



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

**MS-831: Jack, Joseph and Morton Mandel Foundation Records, 1980–2008.**

Series C: Council for Initiatives in Jewish Education (CIJE). 1988–2003.

Subseries 1: Meetings, 1990–1998.

---

Box  
23

Folder  
8

Staff Consultation Days, November 1994.

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

---

**COUNCIL FOR INITIATIVES IN JEWISH EDUCATION**

**MINUTES:** CIJE STAFF CONSULTATION DAYS  
**DATE OF MEETING:** NOVEMBER 7-9, 1994  
**DATE MINUTES ISSUED:** NOVEMBER 29, 1994  
**PARTICIPANTS:** Gail Dorph, Seymour Fox, Annette Hochstein,  
Alan Hoffmann, Barry Holtz, Ginny Levi,  
Robin Mencher (sec'y), Daniel Pekarsky, Nessa Rapoport  
**COPY TO:** Morton L. Mandel

---

*DAY ONE:***I. CIJE Gameplan - 1995 and Beyond**

Alan began the meeting by setting the tone as to the purpose of the week. He based his introduction upon the CIJE workplans for 1995 developed thus far. Emphasizing the emerging structure of CIJE, Alan outlined the four clear domains our of work, structured in committees chaired by members of our board. In the first half of 1995 the board of CIJE should grow in size to include approximately sixteen new members, four to each committee. The Steering Committee is set to meet five to six times in the coming year. Alan noted that as the role of the board crystallize, so does the clarity of CIJE's role within the federated world.

In beginning a discussion about the short term and long range agendas, Alan posed the question for the consultation days of where does CIJE want to be in one year and in three to five years. Are the goals of the organization an aggregate of the workplans or is there a further guiding vision for CIJE? Which parts of the present workplans are indispensable to the larger goals of CIJE?

If we examine the current status of CIJE, Alan suggested, we can isolate four basic axes within which CIJE must respond to some fundamental areas of tension regarding its mission. These are:

- A. Planning vs. Implementation
- B. Building the Profession and Community Mobilization:  
How much of our energy in one relative to the other?
- C. Community vs. Continental
- D. The Federated system as the major context for CIJE's operations

Alan expanded on these issues as framing questions for the consultation days:



A. The planning and implementation axis begs CIJE to make choices about how we wish to impact Jewish education. In the instance of providing professional development, for example, what type of a role or roles does CIJE provide now and what should we be providing in the future? Alan offered the CIJE - Harvard Principals' Center Seminar as an example of CIJE staff members actively planning and then implementing a CIJE design for in-service training of leaders. The impact of the seminar came directly from the efforts of CIJE staff on site. As our goals require both planning and implementation, how much of the ongoing work of CIJE should be devoted to such activities as the seminar at Harvard?

B. CIJE speaks of both building the profession and community mobilization frequently, but in the past, much of our emphasis and staff time has been placed on the former. Is there any well-thought out knowledge base for community mobilization? What would it take for us to move the community mobilization agenda forward? Alan noted the continuing expansion and development of the CIJE board and committees as one milestone for community mobilization.

C. Superimposed on A and B above lies the tension between CIJE acting on a communal vs. a continental level. The building blocks of Jewish education, as outlined in *A Time To Act*, indicated that the implementation of building the profession and community mobilization were to take place in the lead communities. The question today begins with an evaluation of whether the lead communities are indeed ready for the change stemming from local implementation of the building blocks.

Our work in communities (e.g. the Educators Survey and Policy Brief, as well as the seminar at Harvard) form the basis for much of the agenda of the work of CIJE. Our work in communities have helped us to develop principles such as the "holy trinity" concept. What commitments does CIJE still have to these communities? They are still waiting for a well-crafted and articulated personnel action plan as well as a goals seminar specifically tailored for their communities.

On the continental level, CIJE is looking for partners in the personnel action plan and in particular for in-service education. We have already begun to connect with JTS and Brandeis on these issues. How important is this coalition work to fulfilling the goals of CIJE?

D. How do we evaluate the success of CIJE? What is the context of our work in communities within the broader context of Jewish life in North America? Alan suggested that as we see the increasing numbers of North American Jewish communities that are involved in creating commissions to improve their educational programs, this is an achievement of the CIJE approach - even if it is not recognized by the communities. As more and more communities are planning for change, our role should be to install within other institutions (such as JESNA) the capacity to provide guidance and



leadership to these planning initiatives.

