewish education professionals are to be effective in working with their constituents, their methodology must be grounded in an accurate perception of the contemporary social context.

Part II addresses the practical, nuts and bolts issues which concern the application of informal Jewish education in the North American Jewish community today and in the near future. Areas to be covered include: informal Jewish education settings; skills of practice; priorities of service; and policy and program recommendations.

Part I: History and Social Context

Two Themes

Two persistent themes emerged in my investigation of informal education within the American Jewish community. In the first theme, informal education is presented as a combination of mental hygiene, something which makes people feel good, and a type of minimalist education. Compared to formal education, informal education is viewed as trivial, effective in helping people (generally children or youth) have fun and perhaps feel positive about their Jewishness, but not as a means of transmitting serious Jewish content. From the perspective of some Jewish educators, informal Jewish education is seen, at best, as a necessary evil—something you turned to to placate or distract poorly motivated students, or, at worst, misguided efforts which competed with and deflected attention from more significant Jewish educational activity.

But, a second theme of informal education emerged, one which I found more appealing in that it seemed to move beyond a stereotype which appears to have become outdated. In this perspective, the relationship between informal and formal Jewish education is seen not as a matter of divergence or even competition, but rather of convergence. That is, the basic agenda and methodology of informal and formal educators are seen as essentially the same: both are committed to teaching Jewish content and both are attentive to teaching methods which would be responsive to their students. Further, there is the belief that this dual orientation makes for a more effective professional practice. If there are differences between informal and formal educators, these are more a function of the age of the students or the setting in which students are encountered, rather than a reflection of contrasting educational ideologies.

A Suggestive Historical Analogy

I have come to think of the notion of a convergence of informal and formal Jewish education as the major motif of this review of the "state of the art" and a motif which can have significant practical implications. In his book, *Democracy and Education* (1916)[1], John Dewey, one of the classic educational theorists, introduced a new philosophy of education, identified as "progressive education." Dewey's innovative ideas were adopted by a number of educators, resulting in different approaches to organizing schools and curricula. Over the course of the next two decades two contrasting and competing educational ideologies had emerged: one, "*traditional education*," which described the existing ideology and which focused primarily on subject matter, and a second, "*progressive education*," which built on

the writings of Dewey, and which focused primarily on the total experience of the students.

Dewey became increasingly troubled by the growing divergence between the two educational ideologies, each affirming that its approach was **the** "correct" one and that there was no merit to the other. Dewey rejected this "either-or" thinking. He decided it was time to clarify his original position and in 1938 wrote *Experience and Education*.[2] This discussion of "progressive education" and "traditional education," written over fifty years ago, offers an interesting paradigm for current efforts to clarify the relationship between formal and informal education. Dewey's basic orientation is expressed in the two opening sentences of the book:

> Mankind likes to think in terms of extreme opposites. It is given to formulating its beliefs in terms of **Either-Ors**, between which it recognizes no intermediate possibilities.[3]

"Either-Or" thinking leads the advocates of different ideologies to stereotyping and over-simplification. Dewey goes on to describe the stereotypes of "traditional education" and "progressive education" which he rejects because they do not accurately represent reality and because they are not helpful in drawing selectively upon the strengths inherent in each of the methodologies. His descriptions sound very similar to current tendencies to polarize formal and informal education.

On the over-simplification of "traditional" education:

> The subject matter of education consists of bodies of information and of skills that have been worked out in the past; therefore, the chief business of the school is to transmit them to the new generation. In the past, there have also been developed standards and rules of conduct; moral training consists in forming habits of action in conformity with these rules and standards. Finally, the general pattern of school organization (. . . the relations of pupils to one another and to the teachers) constitutes the school a kind of institution sharply marked off from other social institutions . . . (with what goes on in the family, for example.)[4]

> The attitude of pupils must, upon the whole, be one of docility, receptivity, and obedience. Books, especially textbooks, are the chief representatives of the lore and wisdom of the past, while teachers are the organs through which pupils are brought into effective connection with the material.[5]

The problem, Dewey points out, in "Either-Or" thinking is that each of the alternative models defines itself by negating the principles and ideas of the other rather than by choosing ideas based on their intrinsic merit. So, progressive education seeks to "correct" the "inadequacies" of "traditional education": replacing "imposition from above" with "expression and cultivation of individuality"; rejecting "external discipline" in favor of "free activity"; "learning from experience"; instead of learning from "texts and teachers"; and rather than preparing students for a "remote future" the time orientation of progressive education focuses on "the opportunities of present life."[6]

But as a result of having conceived its ideology in a negative, reactive manner, progressive education affords insufficient attention to certain vital educational requisites stressed by traditional education. Dewey notes the resulting lacunae in the following questions he poses for progressive education:

> What is the place and meaning of subject-matter and of organization **within** experience? How does subject-matter function?
>
> . . . What results follow when the materials of experience are not progressively organized? . . . What does freedom (of the learner) mean and what are the conditions under which it is capable of realization? . . . When external authority is rejected, (does it) follow that all authority should be rejected? . . . What is the role of the teacher and of books in promoting the educational development of the immature? . . . How shall the young become acquainted with the past in such a way that the acquaintance is a potent agent in appreciation of the living present?[7]

The intent of raising such questions is to lead progressive (or formal) educators to move beyond an "either-or" orientation into what Dewey calls "intermediate possibilities." This is apt to be a realm of flexibility and synthesis rather than rigidity and dogmatism, and, he suggests, likely to lead to more effective educational approaches.

The indications are that contemporary Jewish educators are beginning to think about formal education and informal education in terms of "intermediate possibilities"—of convergence rather than divergence, of an appropriate blending of the key insights and skills of both methods in addressing the Jewish educational requirements of the contemporary American Jewish community.

Before proceeding to the specifics of that task however, it would be helpful to provide two other pertinent sets of background information, both of which have contributed to the "either- or" orientation of formal and informal Jewish education.

Setting and/or Method?

Until recently, most Jewish educators defined informal educators in terms of the settings in which they practiced. So, for example, there are youth workers, camp counselors, nursery school teachers, Jewish center workers, etc. What these practitioners have in common is that they work in Jewish communal settings whose programs are mainly in the area of recreation, they seek to incorporate Jewish content in their programs, and they have informal relationships with the participants. At the same time there is a parallel network of Jewish communal settings—Jewish schools—whose practitioners, the teachers, are defined as "Jewish educators," who are to transmit a standardized Jewish curriculum in a formal setting with the students.

The above definition of formal and informal Jewish education has been undergoing discernible change over the past several years. It is a change in which both types of Jewish communal practitioners have been reassessing their goals and

their methodologies. Informal Jewish educators have been increasingly seeking to upgrade the priority given to formal Jewish content in their programs; formal Jewish educators have been increasingly attentive to utilizing informal educational values and methodology as means of better achieving their educational goals.

A similar type of change is affecting the settings in which formal and informal educators work: greater informality in teacher-student relationships and in institutional practices in "formal" Jewish schools, and greater attentiveness to "formal" educational procedures, such as the use of curriculum and other staff-initiated educational content in Jewish community centers, camps, and pre-schools. The staffing patterns of formal and informal Jewish education settings similarly reflect a greater interchange of professional personnel: the typical formal Jewish educators—rabbis and Jewish educators —are now being hired in informal settings, and social workers and other types of informal educators are taking positions in Jewish schools.

In summary, the differences between formal and informal Jewish educational settings are diminishing and the similarities in the methodologies used by the two types of practitioners are increasing.

The Professional Frame of Reference of Formal and Informal Jewish Educators

Contributing to the differences between formal and informal Jewish educators are issues related to their professional identity. First is the question of whether either is a full profession since the large majority of both formal teachers and informal group leaders work part-time and for limited periods of time. And within both formal and informal practitioners there is a diversity of educational backgrounds and career tracks.[8] Such a lack of clarity about professional identity and status typically leads practitioners to be overly concerned about how they are perceived by their constituencies and what are their specific responsibilities. Formal and informal educators essentially share the same Jewish constituencies, both in terms of the people in the Jewish community they serve and the Jewish communal leaders to whom they are responsible, and such a situation inevitably, albeit inadvertently, generates competition between the two sets of practitioners.

Secondly, while there are few professional credentials among the front-line practitioners in formal and informal Jewish education, many of the top practitioners have had advanced specialized education and have a long-term commitment to their professional careers. These top practitioners do have a clear sense of professionalism and it is their professional identity which serves as the frame of reference for the other staff and defines the values and operating style of the work organization. It is therefore helpful to clarify the dominant and existing professional identity of each of the two fields of formal and informal education in order to assess how this identity has shaped the values of the two fields and their relationship with each other.

The leading professionals in formal Jewish education—principals and school directors—have been trained either as rabbis or Jewish educators. The primary area of professional expertise highlighted in their training is a knowledge of Jewish studies (the essence of the curriculum of the rabbinic seminaries)—Jewish history, classical texts, rituals, and Hebrew language. Some of the Jewish educators receive their training at the seminaries; others are likely to do graduate training at a university, either in America or Israel, where they concentrate on Jewish studies. In either case, their professional socialization and subsequent professional identity will have been shaped by an institutional culture and professors whose teaching style and values are consonant with "traditional education" as described by John Dewey. That is, there is a central commitment to achieving a mastery of Jewish classical subject matter with minimal attention to methodology, process, or shaping school environments. This "traditional education" orientation is further reinforced by the likelihood that when these formal Jewish educators complete their graduate education they will be supervised in their professional positions by a rabbi.

The professional routes of the formal and informal educators, therefore, vary greatly, with those of the informal educators being more diverse and at times in conflict with the formal educators. More specifically, the sources of professional influence for informal education stem from five different, but related, disciplines or areas of intellectual/professional thought: progressive education, group dynamics, social group work, values clarification and adult education. For formal Jewish education, the framing professional motif is mastery of Jewish content; for informal Jewish education, if there is a single framing professional motif represented in these five realms, it lies in the area of methodology, a way of working with people, sometimes referred to as "process." In other words, the "how" of the interaction among teacher (leader) and students (members) is at least as important as the "what" (subject matter).

Let us briefly examine the key ideas and values represented by these five professional areas as they have shaped the emerging discipline of informal education across the fifty years beginning with Dewey's introduction of progressive education in 1916 and continuing through the late 1960s.

1. Progressive Education

A new approach to understanding human development appeared at the outset of the 20th century, stemming from the psychological theories of Sigmund Freud and the emerging disciplines of sociology and anthropology concerning the role of culture in shaping behavior. John Dewey first addressed the implications of these new insights for education. He emphasized the need to afford central attention to the needs and perspectives of the student in designing both the curriculum and the culture of the school. Dewey broadened the responsibility of the educator to include the **affective** dimension—the social and psychological needs of the student, in addition to the **cognitive** dimension—the subject matter. Finding an appropriate

balance between these two dimensions remained as a key challenge facing all educational theorists following Dewey.

2. Social Group Work

In the early decades of the 20th century, a growing number of people were finding positions as group workers and informal educators in settlement houses, recreation departments, Scout programs, Ys, and youth movements. Perhaps the first systematic initiative to professionalize these informal education practitioners occurred in the 1930s with the alignment of group work as a specialization within the profession of social work. At this point in time, graduate schools of social work began to expand on their previous focus on clinical case work by developing specializations in community organization and group work. One of the pioneer theorists in defining the methodology of social group work was Grace Coyle who introduced the group work concentration at the School of Social Work at Western Reserve University. She, and the other early group work theorists, identified three major themes in their methodology, which they drew from three related approaches of working with people in recreation and informal education settings:

a) *Individual-centered*—as defined by progressive education;

b) *Democracy*—as reflected in the Settlement House movement;

c) *Group potential*—as demonstrated in the research of social scientists studying the impact of small groups.

Coyle's description of how her thinking and that of her colleagues moved from focusing on activities to human relationships parallels a similar process earlier described by John Dewey with progressive education:

> The greatest innovation in our thinking . . . has come—as it has in education—in the realization that it was not the activity nor the subject matter alone that was important. It was also the human relations . . . The experience in and through the group began to emerge as a significant part of what these leisure-time activities meant to people . . . As the more progressive educators made their schools child-centered, not subject-centered, so we moved toward making our program person-centered, not activity-centered.[9]

As in the field of education, there remained a traditional activity-centered element of recreation practitioners and a second element, described by Coyle, who aligned with social workers and who saw their recreation and informal education programs as means for affecting personal and group development. In addition, social group workers differed from their traditional recreation colleagues in two other respects:

a) *The role of the group leader*—The traditional recreation worker assumes an active leadership role in planning and carrying out the group programs. The social group

worker assumes a non-directive, facilitating style of leadership so as to foster individual and group responsibility.

b) *Ideology and values*—For the traditional recreation practitioner, the prime values are to help people learn to use leisure time productively and at the same time to have fun. Recreation programs are frequently used by youth groups, under ideological auspices, to attract and maintain the interest of their members. Because of social work's commitment to individual client/member responsibility, there is the expectation that its professionals should be "value-free," remaining ideologically neutral so as to help their group members choose their own beliefs and values.

Of particular interest in this analysis of informal Jewish education is the very close relationship between social group work and the field of Jewish community center work. In the early decades of the 20th century the major function of the predecessor agencies to the JCCs, the Jewish settlement houses and YMHAs, was to help the largely immigrant Jewish population accommodate to American society. The staffing of the Jewish settlement houses and YMHAs was similar to that of their non-Jewish counterparts, namely, a mixture of recreation workers, educators, and "idealists," whose vocational identity was defined by the setting in which they worked. Following World War II, the function of the settlement houses and Ys, now generally identified as JCCs, changed to helping what was now primarily a second and third generation American Jewish community become better acculturated into American society. To accomplish this function, the centers moved to professionalize their staff and turned to social group work as the most compatible profession. By 1955, 58% of all professionals working in JCCs were professional social workers, with masters degrees in social group work, with an even higher proportion of social workers occupying the top administrative positions.[10] In that same year Sanford Solender, then executive director of the Jewish Welfare Board, described the close relationship between the JCCs and social work: "Central to the Jewish community center's way of work is its use of modern social work. . . . This commitment to social work is at the heart of the uniqueness of the JCC."[11]

The close ties between the JCCs and social work reached their zenith in the mid-1950s and have been diminishing since. The reasons for this will be discussed below.

3. Group Dynamics

The use of small groups is a key ingredient in informal education. The awareness of the potential of the small group for influencing human behavior in education, therapy, industry, and other human collectives, was given a major impetus in the 1930s and 1940s by the pioneering research of the social psychologist, Kurt Lewin. Lewin's research was of particular value for human service professionals since much of his research was "action research," geared to modifying the behavior of people in the range of small groups encountered in their day-to-day lives. The following are five theoretical perspectives, including research findings, drawn from Lewin's work,

which have been of particular relevance to Jewish communal professionals working with groups.[12]

a) *Field Theory*—Lewin viewed the small group as "a psychologically organic whole," comprised of individuals with different and similar interests and agendas, but with an important psychological interdependence. The interactions among the group members include both negative and positive emotions. To the extent that professionals working with small groups are aware of these "group dynamics," they can more effectively guide the experience to achieve their professional goals.

b) *Life Space*—Lewin's concept of "life space," defined as "the total psychological environment which the person experiences subjectively,"[13] provides a social psychological perspective for understanding human behavior. He liked to use mathematical terms to present his concepts and used this now classic formula to explain life space, B = f(p,e), behavior is a function of the person and his/her environment.[14] The appeal of this approach for Jewish communal professionals is that it affords an understanding of individual behavior which accounts for both family influence and the many social forces which affect the person, and it focuses on "here and now" behavior.

c) *Leadership Style*—Lewin's work at the University of Iowa Research Station resulted in two classic studies of leadership, both of which have had significant impact on shaping the leadership style of contemporary human service practitioners. The first study, done in collaboration with Ronald Lippett and Ralph White, contrasted the differential effects on groups of three types of leaders—authoritarian, laissez-faire, and democratic. The democratic leadership style emerged as the one most preferred by the group members, generated the most creative, consistent work output, and caused the least negative interpersonal behaviors in the group such as hostility and scapegoating.[15]

The second study addressed the issue of how different leadership styles might change people's attitudes and behavior. During World War II, an American government agency turned to Lewin and his Iowa colleagues to attempt to get housewives to use foods for their families which were more nutritious and readily available, although not typically appealing. Two leadership styles were used in the experimental design, one using a knowledgeable and prestigious expert who lectured on the benefits of the foods being promoted, and a second leadership style in which the leader used discussion-leading techniques to encourage the group members to share their own ideas about how to get their families to accept the new foods. The anthropologist Margaret Mead worked on this project with Lewin. Alfred Marrow summarized the results, quoting Mead.

> The lecture of the prestigious expert from Washington "had no effect at all." The approach in which the group members were asked to find their own resolution of the problem proved that groups of people "can do a thing better when they themselves decide upon it, and also how they themselves can elect to reduce the gap between their attitudes and actions.[16]

These studies offered strong endorsement for two basic approaches in working with groups in informal education—democratic decision-making and non-directive leadership to foster active member participation.

d) *Feedback*—While Lewin was working with a leadership training program designed to help community leaders combat racial and religious prejudice in their communities, he unexpectedly came upon the important leadership process of "feedback." The content of the training program was originally focused on teaching the community leaders about causes of prejudice and ways to combat such attitudes. In the open atmosphere of the group discussion, the staff and the community leaders began to share reactions both to the internal dynamics of the group and to the behaviors of the group members themselves. The process of feedback has been a valuable technique for helping people become more aware of developments within the group and more sensitive to their own functioning.

