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	Folder
25	11

Steering committee. 8 June 1995. Meeting book, June 1995.

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

COUNCIL FOR INITIATIVES IN JEWISH EDUCATION
MASTER SCHEDULE CONTROL

Schedule 1
Date Prepared: 4/10/95

ELEMENT	OCT	NOV	DEC	JAN	FEB	MAR	APR	MAY	JUN	JUL	AUG	SEP	OCT	NOV	DEC	JAN
	----1994----						----1995----									----1996----
1. Steering Committee 10:00 AM - 4:00 PM	N.Y. 10/5				N.Y. 2/14		N.Y. 4/26		N.Y. 6/8		N.Y. 8/25			N.Y. 11/1		CLEVE 1/22
2. Executive Committee 6:00 - 7:30 PM	N.Y. 10/5						N.Y. 4/26							N.Y. 11/1		
3. Board of Directors 7:45-10:00 PM; 9:30 AM - 4:00 PM	N.Y. 10/5-6						N.Y. 4/26-27							N.Y. 11/1-2		
4. Sub-Committees:																
A. Building the Profession	N.Y. 10/6						N.Y. 4/27							N.Y. 11/2		
B. Community Mobilization	N.Y. 10/6						N.Y. 4/27							N.Y. 11/2		
C. Content & Program	N.Y. 10/6						N.Y. 4/27							N.Y. 11/2		
D. Research & Evaluation	N.Y. 10/6						N.Y. 4/27							N.Y. 11/2		

MINUTES: CIJE STEERING COMMITTEE

DATE OF MEETING: April 27, 1995

DATE MINUTES ISSUED: May 15, 1995

PRESENT: Morton Mandel (Chair), John Colman, Gail Dorph, Adam Gamoran, Ellen Goldring, Stephen Hoffman, Alan Hoffmann, Barry Holtz, Daniel Pekarsky, Nessa Rapoport, Esther Leah Ritz, Richard Shatten, Jonathan Woocher, Virginia Levi (Sec'y)

Copy to: Lester Pollack, Charles Ratner, Henry Zucker

I. MASTER SCHEDULE CONTROL

The master schedule control was reviewed and committee members were reminded that the next three meetings of the steering committee (June 8, August 25, and November 1) will be in New York.

It was noted that committee chairs may wish to consider holding committee meetings more frequently than twice each year. It was also suggested that we move forward now with identification of committee co-chairs and additional committee members.

Assignment Alan Hoffmann will work with committee chairs and be prepared with recommendations to the steering committee at its June meeting.

II. MINUTES AND ASSIGNMENTS

The minutes and assignments of February 14 were reviewed. It was noted that the CIJE workplan, while perhaps on the ambitious side, is now an excellent tool for moving the work of CIJE forward. It was noted that in some areas of its workplan, CIJE is acting in collaboration with others, and that the involvement of partners may help to move the agenda ahead.

Assignment In a discussion of plans to increase the size of the board, it was agreed that this assignment will be seriously undertaken in the coming months.

In a discussion of mobilizing young leaders for community support it was noted that graduates of the Wexner Heritage Program have an interest in being active in their communities but need guidance on how to get engaged. CIJE is working with Wexner in this area. It was suggested that this work may be expanded to include people who go through the CLAL leadership programs and others. Barry Shrage in Boston is working on a means of getting his young leaders involved and may be a resource for CIJE. It was suggested that a future agenda item for the steering committee is a full discussion of community mobilization.

III. MONITORING EVALUATION AND FEEDBACK

A. Preliminary Data on Educational Leaders from the Study of Educators.

Ellen Goldring reminded the committee that in addition to the study of educators which was undertaken in each of the three laboratory communities, the leaders of those same educational institutions were asked to complete a survey. This included principals, directors, and department heads in the formal educational institutions of each community, including early childhood directors.

In addition to the level of training in education and in Judaica that were studied for educators, this group was also evaluated on their preparation in the field of leadership and administration.

Preliminary findings show that educational leaders are, on the whole, better trained than teachers. However, only 35% of educational leaders across all settings are prepared in both general education and Judaic studies, while 11% have training in neither general education nor Jewish studies.