As the face of organized Jewish life in North America appears to be changing, which institutions are our constituency? With which institutions should we build coalitions? Taking into account the structural changes of UJA and Jewish Federations life is a close connection with the federation structure still the most promising address for renewal and reform?

In light of the issues and tensions outlined above, what should the gameplan of CIJE be for 1995? In the coming year, CIJE will present a personnel action plan for in-service education to the Jewish communities of North America. In addition we should take the first steps to develop a plan which will lay out a matrix detailing core components of the profession in Jewish education.

The CIJE goals and best practices projects should be instrumental to the implementation of our action in personnel. Best practices can be used as part of the process to build the curriculum for educating the educators. Concurrently, the Goals Project stands at the heart of CIJE's work with educational leaders. It has to be part of the plan for both lay leaders and Jewish professionals.

Is this an effective way to frame the work of CIJE? Does it speak to the question of what we want CIJE to achieve?

#### Discussion:

In thinking about the key CIJE issues noted above, the participants began by examining the actions CIJE could take in these areas and the resulting impacts of those actions. Brainstorming one aspect of the workplans could serve as an example of how CIJE could implement all aspects of the workplans.

The exercise, proposed by Annette, centered on the topic of training personnel. It was proposed that an approach to developing capacity for in-service training should be developed. A half day seminar for communities in North America on preparing in-service programs for their personnel would need to be located. For such a project, the role of CIJE might be to run these training seminars, or maybe to set up regional centers, facilitating such work by others. This project could be approached at either or both local and continental levels. A prominent challenge would be to articulate the size and scope of the project in a way that would maintain the quality. The developing of the people to facilitate this project was seen as the most important and difficult part of the project. It therefore should call for the most immediate attention.

Several questions arose out of this brainstorming session. Does the work to create a



quality product, in this instance, fit into the longterm goals and and outcomes for CIJE? The most strategic of goals must be chosen with regard to the work of CIJE. Can we achieve our goals without expanding our leadership base? By creating more competition? Into what geographical space should we put the majority of our efforts? Who are our partners in this project? Are communities ready to back this work? Are we using CIJE's own resources to our best advantage? Taking into account our limited resources, what type of choices will we have to make? While this plan for personnel may be attractive, are we heading down the right course or falling into a trap? Where will this eventually take us?

As Dan Pekarsky was in New York only through Tuesday morning, the discussion on Personnel was deferred until after the full discussion on the Goals Project.

## II. The Goals Project

(This Summary was written by Dan Pekarsky)

The purpose of this meeting was to arrive at a 1995 Work Plan for the Goals Project that is anchored in an adequate conception of the project. The meeting began with a status-report that focused on three matters: a) outgrowths of the Jerusalem Seminar, with special attention to developments in the represented communities; b) the October plan for Goals, developed by the core CIJE staff in New York in October, 1994; and c) recent conversations between Pekarsky, Fox, and Marom which suggested considerations to be considered in our review of the October Plan and the overall conception of the Goals Project. Because the outgrowths of the Jerusalem Seminar and the October plan are described in some detail in the document summarizing the October Staff Meeting in New York (attached), this summary proceeds immediately to item c), which concerned questions posed by Seymour Fox in Pekarsky-Fox conversations, questions which offer useful lenses to use in the planning-process.

### A. SEYMOUR FOX'S QUESTIONS

1. Success. What would Goals Project success look like after, say, 3 years? As noted in our discussion, this could fruitfully be interpreted in two different ways:

a) If the Goals Project is understood as no more and no less than the path identified in our October meetings, what would optimal success look like? What would we have accomplished?

b) Does a) exhaust our expectations of the Goals Project -- or is there more that we hope for that might not be captured in a)? If so, what is this

"more"?

Jointly, a) and b) ask us to try to identify the larger conceptions that should inform the Goals Project

2. What is the relationship between the Goals Project (as articulated in the October meetings) and the work of a) the Monitoring, Evaluation and Feedback Project and b) the Educated Jew Project? More narrowly, how might these projects serve as resources to the Goals Project?

3. The five levels and our work. The Educated Jew Project has identified five intimately inter-related levels pertinent to the work of that project and to the Goals Project. These levels are:

PHILOSOPHY

PHILOSOPHY OF EDUCATION

TRANSLATION INTO CURRICULUM

IMPLEMENTATION

EVALUATION

At which of these levels does the October Plan operate? Optimally, at what levels should we be operating?