This training experience led to the emergence of Sensitivity or T-Group Training and the awareness of the importance of introspection and self-awareness as vital ingredients for effective group leadership.[17]

e) *Jewish Identity*—Finally, Lewin might well be thought of as the social scientist who launched a systematic study of Jewish identity, a process which has flourished in the fifty years following Lewin's pioneering work. An important resource for carrying on Lewin's research on Jewish identity is Simon Herman, the social psychologist now living in Israel, who studied with Lewin in his final years and who has applied Lewin's theoretical model to his own studies of Jewish identity.[18]

Lewin begins with the premise that people's identity is shaped by the key groups to which they belong. Most important is the family group. A person's well-being is primarily a function of the sense of clarity and security they have about their family and, subsequently, about other groups they deem important. For Jews, their Jewish well-being is similarly linked to the sense of clarity and security they have to the Jewish group. In Lewin's "field theory," the Jewish group involves several forces: Jewish history and traditions; the nature of the interaction between Jews and the host culture in which they live; and the nature of the Jews' involvement in the Jewish community itself. How a Jewish person resolves these several areas of tension determines his/her Jewish attitudes and behaviors. Since for many Jews their Jewishness occupies much of their "life space," the resolution of their Jewish identity also affects their general "grounding." When they are at one with their Jewishness, there is a sense of coherence and security; when there is conflict, it leads to confusion and insecurity.[19]

In Traditional society, the all-encompassing Jewish family and Jewish community provided a stable grounding for earlier generations of Jews. For Jews of modernity, living in the open society, Jewish identity is "problematic"; they are confronted with the task of finding a resolution to living in two cultures. Helping Jews grapple with this ever-present problem of defining their Jewish identity is a central challenge for Jewish professionals.

4. Adult Education

The field of adult education began to emerge as a significant specialization following World War II as a result of two interrelated developments. First, in the post-war period, the economy surged forward, following the depression of the 1930s, and the standard of living of the general public rose. In addition to higher levels of income there was also a drop in the hours people were working. The result was that people had more leisure time and a growing interest in using that leisure for self-development and advancing of their education.

One of the early theorists of adult education, Malcolm S. Knowles, established that the learning needs of adults were different from those of children.[20] The premises and the techniques of teaching used with children—*pedagogy*—are not effective with adults. The premises of pedagogy are that students are dependent and passive; therefore, the teacher should be central in assuming responsibility for transmitting the subject matter and controlling the school environment. Such premises are not applicable to adults, who come to their educational experiences voluntarily (children have no choice) and with an interest and motivation to learn. As mature individuals with ideas and interests to share, adults are desirous of assuming an active role in their learning. They are eager to interact with their fellow students both for social reasons and for serving as educational resources for each other.[21]

Knowles defined a special educational methodology designed for adults which he termed *andragogy*. Andragogy is quite similar to informal education in its emphasis on the emotional needs of the student, the active role of students in the learning experience, the informal relationship between teacher and students, and the effort to set up a creative and supportive educational environment.

Obviously, these principles of adult education are relevant to the important fields of adult education and family education in the Jewish community today. At the same time, the characteristics of adults which were presented a generation ago as the rationale for a different educational approach for that age group, may, in the 1990s, be appropriately extended to young people who have had rising levels of expectation about being in charge of all phases of their lives, including their education.

5. Values Clarification

I conclude this discussion of the several methodologies which have shaped informal education with a brief review of values clarification. My interest in including values clarification in this section is twofold: first, it provides another perspective to the "either-or" debate between formal and informal education with which this inquiry began; and second, values clarification offers a good example of how a methodology develops as a response to the dominant cultural ideas and themes of its time.

An important area of difference between formal and informal education is in the different emphases each one places on the cognitive (subject matter) and the affective (emotional) domains. Thinking about these two domains as a continuum, traditional formal education would be at the cognitive end of the continuum and values clarification at the affective end. Values clarification is an educational methodology which seeks to help students become more aware of themselves and how they choose to order their lives. If there is to be a curriculum, explain the authors of a values clarification text, it should be "a curriculum of affect, based on student's concerns," whose content should include such areas as "feelings, fears and wishes of the students."[22]

Process becomes an end in itself. Encouraging students to assume responsibility for their own lives is viewed as a priority, the primary educational objective. The teacher or group leader should strive to remain neutral and non-directive to allow full freedom of choice for the students. This attitude is reflected in the following comments by a Jewish educator committed to a values clarification approach:

> If I tell my students what to think, how to act, and what to feel, I am infantilizing them, not teaching them . . . I have come to the firm conclusion that *I can't teach anybody anything!* I can only help them teach themselves.[23]

In retrospect, what becomes clear is the strong connection between the flourishing of Values Education, in the 1960s, as a very popular educational approach and the societal developments of that period of time, especially as they were perceived by young people. This was the time of the Vietnam War and revolts in America's urban centers. There was a disenchantment, particularly among young people, with the major social institutions of American society: government, family, religion, the education system, and the prevailing values of America. What up to then had been the accepted societal sources of stability and meaning in people's lives were now sources of uncertainty for much of the population. Traditional authorities—government leaders (recall Watergate), parents, teachers, and religious leaders—no longer were automatically viewed as objects of respect or as models of identification. There were few ideologies which could give direction to people and how they ordered their lives. And at the same time as these societal institutions and authorities were becoming less appealing and responsive to young people, the young people's sense of their own entitlements and expectations was growing.[24]

Values clarification emerged as a response to these societal/generational tensions. Its method fully respected the rights and autonomy of its constituents, its ideology focused on the individual and not on the institutions, its style was innovative rather than traditional, and its creative techniques could capture and hold the attention of a clientele with a low tolerance for frustration and tedium. In sum, Values Clarification was in consonance with the needs, rhythms and values of the '60s generation.

Times change, and, in turn, people's needs, expectations and values change; so too should the methodologies used by human service practitioners change if they

are to be effective. My thesis is that the current growing interest in informal Jewish education is, in large measure, to be explained by the consonance of this methodology with the agenda of American Jews and of the American Jewish community of the '90s.

Contemporary Developments in the American Jewish Community

The review of the five methodologies which have shaped informal education (progressive education, social group work, group dynamics, adult education, and values clarification) is helpful to us in two ways. First, it clarifies several relevant, educational assumptions and techniques. Second, the review highlights the key principle that these methodologies were effective because they incorporated new ideas in human development and the social sciences. They made their approach responsive to the changing issues and values of the individuals and collectives they sought to serve.

If, as I have suggested, the growing interest in informal Jewish education today is because it is a methodology which appears to be responsive to the societal changes which have affected individual American Jews and the American Jewish community, it is well to be clear about the nature of those changes.

I turn now to examine some of those important changes.

1. The Jewish Resurgence

Until the 1980s, the prevailing assumption about the future prospects of the American Jewish community was governed by the "three generation theory." This theory posited that American Jews (or any other religious or ethnic minority group) would gradually assimilate over the course of three generations.[25] Jewish communal policies and strategies growing out of an "inevitability of assimilation" perspective resulted in what might be characterized as a "saving remnant" approach. In Jewish education, that perspective would be translated into a strategy which concentrates the Jewish community's resources on educating the children of those families who are dedicated to their Jewish heritage, and ignoring or giving low priority to the children of those families assumed to be on the assimilatory track. One simple policy expression of such an approach would be to invest community resources in day schools, assumed to be the mode of education chosen by the "serious" Jewish families, and invest less in supplementary schools or types of informal education, assumed to be the choices of assimilating families.

There are several problems with such a strategy. The first is uncertainty regarding the premise that the choice of day school education fully reflects serious Jewish commitment. Families choose between day school and supplementary school Jewish education for a variety of reasons, some of which are unrelated to levels of Jewish commitment. Moreover, the comparative impact on the Jewish

identity of graduates of the two systems, let alone different schools within the two systems, is not clear.

A second problem is that of sheer numbers. Figures on Jewish education of all Jewish children within the past several years indicate that about 21% attend day schools, 62% attend supplementary schools (from one to several days a week), and 17% have no formal education.[26] The strategy of giving little attention to the supplementary school, a system which all agree is in need of improvement, is likely to jeopardize the future Jewish identity of over 60% of Jewish young people growing up today. Add to that number the almost inevitable loss of the 17% of Jewish children who receive no Jewish education at all, and we have a self-fulfilling prophecy which would seem to abet the possible assimilation of four out of five Jewish young people.

However, new demographic data about American Jews, emerging in the early 1980s, confirmed that the community was now primarily third and fourth generation. The new data raised questions about the "three generation theory," suggesting that the assimilatory thrust abated with the third generation and that fourth generation American Jews were holding on to their Jewish identity. While there are differences among demographers about these new data,[27] most analysts agree that there is more Jewish interest expressed by the fourth generation than previously expected. There is also agreement that the majority of third and fourth generation American Jewish families are positive about their Jewish identity and "receptive" to learning more about their Jewishness and how this learning might shape their lives.

Such information about the contemporary Jewish community leads to different communal policies and strategies than the "saving remnant" approach. It suggests that there can be payoffs, in terms of Jewish identification, in reaching out to the "American Jewish masses," those individuals and families likely to be marginally involved in the Jewish community and who previously were assumed to be assimilatory "victims" of the "three generation theory." Given that the "American Jewish masses" now represent the majority of American Jewry, such an outreach program, if successful, can be significant. Among the programmatic techniques and services which would likely be responsive to the marginally involved would be informal Jewish education methodologies and the use of the range of informal Jewish educational settings.

2. New Responses from the Organized Jewish Community

a) *The Jewish Federation* – Until the 1950s, Jewish federations in America restricted their funding of community agencies to social welfare services such as Jewish centers, family agencies, and community relations agencies. Excluded were Jewish education programs. That pattern began to change by the early 1950s when federations began to fund Jewish day schools. Within the past decade, there has been an important upgrading in the priority afforded to Jewish education by leaders of the organized American Jewish community, in particular by the leaders of the

Jewish federation world. I believe this change is grounded in an implicit belief in a resurgence in the American Jewish community and of the holding power of the Jewish heritage for acculturated third and fourth generation American Jews. Previously, federation leaders made minimal effort to relate to Jewish education services. Jewish education was seen as part of the domain of the synagogue world or of the Orthodox community, neither of which was part of the federation mainstream. The federation leaders depended on other strategies to sustain the Jewish people, primarily Israel and its achievements, and to a lesser extent, organizational work and the appeal of Jewish ethnicity. But starting in the early 1980s, these leaders began to sense that these bases for Jewish identity were not enough to hold the interest of their changing American Jewish constituents.

Symbolizing the recognition of a changing, resurgent American Jewish community was the title chosen by the federation leaders for the 1985 General Assembly—"The Coming of Age of the American Jewish Community." I interpret the coming of age to be an awareness of a deepening of interest in Jewish identity of American Jews, and the recognition by the federation leaders that these Jews could not be sustained by vicarious or instrumental Jewish strategies. It was a beginning of the realization that today it is only Jewish education—knowledge about Jewish history, ideas, beliefs, and practices—that can assure the future of the American Jewish community.[28]

There are two implications for the new interest and involvement of the Jewish federation in Jewish education. First is the availability of new resources, financial and human, which can make feasible extending the reach and impact of Jewish education. The second implication, following the adage that "he who pays the piper picks the tune," is that Jewish education will be expected to be more responsive to the federation perspectives and priorities, among which is the greater use of informal Jewish education methodologies and settings.

Among the new resources available to the American Jewish community as it prepares to respond to an upgraded Jewish agenda are the several schools of Jewish communal service which have emerged over the past two decades. Up until the late 1960s, the primary setting for educating Jewish communal professionals was the graduate school of social work. With the rise in Jewish consciousness, the Jewish commitment and background of the communal professionals became more important. To respond to that need new university-based graduate schools specializing in Jewish communal service began to be established. These schools (of which there are now seven) seek to blend a Jewish perspective along with the necessary human relations, planning, and management skills in their curricula.

b) *Jewish Foundations*—A related phenomenon is the recent emergence of a number of independent Jewish foundations which represent significant sums of money and which have chosen to concentrate their efforts on Jewish education. Many of the individuals and families who have established these foundations have been actively involved in the organized Jewish community. It is reasonable to assume that they have been motivated to support Jewish education for many of the

same reasons that have motivated the leaders of the Jewish federations to upgrade Jewish education. It is also reasonable to presume that their decision to set up a foundation as the vehicle for their philanthropic initiatives represents the classic free enterprise entrepreneurial spirit. Being independent, the foundation can direct large amounts of money to a perceived priority need—Jewish education—without the initiative being significantly slowed up, or rejected, by bureaucratic procedures or institutional policies, and without the innovative ideas being vetoed or distorted by people in the system who have a vested interest in maintaining the status quo.

At the same time, to the credit of most of these Jewish foundations, they thus far have sought to cooperate with the organized Jewish community, both in getting input from the relevant Jewish communal organizations and, where appropriate, involving communal organizations in helping implement the foundation-supported projects. This style of operation is best represented by the Mandel Associated Foundations in their initiative to create the Commission on Jewish Education in North America.[29] On one level, the Mandel Foundation involved three Jewish national organizations, each of which has an important connection to Jewish education: the JWB, the Council of Jewish Federations, and Jewish Education Service of North America. On another level, the convening foundation invited some six other independent foundations interested in Jewish education to be part of the Commission so as to coordinate their efforts and to assure the mobilization of "significant financial support" needed to generate real changes in Jewish education in America. It was recognized that such collaborative fund raising could also have a leveraging effect on the readiness of the traditional network of Jewish communal organizations to upgrade their own financial initiatives in strengthening Jewish education.[30]

c) *JWB and the Jewish Community Centers*—Further evidence of the upgrading of Jewish education in the American Jewish community is reflected in the actions launched in 1984 by the JWB (today known as the Jewish Community Centers Association), the umbrella organization of the North American Jewish community centers, to "maximize Jewish educational effectiveness of JCCs." The plan is outlined in the Report published by the Commission. In order to assure achieving the JCCs' central objective for "promotion and nurturing of Jewish identity and continuity," centers are encouraged to enhance their Jewish educational activities both within the centers by "providing appropriate Jewish educational experiences" and within the overall Jewish community "by cooperating in Jewish educational programs with Bureaus of Jewish Education, synagogues, schools and other institutions and organizations; and by giving leadership to and/or participating in the sponsorship of community events."[31]

The initiative by professional and lay leaders of the Jewish center field to maximize the Jewish education function of the centers is of special significance for this study of informal Jewish education for two reasons. First, the JCC is the major informal Jewish education setting in North America in that it reaches the largest numbers of American Jews. Second, many people in Jewish communities have been skeptical of the Jewishness of the Jewish centers. The maximizing initiative

seems to be convincing many of its critics that this is a serious endeavor. This is seen in the tangible steps taken over the past five years to enhance the Jewish background of professional staff and lay leaders, the attempt to increase Jewish programs in the centers' offerings, and the more obvious appearance of Jewish ambiance of the center buildings. Further evidence to support the seriousness of the maximizing effort was provided by an evaluative study in 1988 of the process.[32]

d) *Israeli Sponsored Projects* – Within the past five years, a number of projects specifically geared to strengthen Jewish education in the diaspora have been developed by Israeli universities and by different units within the Jewish Agency. The 1984 World Leadership Conference for Jewish Education held in Jerusalem and focusing on Jewish education was the largest gathering of lay and professional leaders of Jewish communities from around the world. The Conference affirmed the leadership role Israel was prepared to take for Jewish education in diaspora communities and successfully mobilized many leaders to act on behalf of Jewish education.

The Joint Fund for Jewish Education of the Jewish Agency has funded many educational programs in Israel for diaspora Jewish educators with the objective of enriching the educator's background in Judaica, Hebrew, and knowledge of Israel. The Melton Centre for Jewish Education in the Diaspora at Hebrew University has sponsored several Jewish enrichment programs for diaspora Jewish educators, among them the Jerusalem Fellows, the Senior Educators Program and a range of custom-designed continuing Jewish education institutes for lay and professional leaders of American Jewish educational and communal organizations. The other Israeli universities are similarly developing programs to offer educational opportunities for diaspora teachers.[33]

3. Developments in the Field of Jewish Education

This appears to be a propitious moment in the American Jewish community for new breakthroughs in the realm of Jewish education and, in particular, for informal Jewish education. I have outlined recent developments with respect to two key constituencies in the American Jewish community which have resulted in changes favorable to Jewish education. Highly educated and sophisticated young Jewish men and women, who, a decade ago, were assumed likely to assimilate are now evidencing a receptivity for Jewish education for themselves and their families. The mainstream American Jewish organizations and leadership, who, for decades, had been oblivious or indifferent to Jewish education, now consistently identify Jewish education as the community service most vital for assuring Jewish continuity. Moreover, these organizations and leaders are backing up their verbal commitments with increasing financial incentives for innovative programs to improve the quality of American Jewish education. This brings us to the issue of implementation and the response of the community of Jewish educational professionals. What have been the related developments among the professional Jewish educators, within their organizational networks, and in the realm of new

ideas? And what role might be expected for informal Jewish education in future implementation plans?

A. DECLINE OF THE SUPPLEMENTARY SCHOOL

Barry Chazan, in a recent comprehensive overview of the state of Jewish education in America, describes three major changes occurring on the Jewish educational scene: the growth of the day school, the decline of the supplementary school, and the search for new forms.[34] This is his description of the latter phenomenon:

> One of the most prominent dynamics of the past decade has been the search for new forms of Jewish education outside of the existing school frameworks. This search has emerged from the growing sense of frustration with existing models and from a sense of success with some new alternatives.[35]

Chazan highlights four arenas which he envisages as "potentially important new Jewish educational networks: Jewish pre-school education; adult and family life Jewish education; the Jewish community center; and the Israel trip."[36] These comments indicate that, according to Chazan's projections, the frontier for Jewish education exists within informal Jewish education settings.