Educational leaders in day schools and supplementary schools were found to be much more highly trained than the leaders in preschools. It was suggested that many preschools do not seek accreditation, so need not meet the general standards in order to operate.

As might be expected, the number of leaders of day schools trained in educational administration is significantly higher than the number in supplementary schools or preschools. In this regard, it was noted that only 16% of educational leaders hold degrees in all three areas: general and Jewish education as well as educational administration. This may be a good pool of potential mentors for others . It was noted that we should be careful not to link competence with having degrees. Many people arrive at these leadership positions in unconventional ways.

It was suggested that it may be necessary to clarify definitions of what constitutes training in each of the three areas. It is possible that a masters in Jewish education from some institutions could serve as preparation for educational administration. This will be considered further by the research team.

Finally, it was noted that most educational leaders work full time and see Jewish education as their career. More than three-quarters have over 10 years experience in Jewish education.

The report which will be prepared for distribution will put the facts and figures in context. It will identify the implications for Jewish education and CIJE and will outline a plan for the training of Jewish educational leaders.

B. Developing Evaluation Capacity

1. Module for a Local Study of Educators

Adam Gamoran distributed a draft document intended to assist North American communities in conducting and evaluating a survey of their educators. The packet includes general introductory information, a written survey instrument and an interview protocol, as well as guidelines on how to use these. The packet includes a set of "anchor items" which are identified as the essential components of the survey and would serve as the basis for a national data bank.

In discussion, it was noted that this and every other publication of CIJE should be coordinated with Nessa Rapoport so that there is a common language and a common look.

It was suggested that both CIJE and individual communities would benefit from the development of a software package for conducting the survey. It was noted that this has been considered and will undoubtedly be undertaken eventually, but that there is a short-term issue of personnel to undertake the task. On the other hand, it will have greater impact if the software is available from the start of dissemination of the instrument. Adam will consider what it will take to create such a package and report back to the steering committee.

ssignment

It was suggested that we may wish to consider a floor beneath which we would not wish to have a survey identified with CIJE. In response, it was noted that we can reject data for the national data base, and that this is our point of control. As CIJE works with individual communities, efforts will be made to influence quality. It was noted that this is one area in which CIJE may be able to impact the area of standard setting, and that this is an area for CIJE to undertake in coordination with JESNA.

2. Creating Evaluation Capacity for Communities

Alan Hoffmann noted that the issue of creating capacity is an underlying theme for all of CIJE's work. The issue, with respect to evaluation, is how CIJE, working with JESNA, can help communities reach a point where they can evaluate the work they undertake. CIJE proposes to begin by training 12 to 18 people from different communities. Communities would be invited to nominate, in close discussion with CIJE, someone to become the local consultant on Jewish education evaluation. This would most likely be an academic or evaluation consultant who is familiar with evaluation, but who would benefit from the assistance of CIJE in putting that knowledge in the context of Jewish education. CIJE will develop a program to take place over a

period of 18 months to serve as a national training program yielding a cadre of Jewish education evaluators.

Communities have expressed great interest in this opportunity. Many have allocated funds to move forward in evaluation but do not have personnel to conduct local evaluation. This is an area in which CIJE and JESNA can work collaboratively. CIJE is seeking approval from the steering community to look into this approach further.

In discussion it was noted that the training of evaluators, along with the module for a local study, is a significant move toward getting local communities to do their own evaluation. It was also noted that many communities are putting significant funds into engaging consultants to undertake evaluation and that they would welcome the opportunity to train local evaluators.

Assignment

The next step will be to discuss this further with JESNA and show how it would impact the CIJE work plan and budget. A document will be brought to the next steering committee meeting.

IV. CIJE AND AFFILIATED COMMUNITIES: GUIDELINES

Gail Dorph introduced this discussion, noting that in response to the recommendation that CIJE expand its activities beyond the original three lead communities, a set of guidelines has been drafted covering areas of potential commitment for CIJE and individual communities. This document identifies CIJE's agenda and desired outcomes in the areas of personnel, community mobilization, and goals identification.