## B. EXAMINING THE GOALS PROJECT AGENDA THROUGH THESE LENSES:

This examination began with Pekarsky offering two different accounts of what Goals Project "success" might look like. A) The first, prompted by a comment by Annette Hochstein in the first part of the day, set forth some very general long-term goals (that were not, at least by design, tied to the October plan.) B) The second identified what success might look like if we fully exploited the potentialities of the October-plan.

A) General long-term goals - three were identified:

1. Increasing numbers of institutions organized around a goals-agenda that includes serious wrestling with issues of content.
2. Heavy emphasis in communal planning processes on the place of goals in Jewish education.
3. A National Center for the Study and Development of Goals for Jewish Education. Such a Center would:



- a) educate key professional and lay constituencies concerning matters pertaining to the goals-agenda;
- b) develop and make available expertise that will inform the efforts of communities and institutions that seek to become more adequately organized around a goals-agenda.
- c) conduct original research concerning the goals of Jewish education, as well as concerning implementation, and evaluation. Such work might, for example, include a Jewish version of the two HORACE books or Carnegie's "The Future As History" chapter;
- d) develop strategies to disseminate its research findings in ways likely to make an impact;

B) What would success look like for the October Plan?

1. Case-studies of institutional efforts to become better organized around a goals-agenda.
2. Out of the first-order work in institutions and its analysis in the case-studies, we would acquired an articulated body of lore that includes:
  - a. strategies and models that can guide efforts at institutional improvement;
  - b. identification of skills, understandings, and aptitudes that are needed by those guiding the process of change;
  - c. identification of institutional "readiness-conditions" if meaningful change is to take place;
  - d. documentation of some of the effects (expected and unexpected) of taking on a goals-agenda;
  - e. identification of important issues, tensions, etc. that need to be addressed, either by institutions embarking on a change-process or national organizations like CIJE seeking to catalyze this kind of change.

3. The development of evaluation tools (that would be usable in the future by other institutions undergoing a change process). These tools would include:

- a. an instrument for taking an initial snapshot of an institution, a look at reality that focuses on avowed goals, on their implementation, and on educational outcomes;
- b. an instrument for assessing the results of having engaged in a serious effort to become more goals-sensitive.

4. The development of a cadre of resource-people, identified and cultivated by CIJE who have been, and will continue to be involved in helping institutions become better organized around a Goals agenda.

5. From among the institutions identified in #1, a community of partnered institutions each engaged in a goals-agenda and offering experiences and ideas to one another on a regular basis.

6. A broad awareness among critical constituencies at a variety of levels concerning the importance of the goals agenda, its feasibility, work being done in this area. This dissemination to be accomplished via publications, film, conferences for different constituencies, etc.

### C. MEF AND THE EDUCATED JEW PROJECT IN THE FULL-BLOWN OCTOBER-PLAN

Monitoring, Evaluation and Feedback. MEF could contribute to the development of the October Plan in a number of ways:

- 1. MEF could be invited to develop the instruments to be used to assess current reality at the outset of a goals-process and the outcomes of having engaged in this process;
- 2. MEF could be invited to do the assessments.

The Educated Jew Project. Were CIJE to proceed with the October Plan, the Educated Jew Project could make a number of important contributions including the following:

- 1. Not immersed in having to address - and possibly be compromised by - day-to-day political realities, the Educated Jew staff could help CIJE keep



focused on some of the basic questions and concerns that are at the heart of the Goals Project.

2. The Educated Jew staff could prove invaluable in our efforts to cultivate resource-people for our project or to educate other constituencies.
3. The Educated Jew staff may be able to offer valuable expertise to the 3 to 5 prototype-institutions identified in the October Plan.
4. The Educated Jew Project's papers could prove valuable resources to the 3 to 5 prototype institutions. Conceivably, if there is a clear need, the Educated Jew Project could be invited to commission additional papers that address issues that are particularly sensitive in the American Jewish community -- for example, those dealing with the role of women in Jewish life.

#### D. DISCUSSION

Our discussion took place against the general background defined by the matters discussed above. Below are summarized some of the major themes and decisions that emerged in our discussion, and then a draft of a work plan.