Chazan's reference to the decline of the supplementary school is based on figures of diminishing student enrollment. A more telling critique of the supplementary school emerged from the major study of the Jewish education effectiveness of supplementary schools in the New York area undertaken by the Board of Jewish Education of New York City as reported on in 1988. The study's assessment of the impact of the schools on students is unequivocal:

> Schools do a very poor job in increasing Jewish knowledge in all subject areas; they show no success in guiding children towards increased Jewish involvement; and they demonstrate an inability to influence positive growth in Jewish attitudes.[37]

This critical evaluation of the supplementary school has had a particularly dramatic impact on the Jewish educational community. While many people intuitively have had doubts about the Jewish educational quality of supplementary schools, especially in recent years as the schools have been reducing their numbers of hours of instruction, the issue of their effectiveness was essentially avoided. The New York Board of Jewish Education study, because of its thoroughness, the wide dissemination of its findings, and the credibility of the research team headed by Alvin Schiff, obliged lay and professional leaders to confront the consequences of the study's findings. Simply put, since today some 72% of Jewish youth who receive any Jewish education attend supplementary schools,[38] doubts about the effectiveness of that system means doubts about the Jewish education and identity of a significant majority of the next generation of American Jews.

B. FAMILY EDUCATION AND OTHER INFORMAL EDUCATION APPROACHES

The New York study addressed the question which logically follows its critical evaluation of the supplementary school: What is the alternative? One response is to encourage greater enrollment in day schools, but the assumption still remains that the large majority of American Jewish families will prefer to use some type of supplementary Jewish schooling. To improve on the quality of the supplementary school experience, the New York study recommendations point to a changing mode of operation built on the use of informal education approaches, in particular, family education and the development of a new professional position for synagogue schools, a Jewish family educator. The research team concludes:

> What is needed, then, is a new supplementary school construct that will make possible the confluence of the affective and cognitive domains, the combination of formal and informal learning, the partnership of home and school.[39]

The language resonates of John Dewey.

At about the same time the New York study was being undertaken, a number of other American Jewish communities set into motion their own self-studies. They too were concerned about problems such as low level of Jewish affiliation and intermarriage, and were not confident about the capacity of their existing Jewish educational services to counteract these assimilatory threats. Perhaps the first and most ambitious such study was conducted in Cleveland. It led to the setting up of an action-oriented commission on Jewish continuity whose goals were to develop new services and modes of organizing and staffing the Jewish organizations in the community in order "to maintain, strengthen and transmit Jewish values and traditions to future generations of Jews."[40] At the core of the Commission's recommendations was a call for the development of several informal education programs—family education, study in Israel, "beyond classroom" activities, retreats and services to strengthen youth groups. In order to implement these informal education programs, the Commission recognized the critical importance of capable professional personnel and recommended a program of recruitment and training especially geared to preparing professionals who would have the personal aptitudes and skills to staff the new informal Jewish education programs. An indication of the seriousness of the Cleveland Commission's program is that it has a four-year operating budget of $5,687,422.[41]

Similar commissions on Jewish continuity with similar recommendations stressing informal Jewish education programs are now getting underway in a number of American Jewish communities. Barry Shrage, president of the Jewish federation in Boston, in an important paper on this subject, provides several valuable specifics and priorities to increase the likelihood that the commission's action goals are implemented. He identifies two high-priority target populations—young families, and people marginally affiliated in Jewish organizations. These targeted populations can be best reached in "gateway institutions" such as synagogues and JCCs. The goal is to establish relationships, particularly with young families during their impressionable parenting years, and to

use family education and other informal Jewish education activities to strengthen the family's Jewish commitment. The close collaboration between the federation and the synagogue is a central strategy in Shrage's action plan, both as a means for effectively reaching an important population—receptive young Jewish families—and also for assuring full access to the community's Jewish educational resources in terms of personnel and facilities.[42]

C. A NEW GENERATION OF PROFESSIONAL EDUCATORS

One might characterize the current state of the American Jewish educational professionals, and of the major Jewish educational professional and service organizations, with the phrase "a changing of the guard." Today, virtually all of the key Jewish education professionals, those who are full-time, career educators and those who occupy the responsible leadership positions in the field, are products of the North American Jewish education system. For most, that means they have grown up with a supplementary school education (day school for Orthodox-reared educators); were likely to have been members of one of the denominational youth groups; attended a secular university with a major in Judaica, education, or social science; studied for a year or more in an Israeli university; and are likely to have an advanced degree, either a masters or a doctorate in Judaica or education.

The professional socialization of Jewish educators coming out of this educational path largely reflects the values and style of both the American Jewish education system and that of the general American education system. This professional socialization is likely to have generated a different type of Jewish educator than earlier generations of American Jewish educators whose socialization had been mainly in more traditional European Jewish communities. The American-trained educator would have been exposed to a modern, secular approach to Jewish studies and to a progressive approach to methodology; the European-trained educator would have been educated in a Yeshiva, concentrating on a traditional approach to Jewish scholarship and with little or no attention to methodology.

The current Jewish educational system still bears the imprint of the non-native traditional Jewish educator. At this juncture, as the American-trained Jewish educational professionals are assuming the positions of influence in the field, they are increasingly sensing the disjunction between their liberal socialization and the traditional settings they have inherited in their professional positions. Therefore, in the face of the current calls coming from outside the system demanding significant change in the current Jewish educational system, it is very likely that this generation of Jewish educators will be quite supportive. Indeed, many of them are already in the vanguard of those calling for radical change. It is also likely that they will be quite responsive to the current recommendations for introducing programs in family education and other types of informal Jewish education.

D. A NEW NETWORK OF JEWISH EDUCATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

The prognosis for innovative Jewish education approaches taking hold today is further enhanced by the parallel process of a changing of the guard in the network of professional and coordinating Jewish education organizations. The two dominant organizations in the American Jewish education community today are CAJE (Coalition for the Advancement of Jewish Education) and JESNA (Jewish Education Service of North America). The priorities and style of each of these organizations is refreshingly innovative, representing the perspectives of the young generation of American Jewish educators.

As a professional Jewish education organization, CAJE attracts significantly more Jewish educators to its conferences and institutes than any of its predecessor organizations. The educational ideas and materials generated at their professional meetings and research institutes are at the cutting edge of practice. CAJE has especially captured the interest of the young people entering, or considering entering, the field of Jewish education. The *chevrot* CAJE has fostered are an important resource for continuing learning and for sustaining the morale of the new generation of Jewish educational professionals.

JESNA is a national voice and coordinating body for Jewish education programs and services in North America. It is funded by allocations from Jewish federations around the country and seeks to effect a closer tie between the federation system and the full range of Jewish educational programs. JESNA concerns itself with efforts to upgrade the quality of Jewish education professionals. It maintains an ongoing liaison with organizations of professional Jewish educators in America and with the Association of Institutions of Higher Learning in Jewish Education, the American coordinating body of the colleges and universities which have programs for educating professional Jewish educators. JESNA also communicates with institutions in Israel which have an interest in Jewish education in America.

The Executive Vice-President of JESNA, Jonathan Woocher, has the personal stature and vision to open up new vistas for Jewish education in America and to extend community support for expanded Jewish educational services. In an important paper he wrote recently, Woocher stressed the importance of informal Jewish education programs, such as Jewish pre-schools, adult Jewish education, and use of Israel as an education resource.[43]

Within the past year, JESNA sponsored three major regional conferences on Jewish education. The subjects were: marketing and financing of Jewish education, Jewish family education, and adult education. These conferences are designed both to provide new perspectives on Jewish content for Jewish education professionals and to mobilize the interest and support of lay leaders for Jewish education services in the community.

E. PROFESSIONAL SCHOOLS IN JEWISH EDUCATION

Virtually all the analysts reviewing the state of Jewish education today indicate that conditions in the American Jewish community are ripe for a significant breakthrough in Jewish education. One of the requisites for such a development is the professionalization of the field.[44] No profession exists without its own specialized, university-based program for practitioners. The professional schools, through the research and writing of their professors, help define the body of knowledge relevant to the profession's function and teach the skills, emerging from the knowledge base, to the aspiring practitioners. The common educational experience contributes both to a clear sense of professional identity of the practitioners and to public recognition and affording of status to the field.

A major surge forward in strengthening the professional schools of Jewish education in North America occurred in 1988 with the formation of the Association of Institutions for Higher Learning in Jewish Education. Today this Association has twelve member colleges, universities, and seminaries, each of which has a degree program in Jewish education.[45] That this Association has come into being is a function of three developments, all of which reflect the growing professionalization of Jewish education:

1) There has emerged a strong cadre of Jewish educators with doctorates who have the credentials, capacity and interest to enter academic careers in Jewish education.

2) There is an adequate number of institutions of higher education committed to maintaining departments or programs in Jewish education to make credible careers as academics in Jewish education.

3) The academics in these twelve institutions now share enough of a commitment to the profession of Jewish education to bring them together to do what professors in professional schools are expected to do: collegially define basic educational standards for entry into the profession.

While the formation of the Association of Institutions for Higher Learning in Jewish Education is an indication of an emerging sense of professionalization of the field of Jewish education in North America, a word of caution must be noted about the current scope of these schools. Davidson, in his 1990 study of the Jewish education schools, identifies a total of fourteen such institutions (he includes two schools which are not formal members of A.I.H.L.J.E.). But he also points out that there are only eighteen full-time faculty in these schools.[46]

* * *

The "changing of the guard" in terms of the emergence of a new generation of capable American-trained Jewish educators, a new constellation of Jewish educational organizations which are innovative in style and substance, and the formation of the Association of Institutions for Higher Learning for Jewish Education are all evidence of a strengthened Jewish education infrastructure. This development bodes well for the professionalization of the field of Jewish education and, in turn, for its capacity to elicit the respect and confidence of American Jews.

Part II: Policy and Program Issues and Recommendations

Informal Jewish Education Settings: Characteristics and Issues

This section includes a listing of informal Jewish education settings in the North American Jewish community. The outline describes the unique characteristics of the setting along with the issues confronting the professional practitioners as they pursue the goals of informal Jewish education.

Two informal education settings however are not afforded separate treatment in this section: service to toddlers and pre-schoolers, such as child care and nursery school, and service to Jewish university students, such as Hillel programs. Such programs touch people at important impressionable stages in the developmental cycle and typically utilize informal education approaches effectively. Similarly, this analysis does not discuss the use of media. Clearly media are a new frontier for informal Jewish educators, particularly the use of videotapes, and interpretive material about this technology is needed.

The information in this section is drawn from interviews with leading practitioners of the several settings (Appendix 1 lists names of people interviewed) and from literature about the settings.

I. Jewish Community Center

The JCC is the oldest and largest informal Jewish education setting in North America, having served the largest number of people for the past 150 years. It is also a prototypical setting for informal Jewish education; it represents the basic elements of both the methodology and of the setting. The center can be considered an informal education setting due to its recreational function and social group work background of its professionals.

A. MAJOR CHARACTERISTICS

- Major program activities are recreation, physical education, creative arts and informal education.
- Emphasis is on social relationships – between professionals and members and between members themselves.
- Members are autonomous – they attend voluntarily and actively define their own programs.
- Staff training emphasizes interpersonal skills and a non-directive, process-oriented, leadership style.

- Ambiance of the setting is informal and relaxed.

B. ISSUES

1. *Jewish Content—Pre-Maximizing:* The JCCs of today are involved in a major effort to "maximize" the Jewish educational function of the setting. In the "pre-maximizing" period, however, the "Jewish content" of the centers focused mainly on affecting positive Jewish identity and attitudes, with less focus on formal Jewish learning. This objective was to be achieved by a number of indirect influences such as:

- helping members have fun in an identifiable Jewish setting;
- maintaining a Jewish ambiance in the center through observing the Jewish calendar, Shabbat, Kashrut, and a Jewish building decor;
- fostering relaxed and positive interactions among Jewish people and Jewish professionals;
- serving as the only means of Jewish identification for those Jews not otherwise involved in Jewish life;
- providing an experience for Jews of different ideological backgrounds to interact with each other;
- responding to members' concerned questions about Jewish issues.

2. *Jewish Content—Post-Maximizing:* Since the mid-1980s, the JCCs have been embarking on a major campaign to upgrade the centers' Jewish objectives. The indirect activities, noted above, continue to provide important informal Jewish educational "lessons," but are now receiving even greater attention in light of the raised Jewish consciousness level of the JCC staff. There is a new initiative which seeks to transmit more formal Jewish educational content, e.g., Jewish history, values, customs, life cycle, rituals.

3. *How to Maximize?* This program, which was undertaken primarily by the initiative of the JWB, the umbrella organization of JCCs, is a model of intentional institutional change. It bodes well for improving the effectiveness of the centers' efforts to achieve their Jewish educational goals. A recent evaluative study of the centers' program to maximize their Jewish education goals confirms that the initiatives, taken over the past five years, have produced positive results. The study pointed to the following four steps as having been particularly important in accounting for positive change in the JCCs' achievement of their Jewish education goals:[47]

a) A clear and persistent affirmation by the centers' leading lay and professional leadership of their commitment to the maximizing program, backed in part by the directing of financial resources to this effort.

b) A serious and sustained program of staff and lay leadership development in the area of Jewish learning, both in America and Israel.

c) Hiring a Jewish educational specialist for the local centers, both to help train fellow staff and to serve as a Jewish program resource/initiator.

d) Developing Jewish educational curriculum materials adapted for use with different age groups and utilizing informal education approaches. Currently underway is the development of a set of materials on "Basic Jewish Literacy."[48]

4. *Constraints*: What are the future prospects for the maximizing initiative? The steps taken thus far indicate that the lay and professional leadership are virtually fully supportive. Two constraints should be acknowledged which will likely set limits on how much change is achievable. The first concerns the traditional function of the JCC as a recreation agency. The appeal of the center has largely been because it makes available quality recreation programs which are attractive and important to the Jewish people in the community. There is of course the motivation of Jews to come to the JCC for these recreation programs because they prefer to be with other Jews and, in responding to this motivation, the JCC contributes to enhanced Jewish identification. But it should be clear: for many of these recreation programs, especially in the physical education realm, there is little or no Jewish education included. This is not said to make light of this fully appropriate and important recreation function of the JCC, but rather to recognize that a large proportion of the center's resources are directed to recreation programs, and also that a large proportion of the people who come to the centers will come only for this level of involvement.

The second constraint is affected by the atmosphere of the center and the perception of the institution by the people in the Jewish community. The vast majority of people think of the center as a place to go to be in a Jewish environment where they can have fun, relax, take part in essentially secular activities, and enjoy social interactions with Jewish friends and with the accessible staff. Such an image of the JCC is appropriate both to attract people to a **community** center and as a desirable end in itself. For many people these reasons will be the only ones which bring them to the JCC. Some of these JCC members are likely to participate in other organizations in the Jewish community, which they perceive of as more appropriate for Jewish educational or spiritual pursuits, such as the synagogue or the Jewish school. Other JCC members will seek out no further Jewish educational activities or involvements, contenting themselves only with an ethnic/social Jewish identification afforded by their JCC participation.

The challenge to the center leadership is how to make the newly emerging Jewish educational programs of the JCC more accessible both to those current JCC members who are not utilizing these services and to people in the community who have not been coming to the center. This would entail a two-step process. First, it should begin to project a new image of the JCC, one which indicates the center's broadened Jewish educational activities. However, recognizing that images are slow to change and that public relations efforts do have limits in their capacity to change perceptions, a second task is needed that will assure that the center's Jewish educational programs are successful. That task will entail persisting in the effort to

achieve a synthesis of the JCCs' appealing, informal, people-centered style with techniques for creatively teaching Jewish subject matter. This is the essence of effective informal Jewish education, and in pursuing it the centers not only help themselves to be more responsive to today's American Jews, but are also doing pioneering work in honing a methodology which can be helpful to other Jewish organizations in the community.

Indeed, the image of the JCC has changed. A top professional of the movement defined today's Jewish center professional as a "Jewish educator in an informal setting." A generation ago the definition would have been a "social worker working with Jewish people."

5. *Statistical Data on Jewish Community Centers*[1] *and YMHAs*[2]*: 1980-81 and 1990*

TABLE 1

Year	No. different cities with at least one JCC or Y[3]	Total JCCs or Ys (includes all branches of multi-unit centers)[4]	Total members of all JCCs and Ys[5]	Total different individuals who participated in JCCs or Ys at least once in the non-members[6]
1980 1981	128	231	750,000	1,875,000
1990	124	217	800,000	2,000,000

1 These data were drawn from the Directory of Jewish Community Centers and Ys of North America, published annually by the JWB in New York City. For comparative purposes statistics have been compiled from the current Directory, 1990, and from the Directory of ten years ago, 1980-81. Information was also obtained from interviews with three JWB professionals: Mitchell Jaffe, Assistant Executive Director; Leonard Rubin, Assistant Executive Director; and Edward Kagen, Consultant for Research and Statistics.

2 *Other Jewish Group Serving Agencies—O.J.G.S.A.* In addition to established JCCs and YMHAs there exist in North America very small or incipient Jewish community centers, usually located in cities with small Jewish populations. Typically these units are sponsored by the Jewish federation in that community and are staffed by a federation professional usually on a part- time basis, or a lay committee or volunteer.
In 1980-81 there were thirty such O.J.G.S.A. units; in 1990 there were thirty-six such units. These small centers offer community-wide events or other occasional programs to youth and the elderly in North America.

3 In this listing New York City is counted as one city. In 1980-81 there were thirty-five separate JCCs and Ys in Greater New York City out of a North American total of 231 centers and Ys; in 1990, there were thirty-three separate JCCs and Ys in Greater New York City out of a North American total of 217 centers and Ys. Not included in these data are synagogue centers in the Greater New York City area, of which there are nineteen, both in 1980-81 and 1990.