It was agreed that this draft needs further clarification and discussion as we consider how prescriptive we wish to be on the issue of community structure. Should we, for example, require a wall-to-wall coalition? How specific should we be on the structure we expect with respect to the three critical leaders? How does evaluation fit into the picture? How much of this can be standard for each community and how much depends on individual community differences? What are the "anchors" for affiliation, without which CIJE cannot move forward?

Assignment

It was agreed that the guidelines will be reconsidered and discussed further at the next meeting.

V. BOARD MEETING REVIEW

The steering committee reviewed the factbook of materials prepared for the following day's board meeting.

COUNCIL FOR INITIATIVES IN JEWISH EDUCATION

ASSIGNMENTS

73890 ASN (REV. 7/94) PRINTED IN U.S.A.

Function:	CIJE STEERING COMMITTEE	
Subject/Objective:	ASSIGNMENTS	
Originator:	Virginia F. Levi	Date: 4-26-95

NO.	DESCRIPTION	PRIORITY	ASSIGNED TO (INITIALS)	DATE ASSIGNED STARTED	DUE DATE
1.	Prepare recommendations for appointment of committee co-chairs.		ADH	4/26/95	6/8/95
2.	Prepare plan for increasing board size.		ADH	4/26/95	6/8/95
3.	Prepare memo on what would be required to develop a software package for use by communities conducting an educators survey.		✓AG	4/26/95	6/8/95
4.	Work with JESNA on developing a program for training evaluators and prepare a proposal for review by the Steering Committee.		✓ADH	4/26/95	6/8/95
5.	Prepare new draft of guidelines for work with affiliated communities.		✓GZD	4/26/95	6/8/95
6.	Consider planning special "invitation-only" session at 1995 GA.		~~NR~~	~~2/14/95~~	~~8/9/95~~
7.	Develop a communications program: internal; with our Board and advisors; with the broader community.		NR	921/93	TBD
8.	Redraft total vision for review by Steering Committee.		BWH	4/20/94	TBD

6A

The Structure of Jewish Education

Walter I. Ackerman

May 1990

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

Walter I. Ackerman is the Shane Family Professor of Education, Ben Gurion University of the Negev, Beer Sheva, Israel.

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

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

Commissioners

Morton L. Mandel
Chairman
Mona Riklis Ackerman
Ronald Appleby
David Arnow
Mandell L. Berman
Jack Bieler
Charles R. Bronfman
John C. Colman
Maurice S. Corson
Lester Crown
David Dubin
Stuart E. Eizenstat
Joshua Elkin
Eli N. Evans
Irwin S. Field
Max M. Fisher
Alfred Gottschalk
Arthur Green
Irving Greenberg
Joseph S. Gruss
Robert I. Hiller
David Hirschhorn
Carol K. Ingall
Ludwig Jesselson
Henry Koschitzky
Mark Lainer
Norman Lamm
Sara S. Lee
Seymour Martin Lipset
Haskel Lookstein
Robert E. Loup
Matthew J. Maryles
Florence Melton
Donald R. Mintz
Lester Pollack
Charles Ratner
Esther Leah Ritz
Harriet L. Rosenthal
Alvin I. Schiff
Lionel H. Schipper
Ismar Schorsch
Harold M. Schulweis
Daniel S. Shapiro
Margaret W. Tishman
Isadore Twersky
Bennett Yanowitz
Isaiah Zeldin

Senior Policy Advisors

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

Director

Henry L. Zucker

Research & Planning

Seymour Fox, Director
Annette Hochstein, Associate Director

Staff

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

The Structure of Jewish Education

The idea of structure suggests order; it implies a definite pattern of arrangements or relationships. Structures are consciously created according to some preconceived plan or just evolve as experience and circumstance would seem to dictate. The development of structures, whether planned or accidental, rests on the assumption that objectives can be stated with reasonable clarity and that once that is done it is possible to identify the means and steps required for their attainment. Structures are intended to facilitate the process.