##### 1. Supplementing our resources.

The comment was made that CIJE, and the Goals Project in particular, should identify and make maximal use of available resources that exist outside the immediate CIJE orbit. We should, it was suggested, make a careful inventory of such resources/opportunities. Such an inventory would include such individuals and institutions as Israel Scheffler, Mike Smith, and the Wexner Heritage Foundation. There seemed to be significant interest in exploring the last of the possibilities.

##### 2. The Center-idea.

Excitement and anxiety. It became clear in our conversation that many of the things identified as central to our October-plan could ultimately be folded into the work of a Center within the larger conception defined by the three long-term goals. There also seemed to be considerable excitement about such a Center as a home for various Goals-related efforts. But at the same time as the fairly comprehensive agenda identified in preceding discussion seemed exciting, it provoked some serious concern. The work defined by this agenda is, to say the least, substantial -- it is much more than CIJE can reasonably take on, given its current shape and priorities. Two nightmares threaten: 1)



that we don't do all that the agenda calls for and end up doing a mediocre, or radically circumscribed, or otherwise disappointing job; 2) that we allow the Goals Project to "take over" the energies of CIJE, thus distorting the overall character and direction of the enterprise.

The spinning-off idea. Neither of these options being acceptable, and in the tradition of the Mandel Institute, it was suggested that the Goals Project agenda might best be carried through if it was ultimately "released" from CIJE and given a quasi-autonomous status (with strong ties of various kinds to CIJE). This Center would draw on some of the expertise and resources currently invested in CIJE, but it would also develop ties with, and seek out resources from, other institutions and individuals.

Of particular interest was the suggestion that such a Center could ultimately be established, in cooperation with CIJE and the Mandel Institute, at Harvard. So interesting was this possibility that Seymour suggested testing out with Israel Scheffler at the end of the week.

Project or Center. There was in this connection some discussion of whether it might be wiser, in our conversations with Harvard, initially to speak in terms of a Project that might eventually rise to a Center. This project would in its initial stages focus on 1) furthering and studying our work with a select number of prototype institutions; 2) identifying and educating personnel that would work with such institutions; 3) the development of our own learning-curriculum.

A limited initial agenda. As the preceding paragraph suggests, whether called initially a Center or a Project, it is not necessary - nor desirable - for such a new entity to take on "a full plate" from the very beginning. On the contrary, if created, it might initially focus on only a few of the efforts that might eventually define its character. But it would be important to view these initial efforts, however narrow, in relation the larger plan of action.

Is an independent Center in our interests? It should be noted that while the idea of working towards a quasi-autonomous Center seemed of interest, at various points reservations were expressed. We should, it was implied, proceed with caution, with attention to the possibility that spinning-off the Center might not be in the best interests of CIJE.

Parallel centers. It was suggested that the model under discussion -- spinning off a CIJE effort and turning it into a quasi-independent satellite-center with strong ties to CIJE -- might in the long run also be the way to approach efforts like Monitoring and Evaluation and Educational Leadership. The thrust of this approach is to keep CIJE as a planning and catalyzing institution that does not get bogged down in implementation of



the initiatives it helps to bring into being.

3. Who could serve as adequate "coaches"/resource persons to institutions embarked on a change-process?

A possibility presented at the seminar is that CIJE work with "coaches" who are themselves appointed by and representatives of the institutions that are embarked on the change-process. While this would enormously simplify our work in that we would not have to seek out a cadre of coaches, the suggestion was countered with the observation that it is unlikely that most such institutionally-appointed coaches would be in a position to help their institutions with the content-side of the goals agenda. In response, it was suggested that maybe we need to be thinking in terms of two kinds of coaches -- an institutional representative skilled in process-issues, and a more content-oriented person that CIJE cultivated (folks like Bieler and Gribbetz, Marom).

4. Working with Institutions: at what level does one begin?

It was reiterated that forwarding the Goals-agenda does not require beginning at the level of "philosophy of education." While efforts at the latter level are important for Jewish education, in any given institution the process might well begin at other levels. Where one begins would need to be decided on a case-by-case basis.

5. Inventory of outstanding commitments.

While we did not feel that our enterprise could be shaped by pre-existing commitments, these commitments need to be honored; and the challenge is to honor them in a way that will forward our own agenda. These outstanding commitments include the following:

- a. 4 seminars in Milwaukee, with the possibility of more intensive work with "graduates" of the seminar that meet our standards for participation at this next stage.
- b. The Agnon School in Cleveland.
- c. Cleveland's Goals Seminar.
- d. Helping to launch Baltimore's Goals Seminars in the spring (with possible additional expectations flowing out of last summer's promises).

e. A JCC Camp.

f. Some kind of support to Toren's efforts in Cleveland to develop a goals-agenda with two congregational programs.