4 If O.J.G.S.A.s are included, the total number of centers in 1980-81 is 261; in 1990 there are 253 centers.

5 If O.J.G.S.A.s are included, the estimated number of members in 1980-81 increased by 3,000 to 753,000; in 1990 the number of members increases by 3,500 to 803,500.

6 JWB professionals estimate that at least once a year involvement of non-members in a center is one and one-half times the number of members. The estimated figures in this column included participation (active or passive) of both members and non-members. If these figures were to include O.J.G.S.A.s the total number of different individuals participating in all centers in 1980-81 would increase by 8,000 to 1,883,000; in 1990 there would be an increase of 8,750 individuals and a total of 2,008,750 different individual participants.

Implications of the JCC Statistics

Number of JCCs and Members: Across the past twenty years there has been a slight decline in the number of JCCs in North America, primarily as a result of the consolidation of smaller branch operations and the building of new large facilities. Also in some geographic areas there has been a consolidation of centers in nearby communities and the emergence of a single larger regional JCC.

During this same period of time there has been a gradual increase in the total number of JCC members in North America. In 1968 there were 754,000 members; in 1978—750,000 members; and in 1989—800,000 members.

In 1989 some 2,000,000 different individuals—members and non-members—had participated in some activity in a JCC. That number represents over one out of every three American Jews. Certainly many of these individuals may have been in the JCC only once or twice, and perhaps as participants in some large audience type of event. This impressive number dramatically interprets the potential of the center as an "entry point" or "window of opportunity" for welcoming people in the Jewish community and for assuring the participation in some Jewish organization of many American Jews who otherwise would not be involved.

II. Youth Groups

While there is an ongoing process of change affecting the professional identification of JCC workers, the leading professionals in the field of Jewish youth work have always defined themselves as "Jewish educators working in informal settings." Where social work had been the shaping profession of the JCC movement, the rabbinate and Jewish education remain the shaping influences in the field of Jewish youth work. The number of full-time, professionally trained staff in Jewish youth work is smaller, both in total numbers and in proportion to part-time staff, as compared to the staffing pattern in JCCs. Those full-time professionals in Jewish youth work are almost all rabbis or Jewish educators. It is their strong commitment to Jewish learning, emerging from their own initial attraction to these professions and their subsequent professional socialization, which gets translated into the clear priority for Jewish education (using informal methods), in the Jewish youth groups.

Jewish youth groups primarily serve young adolescents of junior high school and high school age. Most of the groups are aligned with national Jewish organizations. These include the three major denominationally sponsored organizations—National Conference of Synagogue Youth, National Federation of Temple Youth, and United Synagogue Youth; the B'nai B'rith Youth Organization; and the American Zionist Youth Foundation and other Zionist youth groups. These youth groups serve some 75,000 members with at least another 25,000 young people attending some of their programs.

A. MAJOR CHARACTERISTICS:

1. *Responsive Methodology*—The capacity of the youth groups to attract and to have an impact on their young adolescent constituency is a result of their responsive methodology. As expressed by a veteran youth group professional: "We focus on where our kids are at." Key elements of that methodology include:

- Jewish programs which use creative techniques and innovative formats and settings with the result being that kids learn that "being Jewish is fun."
- Active participation by members in defining the programs and in carrying them out.
- Opportunities for co-ed interactions and a sense of social belonging to a Jewish peer group.
- Access to sensitive, non-authoritarian group leaders who serve as Jewish role models. A Jewish youth group professional comments: "I live the life I teach and I help my kids see that what they learn about their Jewishness can give direction to their lives."

2. *Responsive Curriculum*—The informal nature of the youth group environment draws on the key issues concerning the personal lives of Jewish adolescents for its curriculum of Jewish programming and activities. Recognizing that this is a developmental stage for clarifying personal and Jewish identity, the types of "learning needs" which are likely to occupy the thoughts of Jewish young adolescents, and to which the youth group "curriculum" is responsive, includes such issues as:

intermarriage;

divorce;

changing family patterns;

Soviet Jewry;

anti-Semitism;

changes in Eastern Europe and South Africa;

developments in Israel.

3. *Local and National Coordinating Organizations*—Since most Jewish youth groups are led by part-time, untrained staff, the field has developed a range of appropriate support services for these group leaders. Typically these services are in the realm of staff training and program resources and have been provided by the national or regional offices of the sponsoring ideological organization. Recently, support services for youth group chapters are also coming from the local Boards of Jewish Education or city-wide coordinating agencies, such as the Central Agency for Jewish Education in Miami. Examples of support services, coming from both the national ideological organizations and the local coordinating bodies, are the following:

- inter-youth group programs to enhance pluralism and to focus energies on action projects, e.g., rallies, fund raising;
- program materials and equipment, e.g., media, publications;
- incentive and recognition programs;
- leadership development;
- the providing of facilities for Shabbatonim, retreats.

B. ISSUES

1. *Professional Staff*—Clearly belonging at the top of a list of issues calling for change in the field of Jewish youth work is the current state of its professional personnel. There are too few full-time professional staff who have made this their career and too much reliance on staff who are part-time and who have a high rate of turnover. There is also a need to clarify the professional identity of the full-time youth group practitioner. A specialized, university-based educational program in informal Jewish education would be very helpful both to attract people to the field and to add to their effectiveness.

2. *Status*—The field of Jewish youth work is not afforded a level of status commensurate with its important educational potential. In part, this is a reflection of the general inclination in the community not to view informal education programs as serious. This adversely affects the morale of the leading Jewish youth group professionals, and in turn has a ripple effect on the part-time staff members. The field's low status also results in the community leaders not allocating adequate financial resources to Jewish youth work. The suggestion to clarify the professional identity of youth group professionals by the development of a specialized university-based training program, would help raise the status of the field.

3. *"Points of Contact"*—Although current Jewish youth group programs may reach up to 100,000 young people in North America, many of these individuals have only a marginal involvement and approximately another 200,000 Jewish youth in North America are not reached at all by such programs. The professional leaders of the field have recognized that by pursuing "points of contact"—creative, personalized reach-out initiatives— with both their own marginally involved members and with the not-involved, they can significantly increase the impact of their Jewish educational work.

In sum, the track record of Jewish youth groups has been impressive. A large majority of people who choose to enter professional careers as rabbis, Jewish educators or Jewish communal workers attribute their decision to a positive experience they had as members of Jewish youth groups and by identifying with a Jewish youth group professional. The director of one of the national Jewish youth groups indicated that 75% of their group leaders had grown up in the movement.

Such an achievement by Jewish youth groups is particularly noteworthy in light of the low status of the field, the gaps in its professionalization, and the minimal financial resources it receives.

III. Jewish Family Education

Jewish family education (JFE) has become the prime frontier for informal Jewish education in North America today. In addition, much hope for the future of the supplementary school has been invested in this educational approach. This expectation grows out of two sets of educational research. The first is the research on such remedial education programs as Head Start, which indicated that efforts of professionals in the school experience without family involvement are limited. A difference can only be made when parents and family acknowledge the importance of the educational endeavor and reinforce the effort by participating in it directly. The second area of research is the several critical evaluative studies of the Jewish supplementary school. The most devastating report is the Board of Jewish Education study in New York.[49]

A. MAJOR CHARACTERISTICS

1. *Organic Learning*:

Jewish family education has become particularly attractive today because it incorporates a methodology which has the unique capacity to involve Jewish young people and their parents in an organic Jewish educational experience. Traditionally, Jews "absorbed" their Jewish education by being immersed in an organic Jewish culture. Their family life, the schools they attended, and the communities of which they were a part, were pervasively Jewish. One learned "how to be a Jew" from a range of accessible role models and because it was what one needed to function in that society.

Jews growing up today in America have few or no opportunities to experience an organic Jewish culture. As third and fourth generation Jews, most of these young people have no direct contact with grandparents, or other relatives, who have been reared in the pervasive Jewish environments of "the old country." Similarly, as a modern mobile community, American Jews have moved away from "the old Jewish neighborhoods," the organic Jewish communities, in which their grandparents grew up.

Jewish family education is an intentional effort to recapture some of the features of organic Jewish life and weave them into the realities of Jewish life in America as the 20th century comes to a close. The strategy is to seek to enrich the two key environments in which Jewish young people grow up today—their families and the Jewish community—so that these young people recognize that Jewish learning can be functional in their lives as they grow up. The family is the most important influence in shaping children's basic Jewish identity and attitudes. Jewish family education seeks to strengthen the family influence directly by

organizing Jewish educational activities in which parents and children learn together, either at the same time or in parallel activities. This Jewish learning may take place in the Jewish school, in the synagogue, in other Jewish organizational settings, or in the home. The Jewish learning, shared by both children and parents, contributes to a Jewishly enriched household.

Jewish family education indirectly strengthens the children's motivation for Jewish learning, as they see and recognize their parents—their primary "value-shapers"—as viewing Jewish learning as important. Also, this process of parental validation of Jewish education is transferred to the other partners in the JFE experience—the Jewish community and its agencies. Such active involvement and reinforcement by parents and the Jewish community sends a very different message to children about the importance of Jewish education as compared to the "drop-off" syndrome where parents merely drive the children to the school for their Jewish education then move on to their separate areas of interest.[50]

2. *Two Components of Jewish Family Education:*

a. Jewish Education: Parents and children participate together in programs of Jewish learning or celebrating. The learning agenda includes the general Jewish educational curriculum of history, religious ideas/practices, and contemporary subjects such as Israel, Jewish identity, life cycle and religious rituals.

b. Enhanced Family Life: Parents and children participate together in "fun" activities or in discussions to foster good communication and understanding among members of the family.

3. *Perceptions of Jewish Educators about JFE:*

In May 1989 the Board of Jewish Education in New York assembled a group of experienced Jewish educators (whose average age was forty-two) for an institute on JFE in supplementary schools. I administered a questionnaire on Jewish family education which was completed by seventy of the participants. The respondents represented three types of Jewish educators: supplementary school directors/principals (64%), supplementary school teachers (12%), and staff of Jewish education coordinating agencies (23%). The attitudes of these career educators provide insights which can be useful for future policy strategies in seeking to introduce programs of Jewish family education in supplementary schools. The full questionnaire findings are included as Appendix 2.

A. OBJECTIVES OF JEWISH FAMILY EDUCATION

I indicated earlier that there are two components to JFE: *Jewish Education*, transmitting Jewish subject matter; and *Enhanced Family Life*, improving interaction and communication between parents and children. When this group of educators was asked to rank their objectives for JFE, three out of five of them

(60%) chose the *Jewish Education* alternative, while 40% chose from among three other alternatives which focus on *Enhanced Family Life.*

TABLE 2: PRIORITY RANKING OF FOUR DIFFERENT OBJECTIVES AND TARGET POPULATIONS OF JEWISH FAMILY EDUCATION – FIRST CHOICES

JFE Objectives/Target Populations	*First Choice*
Help parents and children improve communication with each other.	27%
Help parents and children increase their Jewish learning and commitment.	60%
Reach out to the several new types of families: single parents, reconstituted, mix marriages. . . .	5%
Interpret an approach to the Jewish family which extends beyond parents and children to include siblings, grandparents, and other relatives.	8%

That a majority of Jewish educators lean to the Jewish education objective is less surprising than the fact that two out of five of them chose one of the family interaction options. These reactions suggest that most educators consider both the Jewish education **and** the enhanced family life objectives as appropriate and are not inclined to an either-or definition of JFE.

B. EXPECTED OUTCOME OF JFE ON PARENTS AND CHILDREN

Recognizing that there is a tendency in Jewish education to turn to new educational approaches with the expectations they will bring dramatic results, the educators were asked to assess whether the current interest in JFE might be a "fad," a trend unlikely to have much impact on children and families. The vast majority (89%) did not agree that JFE was a fad and, among these, 33% strongly disagreed.

TABLE 3: EXTENT AGREEMENT WITH STATEMENT: "JFE IS TYPICAL OF MANY FADS IN JEWISH EDUCATION AND IS LIKELY TO RESULT IN NO IMPACT ON CHILDREN AND FAMILIES."

Extent of Agreement	
Strongly Agree	7%
Agree	4%
Disagree	56%
Strongly Disagree	33%

Another question sought to assess more specifically the nature of the impact, if indeed there was, of JFE programs on children and families. The outcomes to be evaluated were divided into the two JFE functions—Jewish education and enhanced family life. The most inclusive JFE outcome, expecting more family interaction, more positive Jewish attitudes and greater Jewish education, was chosen by 53%. The next outcome possibility, achieving more interaction, more positive Jewish attitudes, was chosen by 38%. Only 9% chose the minimal outcomes—6% felt that only more family interaction might be expected, and 3% anticipated little or no impact of JFE programs. These findings confirm the results of the prior two questions, namely, that dedicated and serious Jewish educators consider **both** Jewish education and enhanced family interaction as appropriate and achievable JFE objectives. They are apparently quite optimistic about the prospects for these objectives being realized.

TABLE 4: EXPECTATION OF OUTCOME OF JFE PROGRAM ON STUDENTS AND THEIR FAMILIES

Outcome of JFE on Parents and Children	
More interaction between parents and children; more positive Jewish attitudes, more Jewish learning	53%
More interaction and more positive Jewish attitudes	38%
More interaction	6%
Little or no impact	3%

C. IMPLEMENTATION OF JFE PROGRAMS

Two questions addressed the issue of implementation of JFE programs in the supplementary school—one which asked these educators how competent they felt about their personal and professional aptitudes in JFE, and a second question which asked the respondents to assess the attitudes of the several synagogue constituencies to the prospect of having a JFE program in their school.

TABLE 5: LEVEL OF PROFESSIONAL COMPETENCE FELT BY EDUCATOR FOR IMPLEMENTING A PROGRAM OF JFE IN JEWISH SCHOOLS

Level of Competence	
Very competent	18%
Competent	73%
Not very competent	7%

As noted in Table 5, the largest majority, 73% of the educators, feel they are now competent in JFE, with an additional 18% describing themselves as very competent. Only 7% felt they were not very competent. Allowing for the likelihood that this particular population of Jewish educators would have had more involvement in JFE than a random group of Jewish educators, their self evaluations, notwithstanding, indicate a high level of confidence in their capacity to implement JFE programs.

TABLE 6: ELEMENT WHICH WOULD BE MOST RESISTANT TO INTRODUCING JFE IN SUPPLEMENTARY SCHOOLS

Element	*First Choice*
Students	5%
Families	46%
Teachers	18%
Principal	3%
Rabbi	8%
Board of Directors	20%

The educators' views about the extent of resistance of the several synagogue constituencies to the introduction of a JFE program in their school are useful for planning strategies for change. The respondents consider the families as the most resistant group (46%), yet since only 5% thought students might be resistant, we can assume that the respondents are referring to parents (Table 6). Clearly, parents are the critical element for JFE, and, if they are indeed unwilling to participate, this calls into question the basic premises and expectations of JFE. There is the possibility, however, that the educators may have responded based on impressions shaped by working with earlier generations of families. But it is more likely the educators' impressions are accurate. In any event, this finding suggests that a direct study of parents attitudes regarding JFE is needed.

The next highest levels of anticipated resistance to JFE are attributed to the board of directors (20%) and to the teachers (18%). Neither of these percentages are high, suggesting that no significant problems are expected from these two important groups. It does, however, hint that a plan should be developed for interpretive meetings about the JFE programs with the board and teachers. That the two top professionals in the synagogue system, the school principal and the rabbi, are not seen as sources of resistance is a potential strength on which to build implementation strategies.

D. FUTURE PROSPECTS

The overall positive attitude to JFE of this group of educators is confirmed by their responses to two concluding questions about policy choices concerning the viability of the supplementary school and the value of JFE. The New York Board of Jewish Education study of supplementary schools calls for a radical change in the schools' current educational structure and focus. High on the list of recommendations for the supplementary school is to introduce JFE. Another, more radical option, which one might extrapolate from the study findings, is to give up on the supplementary school and pursue different approaches for educating Jewish children.

TABLE 7: CONSIDER IT WORTH MONEY AND EFFORT TO MAINTAIN SUPPLEMENTARY SCHOOL – WITH JFE PROGRAM

Choices	
Definitely yes	79%
Yes	18%
No	3%
Definitely no	0%

The educators were almost unanimous (97%) in their conclusion that it was worth the money and effort to maintain the supplementary school and to try to improve its effectiveness with JFE programs (Table 7). Almost four-fifths of the 97% responded "definitely yes" to maintaining the supplementary school. This certainly is a clear endorsement of the basic Jewish educational vehicle for the majority of American Jews – the supplementary school.

A similarly favorable response to the supplementary school being strengthened by JFE is reaffirmed when the group was asked to choose between that as a policy option and two other alternative policy options: encouraging greater use of day schools or for families to go on aliyah. Almost four out of five educators (79%), prefer a policy to support supplementary schools, with 21% favoring an emphasis on the day school (Table 8). No one chose the option of aliyah. It is not clear whether the non-endorsement of aliyah for American families is based on pragmatism or ideology, but a zero response is noteworthy.

TABLE 8: PRIORITY CHOICE OF JEWISH EDUCATIONAL POLICIES

Policy Choices	*First Choice*
Introduce JFE to maintain and enhance a viable supplementary school	79%
Try to get as many Jewish children into day schools	21%
Try to get as many Jewish families to go on aliyah	0%

B. ISSUES IN FAMILY LIFE EDUCATION

1. *Professional Personnel*—If JFE is to become a more significant component of the basic educational program of the supplementary school, who will provide the professional leadership? Thus far, where there have been successful JFE programs—of which there are few—they have been developed by an unusually gifted individual with some professional background and personal aptitudes for informal education approaches. There are a handful of such "stars" in the country, among them: Harlene Appelman in Detroit, Vicky Kelman in Oakland, Ron Wolfson and Janice Alper in Los Angeles, and Joe Reimer and Joan Kaye in Boston. There is a need to define the knowledge, skills and personal qualities requisite for effective JFE practice and to develop educational programs to produce more able JFE professionals. Needed are both short-term institutes for retraining Jewish educators already in the field and formal JFE educational components in the formal curricula of the graduate programs in Jewish education, the rabbinate, and Jewish communal service.