The formal relationships between parts which characterize structure do not always guarantee an actual acknowledgement of interdependence. It is a commonplace of large organizations that one branch derides the efforts of another and even questions its contribution to the common endeavor. The fact of the organization, however, forces them to work together. The function of management is to bring both of them to productive cooperation.

Jewish education, by contrast, is without a compelling framework. Whether understood as formal schooling only or as a complex process in which many different agencies may participate, it is a voluntary effort consisting of autonomous units each of which is free to develop as it sees fit. In the case of the former, the school is the basic entity. In congregational schools, the dominant type, final authority for their conduct is rested in the synagogue board which acts through an appointed or elected school committee. Non-congregational schools—large day schools—have their own boards and committees which are responsible for every aspect of the school's activities. Schools and other educational agencies are, of course, subject to all manner of influence. The way in which they react to events and circumstance, however, is ultimately a matter of their own choice. Where connections do exist they are an expression of good will and almost never "required." In all Jewish communities around the world excepting Israel, the relationships between the various bodies engaged in Jewish education, when at all existing, may best be likened to those which characterize a loosely coupled federation lacking all power of enforcement.

The development of Jewish education in the United States in the last hundred years or so may be understood in some senses as an attempt to bring some order

and standardization into an area of public activity given perhaps naturally to separatism. One of the earliest examples of this tendency is the public examinations in various school subjects—Hebrew, Bible, and History—sponsored by the Young Men's Hebrew Association of New York beginning in 1875 and continuing until the end of the century. The seventy students who were tested in 1876 came from all-day schools, afternoon schools, two-day-a-week schools and Sabbath schools. While the ostensible purpose of the examinations, reported in detail in the Jewish press, was to encourage attendance at a Jewish school, its effect, intended or not, was to determine the curriculum of participating schools.[1] Thirty years later, the Central Board of Jewish Education, established in New York in 1909 by a group of professionals and lay people involved with a number of Talmud Torahs, set as its purpose the development of a uniform curriculum for all such schools in the city. It was hoped, among other things, that with the introduction of a common curriculum a youngster moving from one neighborhood to another would not have "to start all over again from the first grade." A similar reason was among the justifications offered a decade later upon the introduction of a unified curriculum in the member schools of the Associated Boston Hebrew Schools.[2] These efforts were clearly influenced by practice in American public school systems. In that model as in others, the locus of curriculum design and development is a source of authority for the conduct of educational affairs.

These efforts as well as others of similar intent were at best sporadic; they were undertaken by bodies of limited resources and a narrow base of public support. They were eclipsed by the establishment in 1910 of the Bureau of Jewish Education of the Kehillah of New York City.[3] The Bureau was the first communal office of Jewish education on the North American continent. Judah Magnes and his associates in the leadership of the Kehillah viewed the creation of the Bureau, rather than direct grants to existing schools, as the most effective use of $50,000 contributed by Jacob Schiff to the Kehillah for the "improvement and promoting of Jewish religious primary education in the city."[4] The Bureau, under the inspired leadership of Dr. Samson Benderly and the coterie of American-born young men attracted to him and the cause of Jewish education, forged a pattern of programs and activities which until this day frames the work of similar agencies subsequently established in cities all over the United States and Canada.

In the years between its establishment in 1910 and its affiliation, upon the virtual dissolution of the Kehillah in 1917, with the Federation for the Support of Jewish Philanthropic Societies, the Bureau had demonstrated the advantages of a centralized effort and, at the same time, gained a new place for Jewish education in American Jewish life. Benderly's report to the Kehillah in 1915 noted that the

Bureau ". . . directs, supervises, or cooperates with 179 schools, 521 teachers and 31,300 students."[5] Even though income from the initial gift, never-ending fundraising, and tuitions collected by the Bureau's Department of Collection and Investigation from the families of pupils in affiliated schools always ran behind the cost of the ambitious and imaginative programs designed by Benderly and his staff, the Bureau engaged in an impressive range of activities: supervision of schools, curriculum development, teacher training and licensing, production of text books and other teaching aids, a professional journal, extra-curricular activities, youth organizations, and more. These activities were rooted in a particular conception of the function of a community office of education.