6. Other interesting possibilities.

a. The Atlanta JCC Camp.

b. The Baltimore congregational program.

c. The new Atlanta Day School.

E. [PEKARSKY'S TAKE ON] THE SENSE OF THE GROUP: BASIC DECISIONS

1. Developing capacity is a very high priority and must be at the center of our efforts.

a. Developing capacity has at least 3 dimensions: the identification and cultivation of a cadre of resource-people who will work with us; learning more about the nature of the enterprise through work with what we have called prototype institutions; a curriculum of study for CIJE staff.

b. In our first stage, the identification and cultivation of personnel and our own learning-curriculum should have a very high priority. We should not be quick to take on more than one or two prototype institutions at the very beginning.

2. CIJE has promises to keep -- particularly to communities that participated in the Goals Seminar this summer in Jerusalem. These promises must be kept in ways that will forward our broader agenda.

a. To keep our promises means to launch and/or to participate in, and/or to coordinate local seminars in Milwaukee, Cleveland, and Baltimore; to work in some fashion with Agnon; and to engage in an intensive process with institutions that emerge from local seminars as promising candidates for intensive work. Institutions that do so emerge would probably qualify as "prototype-institutions."

b. The impact of keeping these promises, over and beyond our maintaining our trustworthiness, will include increased awareness among participating institutions of the importance of serious attention to goals; a



measure of change among some participating institutions; the identification of one or more institutions ready for serious change-efforts; a lot of serious learning on our own part.

3. CIJE should design and establish a Center for Philosophy of Jewish Education.

a. The Center will conduct and disseminate the results of research pertaining to the goals agenda. It will cultivate and make available the kinds of expertise that will be useful to institutions and communities undertaking a goals-agenda. It will educate varied lay and professional constituencies concerning the importance and character of a serious goals-agenda. Through such varied activities, it will place the conversation on goals at the center of efforts to improve Jewish education.

b. CIJE's role is to strategize, design, enable, and create this Center, which will eventually exist in a loosely coupled relationship to CIJE.

F. GOALS PROJECT WORKPLAN FOR 1995

1. Building capacity

a. Conceptualizing and planning our own learning-curriculum (Nov.-Dec., 1994)

b. Resource persons

i. Identification of 5 to 20 promising individuals (Dec., '94)

ii. Recruitment of these individuals (Jan. '95)

iii. Development of a summer-seminar for these individuals (Feb. and March, '95)

iv. Summer Seminar for CIJE staff and for resource persons (July '95)

v. Pair resource-persons with prototype institutions (July, '95)

vi. Winter-seminar with resource-persons (Dec.95)

c.. Learning through prototype institutions

- i. Begin with one or more institutions to which we may have preexisting commitments.  
(January-June, '95)
- ii. If and only if we have sufficient personnel after meeting requirements of #1,  
identify other institutions. (Summer '95)
- iii. Identify institutional representatives who will work with CIJE (Summer, '95) and hold seminar with them (Fall, '95)

## 2. Honoring outstanding commitments.

- a. Four Milwaukee Seminars (January - May, 1995)
- b. Participation as planners and possibly as resources in the Cleveland seminar (Dec.'94 - June '95)
- c. Help launch the Baltimore seminars (spring, '95)
- d. Meet with Agnon to conceptualize and to help them begin to implement a goals-agenda. (Jan. - May 1995)
- e. Consult to Toren in his efforts to enter into Goals-focused relationships with local educating institutions. (as needed)
- f. Identifying "prototype-institutions" from among those participating in local seminars and/or other institutions -- i.e., institutions we are prepared to work with intensively (June, 1995). Begin work with these institutions in September 1995.

## 3. Establishment of a Project for the Philosophy of Jewish Education.

- a. Initial conversations between Harvard, Mandel Institute, and CIJE.  
(Dec. 1994)
- b. Flesh out conception of the Center, the stages through which it would develop, and its initial assignments. (January, 1995)
- c. Develop funding support for the Center.