2. *Participating Families*—The uncertainty of the willingness of parents to participate in JFE programs, emerging from the study I did of Jewish educators, raises the critical issue of how families are to be recruited and sustained. Some reassurance arises from the several "star" directed JFE programs which have successfully involved parents, and suggests that it is an achievable objective. Nevertheless, this is an issue which requires creative thinking and certainly needs to be addressed by research directed at better understanding the attitudes of parents in addition to curriculum development for the JFE professionals.

Another issue concerning family participation which needs attention is how to involve non-traditional families in JFE, e.g., single-parent families, reconstituted families, and mixed marriage families. Non-traditional families represent a growing proportion of all Jewish families, and are likely to especially benefit from JFE programs.

3. *Educational Materials*—The curriculum resource specialists, over the past decades, have been developing increasingly effective Jewish educational materials for the Jewish schools. Certainly some new types of materials will be needed when

the target population is the family. Special attention should be devoted to materials which can be used by family units working independently in their homes. The use of media is certainly an area which can be further exploited.

A Concluding Note: JFE has much promise for bringing a valuable, new perspective to the field of Jewish education in America and for revitalizing the supplementary school. Much is at stake given these high expectations. If the JFE initiative fails to fulfill its promise it could have a very chilling impact on the field of Jewish education. The prospects for such a negative outcome can be significantly reduced by deliberate and thoughtful advanced planning, with special attention to the three issues noted above: preparing skilled JFE professionals, soliciting the active involvement and participation of parents, and developing appropriate curricular resources. Implicit in such a serious planning effort must be the allocation of adequate financial resources by the North American Jewish community.

IV. The Retreat/Conference Center

A retreat or conference center under local Jewish communal auspices is now in operation in about fifty cities in North America. Only thirteen of these centers have facilities to accommodate conference meetings and are capable of housing people overnight. The rest use other facilities available in their community. Most of the Jewish communities without a current retreat or conference center have future plans for developing one.

A. MAJOR CHARACTERISTICS

1. *Types of Settings:* An example of a retreat center "without walls" is the Bob Russell Community Retreat Center in Miami. The permanent staff of the Center locate a number of different types of settings, using hotels and other community buildings with appropriate facilities, which are reasonably accessible to the Miami area, and which can provide Kosher food. The Russell Center's staff serve as an administrative and program resource in helping Jewish community groups plan retreats, conferences, and Shabbatonim. The Center is administratively based in Miami's central Jewish education coordinating agency—CAJE.

A similar service, The Retreat Institute, has recently been developed in Cleveland, and is part of The Jewish Community Center of Cleveland.

The Butzel Conference Center in Detroit is one of the centers with its own facilities. It is part of the Fresh Air Society, a Jewish camping agency affiliated with the Detroit Jewish Federation. The Butzel Conference Center has comfortable winterized quarters, serves Kosher food, and can accommodate forty people overnight (larger groups for day meetings). Priority is given to serving groups from Detroit area synagogues and federations and Jewish youth groups. An attractive feature of the Center is that it is within a one-hour drive of the city. However, despite the fact that Jewish groups make extensive use of the Butzel Center, its

financial viability is dependent upon use by outside groups. For example, for several years a large area industrial corporation had a contract with the Center to use the facilities for their executive staff retreats. While this corporation and others were using the Center, the Center made a modest profit. Without that outside income, however, the year-round facility would result in a significant financial deficit.

The staff who work in the retreat/conference centers "without walls" indicate a strong preference to have their own facility. The problem in seeking to develop a new retreat/conference center is a financial one—both the high cost of constructing or purchasing a building and the high annual costs of maintaining the building and the grounds. For a number of years the National Jewish Center for Learning and Leadership (CLAL), located in New York City, which regularly conducts conferences and institutes for Jewish groups, has been actively pursuing the idea of establishing a major Jewish conference center. Although CLAL has grown in its programs and resources, they have not been able to commit the significant amount of money required for capital and operating costs of a permanent facility.

2. *Groups Served and Types of Programs:* A conference/retreat center offers the opportunity for "away from home" programs for a period of a day, a weekend, a week or even more. Types of programs and Jewish populations who are served include:

- leadership training programs for board and staff groups;
- family camping or Jewish education retreats;
- *Shabbatonim* for Jewish schools and other groups;
- "beyond classroom" Jewish educational programs for Jewish school groups;
- specialized weekends for different groups, e.g., singles, mixed marrieds, the elderly;
- specialized weekends based on themes: Jewish arts; drama; music; pluralism; Who is a Jew?;
- conferences on different subjects and for different groups with use of guest scholars.

3. *Unique Characteristics of the Conference/Retreat Center:* The following are the appealing characteristics of the conference/retreat center. These attributes should be stressed to optimize the potential of this setting:

- Close social relationships are fostered when a group of people spend a sustained period of time together. People experience a sense of community.
- Living in a "Jewish domain," people learn about Jewish traditions in action, at meal times, during Shabbat, through songs and other Jewish cultural activities.
- Being in a setting, away from home and routine, allows for sustained study and work without distraction, along with opportunities for leisure and relaxation.

- The attractive rural setting of a retreat/conference center fosters creativity.
- The informal atmosphere helps people relate more comfortably to each other and to authority figures such as rabbis, teachers or employers.

B. ISSUES

1. *Pre- and Post-Planning:* The quality of a retreat or conference away from home can be enhanced by convening the participants both before and after the experience. The pre-planning serves two important purposes: first, coming together to meet both the staff and their fellow "campers" and getting details about how to travel to the setting, the nature of the facilities, what to bring, etc. helps to dispel the participants' anxiety. Second, the advance meeting is an opportunity for staff to involve the participants in shaping the agenda and procedures for the group's time together. This initial involvement will set a pattern for the group's assumption of responsibility while they are at the retreat center or camp, which will strengthen their sense of autonomy and full participation in the retreat objectives.

A meeting of the group "back home" following their time together at the retreat/conference center affords an opportunity to consolidate the actions or learnings and to build on the social relationships developed. For the sponsoring Jewish organization this can be an occasion to bridge the group or individuals more closely into the ongoing work of the organization.

2. *Auspices:* The professionals who work with retreat/conference centers agree that the issue of organizational auspices is an important factor in how well the center functions and accomplishes its goals. The reality is that for reasons of costs a Jewish community can only sustain one retreat/conference center. The issue is who, which community organization, operates the center. In addition, it is not only economically prudent for the center that the full range of Jewish organizations make use of what it has to offer, but it fosters pluralism too. The shared use of this Jewish community facility by the different Jewish groups and also the coming together of individual members of these different groups or programs addressing common interests, are ways of building a sense of Jewish unity—a priority issue facing the Jewish community today.

Given the desirability of a permanent, well-equipped retreat/conference center, one approach which should be considered is a regional center which would serve several Jewish communities in the same general area. Such an arrangement could assure optimum use of the facilities by Jewish groups throughout the year, and could help spread the costs of setting up and maintaining the center.

V. Informal Programs in Day Schools and Supplementary Schools

Day schools and supplementary schools are formal education settings which have been increasingly turning to the approaches of informal education as the vehicle for more effectively fulfilling their educational goals. In both settings, more attention is being directed at shaping the cultural feel of the school, recognizing that this can either support or undermine Jewish learning. The headmaster of a large day school reports that when the school is solely focused on academics, there is a tendency for cliques and hostile relations to develop among students which distract energy from learning and result in poor morale. Social programs are planned to improve interpersonal relations among students and also to afford opportunities for students and faculty to have fun together. Students who feel good about their fellow students and their teachers will come to school with positive attitudes and, it is reasonable to assume, with a greater receptivity to learn.

Student councils, with an appropriate allocation of responsibility, are proving to be a means for helping students feel a sense of ownership for their school. To the extent that students sense they have a voice in shaping their school the greater is the likelihood that they will identify with the school's educational objectives.

Both day school and supplementary schools report greater use of creative methodologies, such as experiential activities and media, as means for transmitting their lesson plans.[52] Also, rather than relying solely on direct teaching, teachers are using small groups within the classroom for "cooperative learning." An added benefit of this approach is to lessen the tendency to individualism and competition among students and to foster cooperation and collaboration.

Some day schools have become aware of a tendency toward Jewish insularity among their students and their families. For some families, this may be expressed as their viewing the day school as their sole means of Jewish involvement, with no membership in either a synagogue or other Jewish organizations. Principals have taken initiatives, working with Jewish youth groups and other Jewish organizations to encourage their students' participation in the broader Jewish community.

Perry London, in an important paper, has offered an historical and psychological perspective to make the case for Jewish educators to be more attentive to creating a sensitive and responsive culture in the Jewish school.[53] He describes a lag, in which Jewish educators bring a perspective about the Jewish school which may have been appropriate for earlier generations of students, but is not in tune with the situation and expectations of families today. Traditionally, London points out, "the ideal of the school" was viewed as a "Jewish literacy training center" seeking to teach knowledge of Jewish texts and Jewish technical skills. Such knowledge and skills would have been applicable in an earlier era, when most Jews lived in organic Jewish communities. As that era has passed, however, families are turning to Jewish schools primarily for shaping their children's Jewish identity and positive Jewish attitudes. In the open American society of today, London writes, Jewish children are confronted with:

> competition for (their) attention, interest and commitment. . . . (C)apturing hearts and minds is exactly what identity is all about. In its affective aspects, identity has to be modelled and motivated. It cannot be ordered, drilled, or even habituated. . . . Indeed, it is a quality first of the heart, and only then of the mind.[54]

VI. Camps

The camp setting affords the opportunity for a "classical" informal Jewish education experience. Here participants can spend extended periods of time with each other and with staff which allows for the emergence of close personal relationships and for the pursuing of subject matter with greater intensity than is otherwise generally possible. The camp is an active and living environment which can serve as a laboratory for campers to experience how Jewishness impacts on daily life. In the camp setting one can recreate an organic Jewish life situation. Shlomo Bardin, the founder of the very successful Brandeis-Bardin Institute Camp for young adults in California, described his camp's environment as a "Jewish domain." By immersing young adults for four weeks in a vibrant and creative Jewish environment, Bardin was able to interpret the attraction of Jewish rituals, cultural activities, and Jewish learning—in sum, a Jewish life-style.

Assessing the impact of the Conservative Movement's Ramah camp experience on the campers, Wertheimer observes:

> Precisely because it created a total Jewish environment, Ramah provided a setting in which to explore what it means to live as a Conservative Jew on a day-to-day basis. Products of Ramah, accordingly, have been prepared to put Conservative ideology into action once they have assumed roles of leadership within the movement.[55]

Wertheimer pointed out that during the late 1960s, many of the first generation alumni of Ramah camps were moving into adulthood and seemed to be attracted to new Jewish institutional forms, such as the *havurah* movement. The question raised by some leaders of the Conservative movement was whether the Ramah experience was leading these young people away from the more mainstream Conservative synagogues. Within the past decade there is evidence that as these first generation Ramah alumni have begun to have children, they are turning in large numbers to the Solomon Schechter schools for their own children's education.[56] Similarly, a high proportion of people choosing professional careers as rabbis, Jewish educators and communal service professionals have attended Ramah camps. These responses suggest that the Ramah experience has indeed socialized their campers in a positive sense about their Jewish commitment and their commitment to the Conservative movement. An even more impressive outcome suggested is that the Ramah alumni are likely to bring fresh and invigorating leadership perspectives to the movement, ones which will help the Jewish communal institutions adapt to the interests of this generation.

In a similar vein, follow-up studies of individuals who attended Brandeis-Bardin Camp Institute indicate that the camp experience had a pervasive influence on the Jewish identity of their former campers.[57]

In the study of the effectiveness of Jewish community centers, the center directors were asked to compare the Jewish educational effectiveness of their day camps with the Center's regular children's programs. Fifty-nine percent of the directors felt day camp was more effective, 33% said there was no difference, and only 8% said camp was less effective.[58] What were the reasons given by the directors to explain why they considered the day camp to be more effective? Their most frequently reported answers were:

More extended contact in the camp	42%
Israeli shlichim	20%
Jewish resource specialist	12%[59]

These data highlight along with the inadequately documented, but nonetheless impressive, personal testimonies of people active in Jewish life, the important role played by a summer camp experience in positively influencing their Jewish identity. Similarly, today one encounters growing interest expressed by leaders of the Jewish community in extending the use of camp settings for Jewish educational objectives. There is the sense that the camp setting can be especially effective in responding to the needs of today's Jewish individuals and families. The question is how ready and capable are the camps in the North American Jewish community to respond to the rising expectations of the Jewish community? I turn now to a more detailed review of the Jewish camps in America.

AN ASSESSMENT OF THE STATE OF JEWISH CAMPS IN AMERICA

1. *Camp Statistics*

TABLE 9: SUMMER RESIDENT CAMPS FOR CHILDREN WHICH ARE UNDER NORTH AMERICAN JEWISH AUSPICES, 1988-89

Camp Type & Auspices[1]	Number of Camps	Bed Capacity	Total Different Campers Served (Most camps have two four-week periods)
1. **JCCs, YMHAs & Jewish Federations**	48	11,660 Range 24-588 Avg. 274	30,287

1 Data on JCC camps obtained from the *Directory of Jewish Resident Summer Camps 1986-87*, published annually by the JWB, supplemented by an interview with Leonard Rubin of the JWB, their staff consultant on camps. Rubin indicates the 1989-90 Directory is about to be published and the figures are essentially the same as reported in the 1986-87 *Directory*.
Data on UAHC camps obtained from Rabbi Alan Smith, Union of American Hebrew Congregations and Arie Gluck, National Director of Camping and Youth, UAHC.
Data on Ramah camps obtained from Dr. Shelly Dorph, National Ramah Director.
Data on Orthodox camps obtained from Meir Frischman, Director, Camp Agudah Israel of America and Director of the Association of Jewish Camp Operators, 84 William St., New York, NY 10038.
Data on other children's camps under Jewish auspices, Teen Camps, Camps Serving Older Adults, obtained from JWB Director of Jewish Resident Summer Camps, 1986-87.
Data on Day Camps obtained from Leonard Rubin of JWB.

Camp Type & Auspices	Number of Camps	Bed Capacity	Total Different Campers Served (Most camps have two four-week periods)
2. **Jewish Denominational**			
a) Union of American Hebrew Congregations (Reform)	9	2,905 Range 345-534 Avg. 323	6,160
b) Ramah Camps – United Synagogue of America	6	2,288 Range 200-460 Avg. 381	33,146
c) Association of Jewish Camp Operators (Orthodox)	42 (33 camps not for profit; 9 private)	17,100 Avg. 407	18,870
3. **Other Children's Camps Under Jewish Auspices** (includes Zionist camps, B'nai B'rith camps & other independent Jewish organizationally-sponsored camps)	37	11,735 Range 149-1,000 Avg. 317	23,110
4. Camps Serving Youth with Special Needs Under Auspices of JCCs, Ys & Jewish Federations	7	1,333 Range 35-750 Avg. 190	2,418
5. Teen Camps	2	68 Range 18-50 Avg. 34	186

TABLE 10: TWO OTHER TYPES OF JEWISH-SPONSORED CAMPS

Camp Type & Auspices	Number of Camps	Bed Capacity	Total Different Campers Served (Most camps have two four-week periods)
1. Residential Camps Serving Older Adults Under Auspices of JCCs, Ys and Jewish Federations	6	1,689 Range 85-1,000 Avg. 282	9,808

Camp Type & Auspices	Number of Camps	Bed Capacity	Total Different Campers Served (Most camps have two four-week periods)
2. Day Camps Under Auspices of JCCs & Ys	200	Capacity for Day Campers 78,000 Range 150-1,000 Avg. 400	120,000

Two cautions should be noted about these data:

a. Aside from the data on the three groups of denominationally-sponsored camps, all data come from the JWB. The JWB contacts camp and obtains its data from their response. Since not all camps respond, nor does the JWB purport to be in touch with all Jewish camps in existence, there remains some number of Jewish camps not included in this report. The central offices of the UAHC and of National Ramah have fewer camps in their jurisdiction and it appears that their reports are based on relatively solid information. I have no information on how the Association of Camp Operators obtains their data on Orthodox camps, nor can I speak of the reliability of the figures I was given or whether this Association is in contact with all Orthodox camps.

b. My impression is that the figures on the last four categories of camps: Camps for Children with Special Needs, Teen Camps, Camps for Elderly and Day Camps, are under-represented. For example, I learned that there is a growing number of day camps under Orthodox auspices but I was unable to obtain definitive information. The Ramah camps offer several Teen Trip Camps, including a summer camp in Israel and a large children's day camp in Nyack which serves some 1,000 different children. In part, these specialized camps appear to be increasing and are not as well covered in the current method of recording camp statistics.

   In sum, these camp data are representative of the scope of camp services available to the North American Jewish community. If they err, it is in the direction of under-representing the numbers of camps and the people being served by them.

2. *Enrollment Patterns*

Interviews with the key coordinating professionals from the several national Jewish organizations which sponsor large numbers of summer camps confirm that over the past ten years there has been a decline of about 15% in camp enrollment. For the most part the decline is explained by the demographic dip in the population of children during that period of time. Some of the camps reported that the enrollment figures for 1990 have increased. Since the numbers of American

children who are of camp age should begin increasing, the Jewish camps should be able to expect fuller enrollments in the ensuing years.