Aside from emphasizing the importance of professional expertise and scientific method—concepts which were central to the campaigns for "good government" led by progressives of the time—Benderly and his associates established the principle of community support for Jewish education. In their view Jewish education, like education in general, could not be left to the partisan efforts of neighborhood groups. The perpetuation of Jewish life in the demanding circumstances of the American environment required ". . . a system of education . . . under *community control.*" This position led to a structure in which the community assumed responsibility for financing ". . . experimentation, initiation, organization, coordination and general supervision. . . ." The centralized functions, almost exclusively educational, are paralleled and even dependent on the administrative tasks assigned the local community—". . . maintenance [of buildings], teachers' salaries, scholarships for children who cannot pay, and local supervision . . . and financed by tuition fees and local contributions."[6]

The "system" of education which evolved from this conception, first in New York and then in other cities, was not as embracive as would appear at first glance. Just as the federations or similar agencies did not really represent or actually reflect the full range of opinion and practice in the Jewish population, the central agencies for Jewish education did not always serve all the schools in the geographic area of their jurisdiction. Whether organized on the model of New York, or that of a central Talmud Torah with branches throughout the city as in Minneapolis, or as a federation of schools led by the Bureau as in Boston, their reach, until relatively recently, did not always extend either to Orthodox or Reform schools. Their work, reflecting the attitudes of their personnel, was by and large limited to the intensive afternoon Hebrew school whose Zionist orientation emphasized the centrality of the Hebrew language.

The spread of the idea of communal responsibility and the establishment of communal offices of education were abetted by the formation of the American

Association for Jewish Education in 1939. This "bureau of bureaus," lately reorganized as JESNA,* was intended not only to "promote the cause of Jewish education in America"[7] but also to serve as "an association of Jewish education interests in relation to the Council of Jewish Federations and Welfare Funds and to the general community (government, etc.)."[8] The surveys conducted by the AAJE are one of its more important contributions. The data gathered in the study of almost forty communities between 1939-59 remain even today an important source of information regarding the growth and development of Jewish education in the country. The method of communal self-study employed in these surveys had an effect as important as the findings themselves; thousands of people were given an opportunity to think about Jewish education and its purposes.

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

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

---

* Jewish Education Service of North America

minimum curriculum for Jewish schools of all kinds; model schools would provide the setting for experimenting with that curriculum, developing new instructional methods and producing textbooks and other materials. Once the effectiveness of these methods and materials had been demonstrated, they could be introduced into existing schools.[9] Berkson viewed the school as the instrument best equipped to unite a divided Jewish community and to provide *all* Jewish children with common cultural baggage.

This way of structuring relationships between individual schools and a communal office of education was rejected in favor of the view, most clearly enunciated by Dr. Alexander Dushkin who had been invited to head the new agency, that the purpose of a central agency was to provide *service* to existing schools. Rather than developing a broad basic program of Jewish education acceptable to all sectors of the community, a task he thought impossible in the cauldron of differences which characterized New York Jewry, Dushkin saw the mission of his agency as providing guidance and supervision to schools of all kinds in order to help them realize their own philosophies more completely. In the lexicon of Jewish education this conception became known as "unity in diversity"; more importantly, it has determined the work of bureaus ever since its initial formulation.

The position celebrates pluralism; it recognizes that schools, like individuals, have multiple loyalties. This was a matter of no small moment in the light of the rise of the congregational school after World War II, a development which structurally is significantly different from a bureau-sponsored community Talmud Torah system. These schools take direction from the educational arms of the national synagogue movements of which they are a part. The potential of conflict is obvious in a statement prepared in 1950 by representatives of the United Synagogue Commission on Jewish Education and the American Association for Jewish Education: ". . . Bureaus should cooperate with the congregational schools or their groups in carrying out their programs as effectively as possible. . . . Bureaus, as central community agencies, shall at all times recognize the autonomy and the ideological integrity of the congregational schools."[10]