### BY THE END OF '95:

1. We will have identified from 5 to 15 resource-people to work with educating institutions and/or communities, and we will have participated with them in a process of learning and tooling up.
2. We will have completed local seminars to which we've committed.
3. We will have planned and engaged in a curriculum of study designed for CIJE staff (and, if timing is right, for some of the individuals identified as resource-people.)
4. We will have identified one or more prototype institutions, either through the local seminars or through other means, and we will have assigned some of our new resource-people to work with these institutions. We will also have begun to work with the person designated by these institutions to work with us.
5. We will have established a Project maybe leading to a Center for the Philosophy of Jewish Education.

### DAY TWO:

#### III. Discussion of the Revised Plan for the Goals Project

Following the model as proposed by Annette earlier, the participants analyzed the revised workplan for the Goals Project in terms of limitations and opportunities for the short and long term and CIJE's role in making this project successful.

The main Question is: What capacity does CIJE have for fulfilling every aspect of the workplan iterated above? What are the limitations in terms of human resources, time, and funding?

##### A. Human Resources

Building capacity should be the highest priority in the work of the Goals Project. While this may be a time consuming process, the recruitment and training of Jewish educators to be "coaches" to institutions and communities can only benefit the work of CIJE in fulfilling both our short term and long term goals.

Gail suggested that when working to develop our human resources, we should not forget to include the newer generations of Jewish educators in order to truly ensure that the process of Building the Profession is addressed in every aspect of

CIJE work. CIJE will bring seasoned educators together with the newer generations of Jewish education professionals to train them for the developing coaching roles.

In an analysis of the Goals Project coaches, Danny pointed out that as these people begin to take leadership roles in their communities, they will also continue to learn. CIJE might ultimately create a central training institute for the coaches.

#### B. Honoring Commitments

It was suggested that CIJE could combine projects to fulfill existing commitments to specific institutions and communities. Additionally, these commitments could be used as opportunities to build the leadership base for future Goals Project activities. At the same time, the possibility exists that this service to communities will bring stronger ties between the Council and these institutions in the future, resulting in more commitments on the part of CIJE.

C. In an analysis of all the workplans of CIJE, the Goals Project represents only one facet of the total activity produced by the Council. The above limitations sit within the total work and resource limitations of CIJE.

### IV. Community Mobilization (Nessa Rapoport)

In the work to mobilize community support for Jewish education and create lay "champions" in the field, Nessa suggested that CIJE must take a proactive approach. We should produce substantive documents and take part in setting the agenda for North American Jewry. Inherent in this work, however, lies the tension between setting the Jewish communal agenda and publicizing the work of CIJE. Both projects are necessary to the success of the overall workplan of the Council.

#### A. Models of Creating Lay Leadership in Communities

How can CIJE engage key Jewish lay leaders in the efforts to transform Jewish education in North America? Concurrently, what can CIJE offer lay leaders so that they feel fulfilled by their involvement? Several models of creating lay leadership were discussed.

##### 1. Peer Group Model

Nessa articulated a model to build lay leadership that arose out of a



meeting with Art Rotman. CIJE could increase leadership by building upon existing peer groups within the world of lay leaders. This could be accomplished by making the elite groups accessible to more lay people.

## 2. Creative Change Model

Nessa noted another approach to the creation of lay leadership. As suggested by Chuck Ratner, CIJE could draw leaders to the Jewish education agenda by proposing creative ideas for the field. By drawing attention to the advancement in Jewish education and its effects on Jewish life, CIJE could attract and build more support from lay leadership.

CIJE could implement this model through our own Board to engage both seasoned leaders and newcomers in the work of the Council.

## B. Community Mobilization as a Building Block of Jewish Education

Conceived by the Commission, the building block of community mobilization plays a significant role in the total CIJE Workplan. As we introduce more lay leaders into the work of the Council, we must remember to always remember the intimate connections between the work of lay leaders to the work of the other aspects of CIJE. Because of this link, it may be most productive to concentrate our efforts for mobilizing community support and building a group of lay "champions" to leaders who are already affiliated with the Jewish education agenda.

## C. Messages

What points of CIJE do we want to highlight when working to mobilize communities? How do we spread the word? Where do these conversations take place? It was agreed that CIJE should highlight our research and activities, offer models of excellence in Jewish education as examples of our work and goals, and bring to light the integral nature of Jewish education to the sustaining of Jewish life.

## D. Community Mobilization: Toward the Future

Alan began the afternoon session with two questions: Where do we see ourselves in terms of Community Mobilization for next year? Are there other parts of Community Mobilization that we should discuss?