However there are other persistent problems which could affect future camp enrollments. The most frequently reported problem is the increase in camp fees, and the concern that high cost may dissuade middle class Jewish families, for whom there is little or no scholarship support, from sending their children to Jewish camps. The issue of cost of camp services is a serious one which is likely to become more problematic in the future because of four recent developments.

a) The major factor responsible for increasing the costs of camp services is the maintenance of facilities. Most Jewish camps are now at least forty years old and the expenses in keeping such facilities operational are very high.

b) Liability insurance costs for camps have been raised significantly.

c) Camps need to increase counselor salaries to attract even a minimally qualified staff.

d) The influx of Russian Jewish families will add a large new camp population requiring full scholarship support.

The one recent development which camp directors report has positive implications for enrollment are the growing numbers of working parents who turn to summer camps as child care.

3. *Jewish Content*

Particularly with the summer camps under the auspices of the Jewish community centers there has been a discernible increase in Jewish content. One important contributing factor are two relatively new members of camp staffs: Israeli *shlichim* (in 1989 there were over 200 *shlichim* in camps in the New York area alone) and Jewish resource specialists. The latter staff specialists help other counselors enrich their individual Jewish programming as well as organizing Jewish programs for the entire camp. The *shlichim* encourage camp programs related to Israel, learning Hebrew, and Jewish singing and dancing.

Virtually all Jewish camps now maintain *kashrut* and have some type of Sabbath observance. Most camps have also taken steps to add to the Jewish ambiance of their physical settings.

Acknowledging these positive developments the JCC camp directors report that Jewish programming efforts still require hard work, with apathy or resistance from some campers and staff.

4. *Personnel*

As with other areas of informal Jewish education, the key problem identified by the leaders of the Jewish camps in America is staff. The American Camp Association reported that in their annual surveys of all camp directors in America over the past

three years, directors responded that staff was their number one problem. There are two aspects to the personnel problem. The first concerns the director, because the director is recognized as the most important variable in determining the quality of the camp. There is high turnover among camp directors. Asher Melzer, the Director of Camping Services of the UJA-Federation in New York City, reported that in the last two years he has had a turn-over of six out of seventeen camp directors. The issues which adversely affect the morale of the director are: relatively low salary, intense work pressures during "the season," year-round camp responsibilities despite the view that it is not a year-round job, and no sense of professional identity or status commensurate with the position of director.

The other major camp staff difficulty concerns getting adequate numbers of qualified counselors. (It is a problem of **both** numbers **and** quality.) In the past, the opportunity for college students to work at summer camps was considered an attractive option. Frequently counselors would work at the same camp for several summers, thereby assuring continuity. Today college students, especially the more able ones, are interested in summer jobs which pay more money and which might help in their long-term career plans in such realms as law, medicine, or business. The difficulty in finding adequate numbers of counselors has obliged camp directors to be dramatically resourceful. One new frontier they have discovered is to recruit counselors from Europe. For example, in this past year, the Jewish camps in New York brought over thirty-five counselors from England and Sweden, and the New Jersey Jewish camps hired over two hundred counselors from these two countries. The vast majority of these European counselors are non-Jews.

There is another reason why the issue of getting more Jewish young men and women into summer jobs as counselors should be given high priority by the American Jewish community. For many of the same reasons which make a summer at a Jewish camp important in terms of the Jewish identity of campers, such an experience is likely to have an enriching effect on the Jewish identity and Jewish learning of the camp counselor. Some camps identify this task as one of their objectives and invest their resources in Jewish educational programs for their counselors. In a recent interview with Shelly Dorph, the National Ramah Director, he explained:

> We see investing in a program of Jewish education for our own staff as an important goal. This is educating for the future leadership of the Jewish community. After all we have over 1,200 staff working in our Ramah camps every summer. About a thousand of these are college-age counselors and another two hundred are division heads and supervisors. They come with Jewish commitment and an aptitude in working with people.

A conservative estimate is that some 25,000 counselors, plus supervisory staff, work each summer in Jewish camps in North America. An investment by the American Jewish community in seeking to assure that these positions are filled by capable young men and women pays off in two ways: first, by having good counselors to serve the more than 200,000 Jewish young people who attend Jewish

camps, and second, by providing a leadership development program for an important pool of future Jewish communal leaders.

5. *Summary Recommendations*

a) Despite the promise and expectations of summer camps, the evidence is that Jewish camps are not being used to their potential. Some of the reasons for this gap have been discussed earlier. Included are: high costs for maintaining facilities, insurance and personnel. Perhaps even more of a factor seems to be the lack of resolve and creative initiatives by community leadership to invigorate the community's summer camps.

b) One frontier is to extend camp programs so that they reach more and varied Jewish populations. Among the important populations which might well be targeted for camp experiences are: families, young adults, people with special needs and interests, children in Jewish education programs, leaders of Jewish organizations, and the well elderly. Grants to innovative camps could help them develop new ways to utilize the camp setting.

c) Another initiative to better utilize the current camp facilities is to extend the times when the camps are available for serving the community. Ideally, having a winterized camp available in various sections of the country would be one approach. A less expensive alternative would be to extend the camp season, depending on the section of the country, for those Spring and Fall months when there is no danger of frost. This might mean having camp open in the northern half of America from May 1 to October 15 and somewhat longer in the southern half.

d) Initiatives to recruit capable young men and women to work as counselors in summer camps should be a high priority. Such initiatives would need to include upgrading salaries, building in more leisure time in the job expectation, and launching an active public relations and a national recruiting campaign. Similar initiatives should be undertaken to upgrade the job prerequisites and salary benefits of the directors, so as to assure attracting and maintaining quality individuals to this critically important position.

VII. Adult Jewish Education

MAJOR CHARACTERISTICS

I distinguish between two major categories of adult education programs for Jewish groups, formal and informal, each of which has different types of programs. The main distinction is that formal adult education groups are organized and taught by professional staff and are almost always based in the sponsoring institution; informal groups typically are formed and are maintained by the initiative of its own members, with occasional use of a professional resource person. They tend to meet in rotating locations, including members' homes.

Formal Adult Jewish Education Groups:

Synagogue, JCC, or Hebrew College based—The classic adult program is organized by a single synagogue or a group of synagogues in the same area. The program may be a single lecture or a series of lectures and classes which would meet over a number of weeks. In this format there are usually formal lectures and classes as the educational style is formal—teachers lecture and students ask questions. The subject matter is either in the area of Judaica, Hebrew language or contemporary Jewish issues.

Similar Jewish educational programs, supplemented by Jewish cultural arts activities, are increasingly being offered for adults in JCCs. The teaching style and class atmosphere in the JCC groups tends to be more informal. Some JCCs have developed a special reputation for offering a large number of high quality classes. Among these centers are the 92nd Street YMHA in New York City, the JCC in Washington, D.C., and the JCC on the Palisades in New Jersey.

The American cities which have Hebrew Colleges offer another setting for Jewish classes for adults. These are classes offered both for credit and not for credit. In a few communities there are special resources which offer Jewish adult education classes and cultural arts programs, e.g., the Brandeis Bardin Institute in California and the Foundation for Jewish Studies in the Washington, D.C., area.

Demographic studies which have inquired about participation in formal Jewish adult education programs indicate a level of participation of between 5-10%. Twenty percent of adults said they had an interest in attending such programs in the future.[60]

VIII. Informal Adult Jewish Education Groups—Havurot and Minyanim

A. TYPES OF HAVUROT

The start of the modern *havurah* movement is attributed to the year 1968 when Havurat Shalom in Somerville, Massachusetts, was founded.[61] There have evolved in the ensuing two decades three variants of *havurot:* **independent** groups, not affiliated with any other Jewish organization, e.g. Havurat Shalom, the New York Havurah and the Washington Fabrengen; **synagogue-based** *havurot*, organized by an initiative of the synagogue rabbi and involving members of that synagogue; and **intermediate** *havurot,* which operate like a small synagogue, using rented facilities. What these three types of *havurot* have in common is that they are run primarily by the members, and stress active participation by members in programs of Jewish study, worship and social activities.

The *havurah* phenomenon represents an effort to create informal, non-institutional environments in which the participants pursue their Jewish interests without being dependent on a rabbi or other Jewish professional. One of the issues which has proven a problem for the sustaining power of the early *havurot,*

especially the independent groups, has been their reluctance to define adequate leadership or institutional arrangements, which could help assure survival over time. Most *havurot* have an average life-span of two to three years, although there are havurot which have continued to meet for fifteen to twenty years.[62]

Havurot Support Systems—Two approaches for offering some institutional supports for *Havurot* have emerged. One is the National Havurah Committee, based in New York, an umbrella organization serving primarily independent *havurot*. Their main function is to keep some lines of communication open among the groups. Each year the Committee sponsors a national retreat and several regional retreats. These events bring together the movement leaders and does foster a network. But the same strong commitment to independence and fear of institutionalism extends to the National Havurah Committee. For several years the Committee has been struggling to meet accumulated debts and no longer is able to maintain any permanent staff. As a result, the support services the Committee can provide its member *havurot* is limited.

Intermediate *havurot,* such as the Havurah of South Florida, have added some greater institutional structure while maintaining the basic *havurah* principles.[63] Havurah of South Florida is essentially a network of several *havurot* which pursue their independent Jewish interest and which on special occasions come together. The key variant is that the Havurah of South Florida has a full-time rabbi, Mitchell Chefitz, who is available for direct leadership of some groups and activities, and who provides administrative/coordinative services to the groups. While there is no permanent facility—most groups meet in homes and even the rabbi's office is in his own home—the members of the network do assume responsibility for maintaining the rabbi's salary. The HSF has operated for ten years and seems to have achieved a balance between the autonomy of the separate member *havurot* and centralized administrative support services. But this resolution may be idiosyncratic in that the coordinating rabbi has a special commitment and capacity to make the *havurah* network, which he created, work.

Another type of intermediate *havurah* is represented by the *minyanim* which have emerged within synagogues. These are usually made up of members of the synagogue who prefer to *daven* separately from the synagogue's main religious service conducted by the rabbi. The *minyan* members typically are more Jewishly knowledgeable than their fellow congregants and have the capacity to manage their own religious services without synagogue professional staff. Further, having their own *minyan*, which generally ranges in size from 30 to 75 members, the *minyan* members determine their own customs and rituals. Like the *havurot* they shun pomp and trappings and seek active participation.

B. ISSUES—POLICY IMPLICATIONS

This overview of *havurot* raises three issues which concern informal Jewish education. First, the *havurah* is a classic informal Jewish educational experience. It is certainly informal in style, it stresses active participation, and its Jewish

educational program is concerned not only with Jewish learning, but also with Jewish behaving. Compared to the typical synagogue-based formal adult Jewish education programs, I believe the extent of participant involvement and impact of the *havurah* is much greater. This raises two policy questions:

How might formal adult Jewish education programs adapt the principles and approaches of the *havurot* to strengthen their programs? Can the organized Jewish community provide support services to *havurot* which would be fully sensitive to the group's autonomy, and might help sustain and extend these creature "pockets of Jewish energy"?

An example of this type of support coming from within the synagogue is the recent initiative of some synagogues to create a new professional position, a program director (an informal Jewish educator) whose responsibilities would include serving as the program/administrative resource for the synagogue's *havurot*, as well as other informal groups and activities within the synagogue, such as the pre-school, youth group, adult education, sisterhood, etc.[64]

A second "lesson" from the *havurah* experience is to recognize the important attraction spirituality holds for people today. One motivation of the people in the separate *minyanim* is to create an environment which is primarily spiritual and deals with religious essence and not its trappings and pomp. Perhaps mainstream Jewish organizations will find that they do not need as much *pizzazz* to attract and sustain their people as they have presumed and would do better with more stress on Jewish spirituality and its essence.

Finally, because of the *havurah*'s openness and informality such groups have special appeal to Jewish "marginals," those in the Jewish community who have not been fully integrated into the "Jewish establishment" organizations. Examples include mixed marrieds, single adults, academics and non-traditional families. I learned from my interview with the director of the Havurah of South Florida of a new population of "marginal" Jews which may well be outside the organized Jewish community—Jews who are involved in "12-Step" programs, such as Alcoholics Anonymous, Gamblers Anonymous, Overeaters Anonymous, etc.[65]

IX. Trips to Israel

A. MAJOR CHARACTERISTICS

In terms of cost effectiveness (time and money), no other educational experience today has the impact on American Jews as does a trip to Israel. We know this intuitively from our own visits and from those of friends and associates. We also know this empirically from the several evaluative studies which have been conducted, both of Jewish young people and adults.[66] In the study I conducted of the Jewish community centers' maximizing Jewish education initiative, educational programs for JCC professional and lay leaders were one of the variables highly correlated with effective maximizing of the centers' Jewish educational objectives.[67]

When directors of centers whose staff had an educational experience in Israel compared the effectiveness of that experience with their center's own Jewish education program, 32% evaluated the U.S. based in-service education program as very effective; 87% evaluated the Israel-based program as very effective.[68]

Thirty-six percent of American Jews have visited Israel at least once. When others were asked if they ever intend to visit Israel, 62% answered yes.[69] One can assume most of these visits were in the category of tourism, but that does not preclude its educational effect, both in terms of learning about Israel and Jewish history, and its enhancing of Jewish commitment. But one can further assume that systematically designed educational programs will have an even greater impact on both Jewish learning and commitment. Such educational programs in Israel are now being made a part of the regular agenda of most American Jewish organizations. Examples include Jewish educational programs for youth groups, JCC groups, Jewish schools, and leadership development programs in Israel for lay leaders and professionals, such as the "missions" regularly planned by UJA and Jewish federations. Hundreds of college-age students spend their junior year studying in Israeli universities, yeshivot and programs like WUJS and Pardes.

B. ISSUES

Several suggestions are offered to optimize the Jewish educational benefits of these trips to Israel:

1. *Staff training:* Having quality staff working with the groups can make a notable difference in their effectiveness. This involves both the American staff who accompany the groups and their counterparts in Israel with whom the American staff work. The first task is to recruit quality people and then to conduct a quality educational program for them. The Charles R. Bronfman Foundation has already undertaken a training program in Israel for Israeli university-age people who will serve as *madrichim* for visiting youth groups from America. The Foundation is considering the possibility of developing a similar training program in America to prepare American university students who will staff summer youth trips to Israel.

2. *Pre- and Post-Trip Meetings:* Groups of young people and adults who are planning a trip to Israel will get more from that trip if they participate in a pre-trip orientation. Similarly, the Jewish educational experience can be further enhanced by a post-trip meeting or series of meetings. One goal of the post-trip meetings is the opportunity to debrief on both things learned about Jewish history and about Israel, and to process emotional reactions. A second goal is to build on the raised Jewish consciousness and identification with Israel by connecting the individual or the group to a relevant Jewish organization in the American Jewish community. Also, there is the possibility that the people returning from Israel would tend to be more receptive at this time to studying Hebrew or other Jewish subjects and to considering *aliyah*.

Summary: Principles and Skills of Informal Jewish Education

A clear conclusion emerges from this review of informal Jewish education: informal Jewish education has the potential to make a significant impact on the present-day Jewish individuals, families, and in turn on Jewish communities. This potential grows out of the consonance between the style, values and techniques of informal Jewish education and the needs and interests of today's American Jews and the American Jewish community. While there does appear to be a sense in the American Jewish community that informal approaches and informal settings need to be afforded higher priority, there is much less clarity about how such a goal is to be achieved. The major void lies in the area of professional personnel. To paraphrase the aphorism: "Everybody talks about informal Jewish education (and Jewish family education), but nobody knows what to do about it."

The prime need now, in terms of personnel, is twofold: to upgrade the capacity of current Jewish professionals to use informal Jewish education approaches, and in addition, to develop a new cadre of specialists in informal Jewish education. This would require a program of in-service training and of redefining the basic curriculum of the institutions which educate Jewish professionals. If such professional retooling is to be effective, it will need a clarification of the methodology and skills of informal Jewish education.

1. Perspective and Grounding

History helps to clarify issues and to better understand how to approach the tasks on the contemporary agenda. As a prelude to defining the knowledge and skills of informal Jewish education it is well to summarize the principles emerging from the review of the early approaches to informal education, the informal Jewish education settings and the changing social context.

a. *The Two Issues:* At the outset of this monograph I noted two persistent dualities which have characterized earlier thinking about informal Jewish education: one is the idea that there are two different educational methodologies, formal and informal, each having different goals; and two is the question of whether informal Jewish education is a generic methodology or one restricted to particular organizational settings. From my interviews with both formal and informal Jewish educators, I received a clear consensus that these dualities no longer are relevant to actual practice. First, Jewish education today involves **both** formal education—systematically organizing and transmitting Jewish subject matter—and informal education—using informal methodologies, focusing on active involvement of the students and shaping a supportive educational environment.

Second, informal Jewish education describes **both** a methodology and Jewish organizational settings. The key point is that the methodology and the setting are not mutually exclusive; that is, formal Jewish education settings, e.g., schools, are increasingly using informal methods, and informal settings, e.g., JCCs, youth groups,

etc., are increasingly using formal methods. And such a synthesis makes for more effective Jewish education.

b. *Consonance Between Method and Context*: In virtually every society across time, the basic function of education has been to transmit the culture of the society, its values, traditions and history, and to provide the next generation with the necessary knowledge and skills both to function in the society and to assure its survival. Since societies change, so too must the agenda and methodologies of its educational system. Note two recent examples of this adaptive process in the educational system of the United States. When the Soviet Union successfully launched Sputnik, the first space satellite, in 1957, it was perceived by the political leaders of the United States as a threat to their assumed technological supremacy. There followed a major effort to upgrade the teaching of sciences and mathematics in American schools. Similarly, the uprooting of many of the accepted American social institutions and values which occurred during the Vietnam years in the late 1960s, resulted in an increased expectation that schools afford more autonomy to students as they worked on redefining their values. Thus was spawned the great interest in introducing programs of values clarification and the expectation by students that they should have more responsibility for the school's curriculum.