This and similar statements issued over the years constitute the ground upon which a delicate pattern of relationships has developed between bureaus and schools or groups of schools of a particular religious or ideological complexion. The internal organization and division of assignments among the professional staff of larger bureaus are very often derived from this sense of function. It is important to note, however, that many educators, not unlike Berkson, feel that the bureau ". . . must cease to be merely a midwife for all the groups in the community and

produce something of its own which represents the best conception of the best educators."[11]

Examples of the possible range of bureau-initiated activities may be found in reports of recently developed programs. In New York, the bureau has established both a teacher's and principal's center, a special education center, a computer resource center, and a media center.[12] In Los Angeles, the bureau has sponsored parent and family life education, holiday workshops, Sephardic Heritage Programs, programs for Iranian and Russian immigrants, special education, activities related to the professional status of educators, community-wide celebrations of Jewish education, and other activities which reflect the idea of an agency responsible to the community as a whole.[13] These listings are not intended as catalogues of activity; they are brought to illustrate the pattern of programs which evolves when an educational agency thinks of itself in one way rather than another.

It is difficult to specify the exact nature of the relationships between national agencies—commissions on education of both the Conservative and Reform movements, the National Commission on Torah Education, Torah U'Mesorah—and local activity. They are not immune to the stricture which specifies that in Jewish life the spread throughout the country of the plans and programs of national agencies depends on local leadership.[14] The key to their influence depends on more than a shared ideological commitment; they must also provide useful service. Over the years these agencies have developed characteristic modes of operation which reflect changing conceptions of their function. The first such agency, the Commission on Jewish Education of the Union of American Hebrew Congregations, was originally the Board of Editors of Sabbath School Literature, then the Board of Editors of Religious School Literature, and after that the Commission on Jewish Religious Educational Literature. The present name was adopted in the early twenties to signify that the body ". . . proposed to envisage the entire field of Jewish religious education and will consider all matters pertaining thereto."[15]

The broad mandate, more or less adopted by similar agencies subsequently established, has come to include extensive textbook publication programs, curriculum development, convening regional and national conferences, professional placement services, and the definition and promulgation of statements of broad educational policy. The latter includes such items as recommendations regarding the number of days per week a school should be in session, "starting" age of pupils, and attendance requirements for Bar/Bat Mitzvah. These set a standard for individual schools at the same time as they create a common framework for member institutions.

The seemingly parallel and even interdependent and complementary pattern of activities of the bureaus and the educational commissions of the various religious groupings ought not obscure the fact that the work of each is guided by assumptions which sometimes conflict. The bureaus view the community, however vaguely defined, as the central element of Jewish institutional life; the well-being of the community dictates a policy of consensus. The religious organizations believe that the religious life and its institutional expression in the synagogue are the guarantors of Jewish continuity. Their sense of community and relationships to its institutions, however wholehearted and positive, cannot but be conditioned by the consequences of belief in a transcendent authority.

As the community office of education, the bureau is the educational agency most directly involved with the organized Jewish community and its institutions. The relationships between bureaus and federations or welfare funds, as so many others in communal life, have not always been clearly cut or exactly defined. At one time, large bureaus such as New York and Chicago, even though connected to the local federation, were responsible for raising a major part of their budget. Today some bureaus are part of the federation structure and are one of several agencies within that framework. Others are beneficiaries of the federation and independent of its administrative structure. The several patterns are generally more a function of local history than a design drawn from organizational theory. We do not know which of them results in the most effective delivery of services.

Accurate mapping of the territory of formal Jewish education requires that we identify and locate several other points of influence. Teacher training schools and programs are certainly one of them; indeed, together with schools, bureaus, and educational commissions they constitute the "core" of formal Jewish education. The most obvious connection between teacher training institutions and the day-to-day work of schools of all kinds is that created by graduates who function as teachers, principals, or in other capacities directly concerned with schooling. Little attention has been paid to yet another aspect of linkage: the role played by Hebrew Teachers Colleges or Colleges of Jewish Studies in setting standards in communities throughout the country. The entrance requirements of member institutions of *Iggud Batei Midrash L'Morim* (Association of Hebrew Teachers Colleges), now defunct, played a major role in determining the curriculum of lower schools. While from some points of view the influence may not have always been beneficial, the idea that there was a progression in Jewish schooling which demanded mastery at one level before moving on to another was certainly positive. Current discussions of structure have generally neglected the question of standards and their significance in the educational process. The successor to the *Iggud,* the Association of

Institutions of Higher Learning for Jewish Education, has not been in existence long enough to permit an assessment of its function and influence.