Nessa suggested we need to build the relationship between education professionals and lay leaders. We need to develop new models for mobilizing communities. She proposed that CIJE begin by developing clear visions of what we would like to see happening in communities and on a continental level.

Seymour proposed a multi-pronged strategy for achieving these goals. His plan would operate on several levels, addressing short and long term, specific and philosophical answers. By generating a variety of approaches, CIJE could offer a plan that would cater to many different types of people and communities.

He noted that some people become involved in Jewish communal life out of a sense of pride they feel associated with being Jewish. Others may find using their creative skills for the advancement of Jewish culture to be fulfilling. Based on these two distinctions, he illustrated the different methods of support CIJE could provide to lay people for Jewish education and Jewish life as a whole.

#### 1. The Perpetuation of Jewish Life in North America

Lay leaders, through their dedication to their communities, and Jewish educators, through their teaching, should be working together to ensure Jewish continuity in their communities and Jewish educators. CIJE should help create places for these conversations to occur. Additionally, we should work to spread the success stories of Jewish education. Educating those lay people who are proud to be Jewish on why contributing to Jewish education is among the best ways to ensure Jewish continuity is also part of the work of CIJE. Additionally, Jewish educators also need educational resources to provide better and better opportunities for learning.

#### 2. Sociology of Knowledge

On the more theoretical side of his proposal, Seymour discussed CIJE's ability to promote creative projects that would add to the quality of Jewish life in the long term. If given the opportunity, the people involved in this work would become major contributors to Jewish life in a way that no one is actively pursuing at this time. Part of this work comes from a need to inspire Jewish learning on as many levels as possible. By expanding the notion of what Jewish life is all about, CIJE can help channel creative resources into our work and create more innovative approaches to mobilizing communities.



To motivate all these different types of people, CIJE must present concise goals. Everyone agreed that engaging lay leaders, educators, and other creative thinkers is a difficult yet worthwhile task in our work for the future of Jewish living.

A major task by Nessa is to begin to articulate the Plan for Community Mobilization which would incorporate this thinking.

#### E. The Policy Brief and Community Mobilization

The discussion turned toward the immediate with a look at the expected community impact of the policy brief on the educational background of Jewish teachers in North America. The group advanced strategies for creating the maximum amount of impact resulting from the policy brief. A discussion then followed about the long range plans for connecting MEF to increasing community mobilization.

##### 1. Planning after the GA

Annette noted that CIJE should expect phone calls from educational institutions and communities as a result of the dissemination of the policy brief and the expected publicity surrounding personnel. She pointed out that this creates an enormous opportunity for CIJE to impact education in an immediate way because it invites communities to analyze the strengths of their teaching staffs, opening possibilities for deeper analysis of their educational programs. Alan suggested that Gail is the best CIJE staff member to field these calls as related to personnel in our pursuit to turn data into action.

##### 2. CIJE and our Growing Data Base

Now that we have begun produce solid data, we need to continue to make it accessible to communities as indicators of improvement. The communities themselves can decide how they can best improve their educational programs.

To continue the impact of the data, CIJE will have to enhance our data base by creating lists of categories of target groups. By isolating rabbis, schools, etc., we can personalize the information to make it more valuable to each targeted group.

*DAY THREE:***V. Building the Profession (Gail Dorph)****A. Overview**

Gail opened the discussion, suggesting that a review of plans for the next year should be put in the context of a longer term goal for building the profession. She suggested that our ultimate goal is to insure that Jewish education is staffed by qualified people, knowledgeable in their fields and committed to their work. She suggested that reaching this long term goal will require the following:

1. Recruitment of new people to enter the field.
2. A change in the structure of the field to support the number and quality of full-time professionals required to do this work.
3. Concerted efforts to energize the people already in the field.
4. Enlarging the group of people who think of themselves as part of the teaching force to include Rabbis, community volunteers, and others.
5. Broader acceptance of the notion that informal education is an integral part of this picture.

In discussion, it was suggested that it would be useful to put numbers to the goals listed above. For example, if there are now 5,000 people working full time in the field of Jewish education, what is our goal? It was also suggested that informal education be added to the MEF short term agenda in order that we might begin to impact that segment of the Jewish education field.

The notion of personnel may keep our thinking too narrow; we should look at this in the context of a profession. Teaching must be made more attractive by making the profession more so. This includes issues of salary, benefits, image, research, licensing and career ladders.