I turn now to highlight four significant changes which have been going on in the contemporary American Jewish community and the challenges these changes pose to the Jewish educational system.

First, there has been the weakening of the traditional social institutions which have always played a significant role in the socialization of Jews: the family, the Jewish community, and the synagogue. As a result, there has emerged a particular need by contemporary Jews for finding a **sense of community**, a place where they feel they belong and are nurtured.

Second, as third and fourth generation Jews have become acculturated in modern American society, they have absorbed that society's strong commitment to individualism and questioning of authority. Today's Jews have high expectations to be autonomous, active participants in all phases of their lives, including their schools. They are not inclined to be in awe of or to defer to traditional authorities such as parents and teachers.

Third, while a steady trend of assimilation has characterized the past three generations of American Jews, the situation today, with the predominantly third and fourth generation, is indicative of a resurgent interest in Jewish identity. That change has a bearing on the receptivity these Jews will have to Jewish education and in turn should be reflected in the response of the Jewish educators. In the early generations, as traditional values prevailed, few Jewish children had the psychological freedom to reject the Jewish identity of their parents and family. Jews growing up today are truly autonomous, and if they choose to continue to identify as Jews, it represents a voluntary decision. They will define the specifics of their Jewishness on what makes sense to them. As someone has said, "All Jews today are 'Jews by choice.'"

Finally, another characteristic of a third and fourth generation Jewish community is the loss of access to an organic Jewish culture in which to experience a Jewish life-style with authentic Jewish role models. The Jewish school is as a result expected to make up for this significant cultural deficit by taking on what Isa Aaron refers to as the function of "enculturation," offering their students the opportunity to experience a Jewish culture. Aaron writes:

> Jewish schools must be re-structured and re-configured to become agents of enculturation. They must become places which model for young people what it means to be Jewish. In short, they must become communities.[70]

In sum, the changes in the American Jewish community which I have described have generated a Jewish communal agenda and a Jewish clientele which are particularly receptive to informal Jewish education insights and approaches.

2. Areas of Knowledge and Skills for Informal Jewish Education Professional Practice

A. THE INSTITUTIONAL SETTING – SHAPING ENVIRONMENTS

I have pointed out the importance of Jewish educators grounding their practice in a knowledge of the overall social context. I narrow the focus now to examine the institutional environment in which the Jewish educator works with his/her students. Here the educator must begin to think on several levels and in systematic terms. The basic unit of the Jewish education system is the class or the group where the teacher or leader regularly meets his/her students. The class or group is part of a school or an organization. And the school or organization is part of a network of Jewish organizations in the community. Effective practice obliges the teacher/leader to be attentive to the interdependence of these several elements of the system and to develop the skills to shape an ambiance in each of these elements which enhances the learning of the students.

What are the specific skills needed at each of these levels for effective informal Jewish educational practice?

- In the classroom – The teacher/group leader needs to structure both the physical and psychological environment to foster active participation by the students in the educational experience.[71] Shaping the physical environment involves, for example, having movable chairs and tables for use in small group activities; enough space for groups to move about and to work without disturbing each other; accessible supplies of newsprint and markers for students and the teacher/leader to use in the process of active learning; and the presence of appropriate Jewish symbols for a Jewish decor.

Shaping the psychological environment involves creating an atmosphere which encourages students to feel comfortable in expressing their ideas and feelings. This requires the teacher/leader to learn to share responsibility with the students for the

class and the educational process. A non-judgmental and accepting attitude by the teacher/leader encourages creativity, risk-taking and honest expression of feelings and questions by students.

- In the school/organization—The school/organization should be viewed as a culture, guided by Jewish values and seeking to be fully responsive to both the Jewish educational interests and the personal emotional issues of its members—staff, students, parents, and board of directors. Ideally, a culture will be created which has the flavor of a surrogate extended family, offering a level of personalized caring and security generally found in the family.

- In the community—Reference has been made to the growing interest of the Jewish federation and other coordinating Jewish agencies to become more involved in Jewish education. This interest can bring important new financial and human resources to support the work of the Jewish educational settings and to strengthen their educational services. This will occur to the extent that the Jewish educational professionals can work collaboratively with other organizations and with professionals from different disciplines.

B. USE OF PERSONALIZED SMALL GROUPS

In the traditional classroom the full responsibility for the educational agenda rests with the teacher; with an informal education approach that responsibility is shared with the students. The rationale for viewing the class as a personalized group is the belief that when students experience a connection between their Jewish learning and their social/emotional needs, the students' learning is enhanced. Sensitive, personalized relationships with the teacher and with fellow students are desirable ends in themselves, and also contribute to students having a receptive, positive attitude to learning. The converse—unpleasant or hostile interpersonal relations—are disincentives to learning.

In addition to providing emotional support, the personalized group adds another educational dimension to the experience, one which is basic to informal education—peer learning. Each member of the group is a source of information. Students learn from the ideas and experiences of their colleagues as well as from the teacher. The question is asked by Rabbi Ben Zoma in *Pirke Avot* (4.1), "Who is wise? They who learn from every person."

In addition to working with the full class group, the informal educator will also divide the group into smaller groups to encourage even more active participation and group interaction. The use of small groups is especially effective for educational problem solving. Also different formats make the educational experience a more interesting one.

Finally, in the recently completed evaluative study of nonformal programs for youth aged eight to twenty-two, conducted by Hanan Alexander in Los Angeles, the importance of group process, in terms of the success of their programs, was noted by 74% of the respondents. Group process is described as: "techniques for creating

collective identity, for encouraging active participation and team work, for involving participants in decision-making and for fostering a sense of group ownership."[72]

C. CREATIVE PROGRAM ACTIVITIES

At the core of informal education is the principle that when a student is directly involved in the educational content, learning is enhanced. The reliance on lecturing from the front of the class has the dual limitation of fostering student passivity and boredom. Deborah Lipstadt points to research which documents the limits of frontal teaching with adults.[73] It is reasonable to assume this formal approach would be even less effective with children, especially this generation of children, accustomed to creative methods in their secular schools and to the stimulating style of television. Having a low tolerance for tedium, children will not be easily sustained by educational approaches which are not creative. They will simply "tune out."

The skills of planning a creative education curriculum begins with a clear understanding of the subject matter to be taught. Then, taking into account the age of the students and time constraints, the teacher/leader creates an appropriate lesson plan, which might include one or more participatory activities (games), and is designed to focus the students' attention on the subject matter. By linking the content to the students' interests and experiences, the students have become involved in the lesson. They are then receptive to ideas coming from their fellow learners and the teacher/leader, to solve a problem which is of interest to them. Whetting the students' interest is a requisite for learning. Educators who skip this step and assume student interest as a given make what Paul Tillich has described as the "fatal pedagogic error: To throw answers, like stones, at the heads of those who have not yet asked the questions."[74]

D. THE ROLE OF THE TEACHER/LEADER

The catalyst, vital for bringing together the several elements of the informal education method, is the teacher/leader. Without capable leadership, the methodology doesn't work or is distracted from its educational potential. To highlight the centrality of the group leader's role however may seem paradoxical in a methodology which seems to de-emphasize the role and status of the teacher/leader. To understand that paradox one must understand the dynamics of the non-directive, facilitative, empowering style of leadership of informal education. This leadership style requires a subtle balance of direct and indirect means of influence.[75] On the indirect level, there is the creation of an open, safe environment which encourages active student involvement in the educational lessons; on the direct level, the teacher/leader uses wisely selected interventions to enhance the learning. Such interventions might include an effort to draw out a student, to rephrase the comment of another student, to link several comments, and of critical importance, to summarize, at the end of the lesson, by highlighting the key learnings which have emerged in the group discussion.

The informal definition of the authority of the informal educator does not, as some suggest, lead to less respect by students, but more likely, the opposite. Since the informal educator is more attentive and more accessible to the students, they come to recognize how this leadership role helps them learn and grow, and they respect the teacher/leader. It is because of this responsive definition of authority that the informal educator also is likely to become a role model for his/her students.

Since much of the learning in the informal educational setting occurs within, and because of the carefully structured environment, the teacher/leader must develop those administrative skills needed to assure that the environment functions effectively and efficiently. This involves the thoughtful advance preparations of the educational activities and then having on hand the necessary supplies to implement the program. Managing time is an important skill, particularly being able to sustain active student participation while being able to limit and focus the group discussion so that there is a sense of achievement and closure.

Finally, the informal educator always grapples with the tension of finding the right balance between learning goals for students and sustaining the appropriate social/emotional ambiance of the educational setting. The responsive ambiance helps to motivate the students and they will have fun in the creative, relaxed environment. These are worthy goals in their own right. They also contribute to a positive Jewish identity and identification with the Jewish community. But the informal educator also has a formal educational agenda—helping students/members learn more about the Jewish heritage so that they become informed Jews.[76] The leadership skill lies in being able to achieve a synthesis of both the affective and the cognitive sides of learning. The reality is that the students are themselves searching for such a blend and will be willing collaborators.

3. Caveats

While it is obvious that I believe informal Jewish education is a potent educational vehicle for the needs of today's Jewish community, I must conclude with two caveats, lest unrealistic expectations are raised. First is to reiterate that the informal education method should not become an end in itself. It is a means to achieving Jewish educational goals. But the point must be noted that some Jewish educational goals, particularly in the more advanced curricula of the school setting, will respond better to a formal educational approach, with a teacher who has a specialized competence in some subject. One such example is mastery of texts. Yet even with this type of more formal teaching, the students' learning will be advanced if the teaching occurs within a supportive school culture.

Second, one must realize that mastery of informal Jewish education, in the full sense in which I have presented it, is not easy to achieve. The method is still being defined. Informal Jewish educators now practicing lack any clear sense of professional identity. It is uncertain whether the field can attract, and hold, capable people, especially people who could indeed master the key dualities endemic to this

methodology—the tension between formal and informal education and between the affective and the cognitive. Finally, is the issue of numbers. As we have come to understand the changing requirements of Jewish education today and in projecting for the near future, there appears to be a need for a major infusion of professionals who have informal Jewish education skills. Can the American Jewish community generate an adequate supply of informal Jewish educators who will have the personal qualities and professional competencies to fulfill the expectations?

Recommendations

As I conclude this review of informal Jewish education in North America, I am impressed with a number of concurrently emerging and converging developments. These developments are:

1. A current generation of highly educated, acculturated and quality-conscious young Jewish families who are positively inclined to find a connection to their Jewishness.

2. A current Jewish education system which has acknowledged that the status quo is unsatisfactory and which has indicated a readiness, and some capacity, to bring about change.

3. An organized North American Jewish community which is becoming increasingly self-assured and which recognizes that its future survival is dependent on Jewish education.

4. Growing affirmation from leading Jewish educators and from the research in the field, that informal Jewish educational approaches, e.g., Jewish family education, trips to Israel, a Jewishly maximized JCC, and others, offer much promise for responding to the interests and aspirations of current Jewish families.

I offer the following recommendations which seek to contribute to the convergence of these related developments and to optimize for the American Jewish community the potential inherent in this process.

1. Professional Personnel

At the top of the list of recommendations is the issue of professional personnel, which involves recruitment, professional education and status. Upgrading professional personnel clearly is the priority need identified by all the formal and informal Jewish educators with whom I met and in the articles and research now being done in the field. A few examples:

• Isa Aaron identifies five steps which are needed to "transform" Jewish schools into communities which foster Jewish enculturation. She concludes: "Of these five,

the most important . . . is that a school which wants to be the core of a community must have teachers who are deeply involved in that community."[77]

- Alvin Schiff comments: "The priority issue for **both** formal and informal Jewish educators is to recognize the confluence of the cognitive and affective areas and how to bring this confluence into their practice."[78]

- Zac Kaye, Director of Informal Education for the Jewish education coordinating body in London, comes to this conclusion in his report on informal Jewish education: "Clearly raising the level of leadership at all levels is the key . . . The emphasis (is) on professionalism."[79]

- Finally, I asked virtually all of the people I interviewed the question: "If money were available, how would you recommend it be used to improve informal Jewish education?" Without exception, the first choice was in the area of professional personnel.

A FIVE-STEP PROGRAM

To move forward in the realm of professional personnel five initiatives are required, all of which are interrelated:

a) Recruitment: Capable people who are prepared for long-term careers as informal Jewish educators need to be recruited. The field needs to work at putting together full-time positions and to assure the prospects of a professional career ladder with opportunities for advancement.

b) Status: The current low status of the informal Jewish educator needs to be upgraded. This will happen to the extent informal Jewish education is viewed as a full-time, long-term career, and has its own professional educational requirements. Along with greater professionalization it is to be expected that there will be a commensurate improvement in salaries and other personnel benefits.

c) Professional Education: The thrust of my analysis of Jewish education today is that all Jewish communal professionals need a blend of informal and formal methodologies. The reality remains, however, that the needs of the Jewish community require different educational experiences and settings in order to be fully responsive to its audience. As a result, there are Jewish schools which will need professionals with greater proficiency in formal Jewish education, and informal Jewish settings which will need professionals with greater proficiency in informal Jewish education. At this point in time there is a void in any systematic professional education for informal Jewish education, and this is a priority need. Therefore I recommend that a specialized program for educating informal Jewish educators should be developed, based in a university framework. It should be a graduate-level program making it comparable to the educational expectations for other Jewish communal professionals.

The focus of the curriculum in such a graduate program would include the areas of education and skills outlined by Susan Shevitz for preparing "Community Educators."[80] Such community educators would have the capacity to work collaboratively with other Jewish professionals and to integrate formal and informal methods. The curriculum would include:

- General education skills;
- Judaica and Hebrew;
- Jewish communal life and issues on the contemporary Jewish agenda;
- Group work, community organization, and organizational management;
- Programming for informal Jewish education;
- Working with families and lay people;
- Capacity for "use of self."

d) Curricular Units for Other Institutions of Higher Learning: It is particularly important that content about informal education be introduced in the American seminaries which educate rabbis and Jewish educators. Courses should be developed for the seminaries and for all the graduate programs which prepare Jewish educators and communal professionals. The expectation is that all Jewish professionals should be familiar with Jewish informal education.

e) Continuing Education: Programs of continuing education are needed to upgrade the competence in informal Jewish education and Jewish family education of professionals now working in the field.

2. Maintain the Supplementary School

The supplementary school has recently received much critical evaluation. From the information I have obtained in the course of this study, I am led to two conclusions: first, that the current structure and approach of most supplementary schools need modification; and second, that it is definitely possible to make modifications which will improve the effectiveness of the supplementary school. Implicit in these conclusions is the conviction that the supplementary school should remain a core component in the Jewish educational services of the American Jewish community.

The type of changes needed to make the supplementary school more viable have been described in this analysis. They include greater use of informal education approaches and programs, especially Jewish family education. For such changes to occur in the supplementary schools, an understanding of the integral relationship between the school and the synagogue context in which it is situated is required. Joseph Reimer has done important research on the relationship between the ambiance of the synagogue, largely shaped by its professional leadership, and the nature of the supplementary school and other educational experiences available in the synagogue.[81]

I recommend that institutes be organized with professional and lay leaders of the synagogue community to discuss how to create a synagogue environment which would be responsive to the changing interests of American Jews today. A more responsive synagogue would lead to changes in the way the supplementary school operates and which would result in greater impact on the students and their families.

An interesting project has been launched in the Los Angeles area which seeks to implement the goal of creating a sense of community in the synagogue. The major leadership for this effort is to come from lay members of the synagogue who participate in an extended training program to become "rabbinic or para-Judaic counselors." The expectation is that the training will produce a leader who "is not in the organizational mode. Rather, this leader is committed to personal Jewish enrichment and growth as well as to leading his fellow laymen along the path to such growth." It is with such volunteer leaders that the project hopes to "create a caring Jewish congregational community."[82]

3. New Frontiers for Informal Jewish Education

I became aware, in the course of this study, of four areas of service in the Jewish community which show potential for having an important Jewish educational impact, and which would benefit from greater community recognition and support. These include:

a) Jewish Sponsored Pre-School Programs and Child Care: One of the "windows of opportunity" for Jewish education are services to toddlers and pre-schoolers. Young Jewish families are strongly inclined to use pre-school programs and child care. When these services are offered by the Jewish community, it affords an opportunity for the Jewish community to establish relationships with an important constituency. Also, the opportunity to reach very young children with Jewish content allows for the kind of bonding which has significant psychological Jewish meaning.

b) Havurot and Minyanim: The development of *havurot* and *minyanim* has occurred as a result of the initiatives and energy of able and committed Jews. These innovative structures have played an important role both in innovating new ideas in Jewish worship and study, and in sustaining the active involvement in the Jewish community of a very creative Jewish population. Because of the great concern such groups have for their autonomy, they do not receive the support services which would be important to help these groups sustain themselves. Such help needs to be offered judiciously. Possibilities include helping the National Havurah Committee to assist its member groups, or conducting a workshop for leaders of *minyanim* to help them share together their common issues.

c) The Jewish 12-Steppers: It is clear that there are increasing numbers of American Jews who have been turning to 12-step programs like Alcoholics Anonymous with problems of addictions of one sort or another. It is time for the American Jewish

community to explore ways of responding sensitively to this growing population. Programs are needed which provide a Jewish context, while incorporating the ideology of the 12-step program.

d) Residential Camps: I identified earlier in this monograph the fact that there is a definite gap between the potential and current expectations of the American Jewish community for its residential camps. Since these settings have the capacity to be particularly responsive to many of today's Jewish educational objectives, it is a service which warrants a high priority. Creative initiatives are especially needed in two areas:

1) *Staff*: There is a critical need for a recruitment program for counselors to work in summer camps and a critical need to upgrade the position and benefits of the camp directors.

2) *Facilities*: To make camping facilities more available to the American Jewish community I recommend that efforts be directed to winterizing a number of camp facilities so that reasonably accessible facilities exist in all geographic regions of the country. These camps would be used for retreats, family camping, leadership development, and educational programs for all age groups.

4. Research

I have noted several times in this report the importance of professionalizing the field of informal Jewish education. In that regard, my final recommendation is in the realm of research—both for its own sake, as a requisite professional function, and to clarify three areas which are important for future professional practice in informal Jewish education:

a) Much interest and high expectations have been invested in Jewish family education as a major new focus for Jewish education in North America. This response reflects a pattern which recurs with some regularity in Jewish education: discover some single emphasis which is expected to resolve the problems which face the field and then invest significant resources (and hopes) in this latest panacea. The missing ingredient in this scenario is research. Carolyn Keller has recently written a thoughtful analysis of Jewish family education in which she raises key questions which clearly need to be systematically researched, both to define what is meant by Jewish family education and to identify the professional and programmatic factors which determine effective performance.[83] Research in Jewish family education is a top priority.

b) What approaches or techniques will be effective in outreach to minimally involved Jews?

c) Finally, evaluative studies of "best practice" are recommended, especially in the newly emerging areas of informal Jewish education, such as Jewish family education, work with pre-schoolers and their families; and innovative projects to introduce informal Jewish education in day schools and supplementary schools.

Appendix 1: People Interviewed December 1989—February 1990

1. JWB Executive Staff

Sol Greenfield

Zev Hymowitz

Mitchell Jaffe

Edward Kagen

Jane Perman

Steve Rod

Arthur Rotman

Leonard Rubin

2. National Jewish Youth Group Directors

Raphael Butler, National Conference of Synagogue Youth

Sidney Clearfield, B'nai B'rith Youth Organization

Gidon Elad, American Zionist Youth Foundation

Paul Freedman, United Synagogue Youth

Alan Smith, National Federation of Temple Youth

3. Academics in Jewish Education

Hanan A. Alexander, Dean, University of Judaism, Los Angeles

Barry Chazan, Hebrew University, Centre for Jewish Education in the Diaspora; Consultant, JWB and Charles R. Bronfman Foundation

Steve Copeland, Instructor, Hebrew College, Boston

Joseph Reimer, Assistant Professor in Jewish Education, Hornstein Program, Brandeis University

Susan L. Shevitz, Assistant Professor in Jewish Education, Hornstein Program, Brandeis University

4. Community Informal Jewish Educators

Sandy Andron, Director, Judaica High School and Youth Programs, CAJE, Miami

Harlene Appelman, Director of Family Programs, Fresh Air Society, Detroit

Miles Bonder, Director, Bob Russell Community Retreat Center, Miami

Mitchell Chefitz, Rabbi of Havurah of South Florida; Former Chairman, National Havurah Committee

Meir Frischman, Director, Camp Agudah Israel of America

Charles Herman, Director, Retreat Institute, JCC of Cleveland

Zac Kaye, Director of Informal Education, United Synagogue Board of Religious Education, London, England

George Marcus, Director, Eli & Bessie Cohen Camps, Ashland, MA

Asher Melzer, Director of Camping Services, UJA-Federation of New York

Charles Rotman, Director, Camp Young Judea, New Hampshire

5. Formal Jewish Educators

Shelley Dorph, National Ramah Director

Joshua Elkin, Headmaster, Solomon Schechter Day School, Newton, MA

Gene Greenzweig, Executive Director, Central Agency for Jewish Education, Miami

Alvin Schiff, Executive Vice President, Board of Jewish Education in New York

Jon Woocher, Executive Director, JESNA, New York City

6. Jewish Communal Professionals

Paul Jeser, Executive Director, CLAL, New York City

Larry Ziffer, Planning Director, Director Jewish Federation of Detroit

Appendix 2: Results of Questionnaire on Jewish Family Education – May 1989

N = 70 Educators attending conference on Jewish Family Education in New York City convened by the Board of Jewish Education of New York.

All questions refer to Jewish supplementary schools

1. PRIORITY RANKING OF FOUR JEWISH FAMILY EDUCATION OBJECTIVES

	N = 70	N = 67	N = 65	N = 67
JFE Objectives *Choices*	1st	2nd	3rd	4th
Help parents & children improve communication with each other	27%	42%	11%	22%
Help parents & children increase their Jewish learning & commitment	60%	19%	12%	7%
Reach out to the several new types of families: single parents, reconstituted, mixed marriages	5%	19%	33%	40%
Interpret an approach to Jewish family which extends beyond parents & children to include siblings, grandparents & other relatives	8%	19%	43%	30%

2. STAFFING PATTERN PREFERRED FOR JFE PROGRAM IN SUPPLEMENTARY SCHOOL

Staffing Pattern	N = 66
Hire JFE specialist	37%
Retrain current school director/principal	39%
Make changes in all school's Jewish education personnel	23%

3. SCHOOL ELEMENT MOST NEEDED TO ASSURE SUCCESSFUL JFE PROGRAM IN YOUR SCHOOL (1ST & 2ND CHOICES)

	N=75	N=68
Element	1st	2nd
Skilled & Committed Teachers	23%	29%
Skilled & Committed School Director/Principal	28%	28%
Access to Appropriate Facilities	1%	0%
Cooperation From Synagogue Rabbi	7%	9%
Creative Program Ideas & Materials	35%	20%
Adequate Budget	7%	13%

4. PRIORITY CHOICES FOR JEWISH EDUCATIONAL POLICIES FOR THE AMERICAN JEWISH COMMUNITY (THREE CHOICES)

	N=67	N=56	N=56
Policy Choices	1st	2nd	3rd
Introduce JFE as way of maintaining & enhancing option of viable supplementary school	79%	21%	2%
Try to get as many children into day schools	21%	71%	5%
Try to get as many families to go on *aliyah*	0%	9%	93%

5. ELEMENT WHICH WOULD BE MOST RESISTANT TO INTRODUCING JFE IN SUPPLEMENTARY SCHOOLS (TWO CHOICES)

	N=65	N=62
Element	1st	2nd
Students	5%	17%
Families	46%	29%
Teachers	18%	21%
Principal	3%	5%
Rabbi	8%	10%
Board of Directors	20%	19%

6. PERSONAL BACKGROUND OF RESPONDENTS

a. 28% Male 72% Female

b. 42 Average Age 21-60 Range of Ages

c. Current Professional Position

12% Teacher

64% Principal/School Director

23% Staff Jewish Education Coordinating Organization

d. Jewish Denominational Affiliation

11% Orthodox

49% Conservative

32% Reform

4% Reconstructionist

3% Other

Notes

1) John Dewey, *Democracy and Education,* New York: Macmillan, 1964, 1916.

2) John Dewey, *Experience and Education,* New York: Collier Books, 1938.

3) Ibid., p. 17

4) Ibid., p. 17

5) Ibid., p. 18

6) Ibid., p. 19

7) Ibid., pp. 20-23

8) The issue of whether the field of Jewish education should be professionalized, and, if so, how it might be approached, is addressed in two recent publications:
To Build a Profession, Joseph Reimer, ed., Waltham, MA: Brandeis University, 1987, and
Isa Aaron, "Issues of Professionalism in Jewish Teaching." Position Paper prepared for the Commission on Jewish Education in North America, December, 1989.

9) Grace L. Coyle, *Group Experiences and Democratic Values,* New York: The Women's Press, 1947, pp. 63-64.

10) Melvin Herman, "Occupational Mobility in Social Work," in *The Jewish Community Center Worker,* New York: National Jewish Welfare Board, 1959.

11) Sanford Solender, *The Unique Function of the Jewish Community Center,* New York: National Jewish Welfare Board, 1955, p. 5.

12) Kurt Lewin, "Experiments in Social Space," *Harvard Educational Review*, 1939, 9; pp. 21-32.

13) Alfred J. Marrow, *The Practical Theorist: The Life and Work of Kurt Lewin*, New York: Teachers College Press Edition, 1977, p. 35.

14) Ibid., p. 34

15) Ronald Lippett and Ralph White, *Autocracy and Democracy: An Experimental Inquiry*, New York: Harper & Row, 1960.

16) Alfred J. Marrow, *op. cit.*, pp. 130-131.

17) Ibid., pp. 212-213.

18) Kurt Lewin, Resolving Social Conflicts, New York: Harpers, 1948.

19) Simon N. Herman, *Jewish Identity: A Social Psychological Perspective,* New Brunswick: Transaction Publishers, 1989 pp. 18-24;
Simon N. Herman, *Israelis and Jews: The Continuity of an Identity,* New York: 1970.

20) Malcolm S. Knowles, "A Comparison of Assumptions and Processes of Teacher-Directed (Pedagogical) Learning and Self-Directed (Andragogical) Learning"; mimeoed, Department of Adult and Community College Education, North Carolina State University, January, 1976.

21) Larry N. Davis, *Planning, Conducting and Evaluating Workshops,* Austin, Texas: Learning Concepts, 1976, pp. 20-26.

22) Gerald Weinstein and Mario D. Fantini, *Toward Humanistic Education: A Curriculum of Affect,* New York: Praeger Publishers, 1970.

23) Dov Peretz Elkins, "Why I Love Values Clarification," *Alternatives,* Fall, 1977.

24) Daniel Yankelovich, *New Rules: Searching for Self-Fulfillment in a World Turned Upside Down,* New York: Random House, 1981.

25) Bernard Reisman, "The Future of the American Jewish Community: Challenges for Its Leadership", in *Towards the Twenty-First Century: Judaism and the Jewish People in Israel and America,* Ronald Kronish, ed., Hoboken, New Jersey: KTAV Publishing House, 1988, pp. 239-242.

26) These figures are extrapolated from demographic studies in several North American cities as reported in: Sylvia Barack Fishman, "Learning About Learning: Insights on Contemporary Jewish Education," Waltham: Cohen Center of Modern Jewish Studies, Jewish Population Studies, Brandeis University, December 1987.

27) Steven M. Cohen and Charles S. Liebman, *The Quality of American Jewish Life – Two Views,* New York: American Jewish Committee, 1987.

28) See comments by Charles Zibbell and Morton L. Mandel in *To Build a Profession,* ed. Joseph Reimer, Waltham, MA: Brandeis University, 1987, pp. 47-49.

29) Bernard Reisman, "Community and Ideology – The Basis for Jewish Leadership Today," New York: Council of Jewish Federations, 1987.

30) "Design Document to Establish the Commission on Jewish Education in North America," Cleveland, Ohio, May, 1988.

31) "Report: Commission on Maximizing Jewish Educational Effectiveness of Jewish Community Centers," New York: JWB, Sept. 1984.

32) Bernard Reisman, *Social Change and Response – Assessing Efforts to Maximize Jewish Educational Effectiveness in Jewish Community Centers in North America,* New York: JWB, 1988.

33) See reports of Nativ Policy and Planning Consultants, Jerusalem: "Report: The Israel Experience Project; Senior Personnel for Jewish Education," June 1988; and "Resource Booklet No. 2," February 1987.

34) Barry Chazan, "The State of Jewish Education," New York: JESNA, Spring 1988, p. 1

35) Ibid., p. 5

36) Ibid., p. 5

37) Alvin I. Schiff, *Jewish Supplementary Schooling: An Educational System in Need of Change,* New York: Board of Jewish Education, 1988, p. 119.

38) Allie Dubb and Sergio Della Pergola, "Research Report Number 4," Jerusalem: Hebrew University, Institute of Contemporary Jewry, 1986.

39) A. Schiff, *op. cit.,* p. 130.

40) *Report of the Joint Federation/Congregational Plenum Commission on Jewish Continuity,* Cleveland: The Jewish Community Federation of Cleveland, December 1988, Appendix I, Mission Statement.

41) Ibid., pp. 6-8.

42) Barry Shrage, "From Experimentation to Institutional Change: An Action Plan for Jewish Continuity," Boston: Combined Jewish Philanthropies, September 1989.

43) Jonathan S. Woocher, "Mountain High, Valley Low: The State of Jewish Education Today," in *Facing the Future: Essays on Contemporary Jewish Life,* Steven Bayme, ed., New York: KTAV Publishing, 1989, pp. 117-118.

44) Isa Aaron, "Issues of Professionalism in Jewish Teaching." Position Paper prepared for the Commission on Jewish Education in North America, December 1989.

45) The member schools are: Baltimore Hebrew University; Brandeis University Hornstein Program; Cleveland College of Jewish Studies; Gratz College; Hebrew College of Boston; Hebrew Union College–J.I.R., Los Angeles; Hebrew Union College–J.I.R., New York; Jewish Theological Seminary of America; McGill University; Spertus College; University of Judaism; Yeshiva University.

46) Aryeh Davidson, "The Preparation of Jewish Educators in North America: A Status Report," Report Submitted to the Commission on Jewish Education in North America, June, 1990, p. 27.

47) Bernard Reisman, *op. cit.,* JWB, 1988

48) A prior publication is: Barry Chazan and Yehiel Poupko, *Guide to Jewish Knowledge For the Center Professional,* New York: JWB, May 1989.

49) See David Schoem, *Ethnic Survival in America: An Ethnography of a Jewish Afternoon School,* Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1989 and Samuel Heilman, *Inside the Jewish School: A Study of the Cultural Setting for Jewish Education,* New York: American Jewish Committee, 1983.

50) See Harlene Appelman, "Family Education," in "Field Notes." Paper prepared for The Commission on Jewish Education in North America, 1989, pp. 22-29.

51) Bernard Reisman, *Serving Jewish Families in Camp Settings,* Wellesley, MA: Institute for Jewish Life, 1973.

52) Bernard Reisman, *The Jewish Experiential Book: Quest for Jewish Identity,* New York: KTAV, 1978.

53) Perry London and Naava Frank, "Jewish Identity and Jewish Schooling," *Journal of Jewish Communal Service,* Fall 1987.

54) Ibid., p. 12

55) Jack Wertheimer, "Recent Trends in American Judaism," in *American Jewish Year Book,* 1989, New York: American Jewish Committee, 1989, p. 130.

56) Ibid., p. 129.

57) Gene W. Levine, "An Adventure in Curing Alienation," Encino, CA: Brandeis Camp Institute 1971.

58) Bernard Reisman, *op. cit.,* p. 58.

59) Ibid., p. 102.

60) Private communication with Dr. Sylvia Barack Fishman, Cohen Center for Modern Jewish Studies, Brandeis University, February 14, 1990.

61) See Bernard Reisman, *The Chavurah: A Contemporary Jewish Experience,* New York: Union of American Hebrew Congregations, 1977, and Gerald B. Bubis and Harry Wasserman, *Synagogue Havurot: A Comparative Study,* Washington, D.C.: University Press of America, 1983.

62) The November 24 1989 issue of *Sh'ma* evaluates twenty years of the modern *havurah* movement.

63) Mitchell Chefitz, "Havurah Promise for Twenty More Years," *Sh'ma,* November 24, 1989.

64) Bernard Reisman, "A Proposal for Professional Leadership for the *Havurah,*" *Central Conference of American Rabbis Journal,* Winter, 1977.

65) Interview with Rabbi Mitchell Chefitz of the Havurah of South Florida, February 27, 1990.

66) Annette Hochstein, "'The Israel Experience'—Educational Programs in Israel, Summary Report to the Jewish Education Committee and the Jewish Agency for Israel," Jerusalem, June 1986.

67) Bernard Reisman, *Social Change and Response,* 1988, *op. cit.,* p. 27.

68) Ibid., p. 48.

69) Steven M. Cohen, *The 1989 Survey of American Jewish Attitudes Toward Israel and Israelis,* New York: American Jewish Committee, 1989.

70) Isa Aaron, *op. cit.,* p. 25.

71) Bernard Reisman, *The Jewish Experiential Book, op. cit.,* pp. 24-35.

72) Hanan A. Alexander, "Good Jewish Youth Programs: Education and the Formation of Jewish Identity," Los Angeles: The University of Judaism, January 1990, p. 8.

73) Deborah E. Lipstadt, "Adult Jewish Learning: Policy Implications," in *Facing the Future,* Steven Bayme, ed., New Jersey: KTAV Publishing, 1989, pp. 136-138.

74) Paul Tillich, quoted in George Isaac Brown, *Human Teaching for Human Learning,* New York: Viking Press, 1971, pp. 15-16.

75) Robert D. Vinter, "The Essential Components of Group Work Practice," in *Individual Change Through Small Groups,* ed. P. Glasser, R. Sarri, and R. Vinter, New York: Free Press, 1974, pp. 18-32.

76) Hanan Alexander, *op. cit.,* pp. 21-25, discusses the dual requirements for informal education groups to acquire Jewish identity and Jewish knowledge.

77) Isa Aaron, *op. cit.,* p. 25.

78) Personal interview on March 1 1990 with Dr. Alvin Schiff, Executive Vice President of the Board of Jewish Education, New York City.

79) Zac Kaye, "Understanding the Informal." A Report to the Board of Education of the United Synagogue Board of Religious Education, London, England, May 1989, p. 16.

80) Susan L. Shevitz, "Community Educators: Implications for Recruitment and Training," in *To Build a Profession, op. cit.,* pp. 102-104.

81) See Joseph Reimer, "The Synagogue as a Context for Jewish Education." Position paper prepared for the Commission on Jewish Education in North America, May 1990.

82) *Project Ezra: A Handbook for Training Congregants as Rabbinic Aides,* Sheldon Dorph, ed., Los Angeles, United Synagogue of America, P.S.W. Region, 1989, p. 20.

83) Carolyn F. Keller, "From Creativity to Policy: Charting a Course for Jewish Family Education," A Paper Prepared for the Jerusalem Fellows, June 10, 1990.