We should continue to devise effective methods of training, both pre-service and in-service, while at the same time working on developing a supportive infrastructure. We believe that CIJE can have an immediate impact on the critical in-service front. The first step is to show the Jewish community that Jewish education is a serious field.

With the help of an advisory committee, CIJE should work to develop a fully



fleshed out plan for Building the Profession. We should assess what is currently being done and select specific areas for early concentration. This would involve the development of a matrix identifying all the actors and the various categories we wish to impact. We should be careful, however, not to limit ourselves only to what is currently being done, but to think creatively about other approaches.

It was suggested that another way to look at our ultimate goal for building the profession is to seek to have a community of learners and teachers in North America.

## B. In-Service Training

Discussion turned to concrete thoughts about how CIJE could impact current Jewish educators. Our staff has particular experience on how to design and implement programs for effective in-service training, but there are few people available to do the work. It was suggested that we use the laboratory communities as sites to develop programs and demonstrate their effectiveness toward energizing the field. CIJE should help to translate this work into a generic approach which can be implemented elsewhere. CIJE's role should be to help design a demonstration, to create models which can be replicated elsewhere, and to make these available to other communities.

### **The Biggest Problem is training capacity.**

One area in which CIJE can have an impact is in attracting qualified people to work as consultants in individual communities in order to move in-service training ahead quickly. Another CIJE contribution should be to identify best practices in the area of in-service to serve as models for the development of new programs.

CIJE's role during 1995 should be to work on building capacity. We might approach the seminars, colleges of Jewish studies, and selected secular colleges and universities about developing programs for training people to serve as trainers of current educators. Alternatively, CIJE might work itself to create a national center of in-service training at which the training of trainers might be undertaken.

It was suggested that CIJE should declare its commitment to the principle of quality. We should articulate through documents, workshops, and meetings the centrality of quality and content to in-service training.

An immediate issue is how CIJE can be helpful to communities in response to the GA presentation on the results of the educators survey. How can CIJE turn up the heat on the need for in-service training, provide guidance on its implementation and not spread our own staff too thin in the process? Perhaps we can help each community to develop its own plan for action, keeping in mind the necessity for quality and continuity in whatever program is offered.

## RESPONDING TO THE POLICY BRIEF

The group turned to how, specifically, CIJE should be prepared to respond to the demands communities might make as a result of the policy brief and Adam Gamoran's report at the GA.

It was suggested that desired outcomes of the presentation include the following:

1. CIJE should be seen as a (or the) leader for change in Jewish education.
2. People should see that Jewish educators are unprepared for their work to a degree which is unacceptable.
3. They should leave with the feeling that there are constructive responses to this problem in the form of systematic, coherent in-service education.

Communities can be advised to take a close look at their own situations, and can be offered the use of the CIJE assessment tool for this process. They should be encouraged to identify local deficits and find local resources which can be applied to in-service training, with advice from CIJE on how to proceed with both of these steps. CIJE can prepare written materials in advance which speak to these issues.

CIJE might sponsor regional conferences to work with the lay and professional leaders of educational institutions, as well as their rabbis, to identify the issues and begin to develop interventions.

Communities can be advised to do the following:

1. Locate a person locally who can facilitate in-service education. (CIJE might provide a job description for this person.)
2. Send that person to a program for the training of teacher educators. (CIJE should design such a program or work with one or more training institutions to do so.
3. Set up local in-service programs. (Regional conferences might use someone such as Sarah Lightfoot to talk about moving from vision to in-service.)
4. Establish new hiring standards and practices to be applied to all new educators into the system.



Other models which CIJE might follow include the following:

1. Identify one community in which to invest heavily in in-service education. Build a macro-attack in that community. CIJE might work directly with the community or the community might hire someone to work under CIJE's guidance.
2. Identify one or several schools (defined as day schools, supplementary schools, JCC's, camps) to serve as "lead schools" and develop them into models.
3. Organize an in-service series to take place over a period of three weeks throughout the year, to be run by training institutions or centers. It was suggested that CIJE's role in all of this is to serve as architect. We should help with the planning, help to identify seed money, and provide guidance as communities do the work.

This portion of the meeting concluded with the following questions:

1. How much of our total building the profession energy should go into in-service training in 1995?
2. Are we letting the policy brief drive our agenda? If so, is that what we want?
3. Does this move our own agenda forward?

It was agreed that these and other questions remain on the table for future discussion.