While there is no argument regarding the role of the colleges in pre-service training, there is some question regarding their function, if they have one at all, in in-service training. In some communities there is a tacit agreement that the latter belongs to the bureaus. Where such questions exist, they obviously have more to do with "turf" than with education. The expansion of Jewish studies programs in major universities has led to some exploration of the possibility that their schools of education might also train personnel for Jewish education.

In addition to their specific purpose—either as training schools and more recently as centers of adult learning—the colleges perform an important symbolic function. They represent the commitment of a community to higher Jewish learning and move Jewish education out of the realm of childhood with which it is usually associated.

University programs of Jewish studies, strictly speaking, cannot be counted as part of the structure with which we are dealing here. They should be thought of as a parallel but independent entity. Even though many of the existing programs were initiated because of the interest and financial support of a local Jewish community, once established they are part of another world. Neither the appointment of advisory boards, very often nothing more than a symbolic gesture, nor the active involvement of individual faculty members in the affairs of the community changes the fact that these programs are guided by the requirements of the academy and the demands of scholarship. Indeed, attempts of the American Association for Jewish Education to become involved in the organization of the Association for Jewish Studies, the learned society of instructors of Jewish studies, were quickly rebuffed. These programs also serve a symbolic function. Placed as they are in colleges and universities, public and private, they confer a degree of social respectability on the study of Judaism which is rarely attained by ethnic schools such as the colleges.[16]

The place of Israeli agencies in the scheme described here has been a subject of much discussion, and even controversy, over the years. Criticism or praise of particular programs, more often based on personal experience than on carefully collected and analyzed empirical data, are incidental to a more basic issue. There is no question that good practice is a necessary condition of effectiveness, and that interventions by outside agencies are most successful when initiated by local constituencies and implemented with their cooperation and participation. Israeli agencies have not always observed this "rule." Poor practice, however, is not the only source of strain. The way in which Israel is used as an educational resource

depends on the understanding educators have of the place and meaning of an independent Jewish state in the life of the individual and the polity. Differences on this fundamental issue, even when muted by common agreement, color the entire pattern of relationships between Jewish education in North America and Israeli agencies working in the Diaspora.

Many of the people involved in the conduct of schools, bureaus, national agencies, and other settings concerned with formal education are members of one or another of several professional organizations. With the exception of the Council for Jewish Education, these are organized along denominational lines and sometimes by type of school within a religious grouping. The CJE was originally made up of bureau directors who saw the organization as a vehicle for promoting community support of Jewish education, developing standards of professionalism, and securing and protecting benefits for personnel. These organizations obviously serve a social function; they also provide placement services and protect members from abuses by employers. Even though they aspire to establishing Jewish education as a profession, it is doubtful that these organizations have succeeded in this regard. That achievement requires more than the efforts of practitioners to specify requirements of training, conditions of entry, and standards of performance.[17] The strivings of educators to gain recognition and status must be matched by public acknowledgement of the unique and essential service they provide. Acceptance of that kind has yet to be attained.

The existing organizations cater to principals and other administrators. In contrast to an earlier period—the first organization of Jewish educators in the United States was *Agudat Hamorim* (Teachers Association), founded in New York in 1910—there is today no effective organization of teachers in Jewish schools. The annual CAJE conference, it is true, is intended primarily for teachers; as important as that gathering is, it does not perform the functions usually associated with professional organizations. The lack of a teachers' organization is a troubling gap. The absence of such a body not only deprives teachers of an agency of advocacy; it denotes the disappearance of a sense of calling among those who are responsible for the day-to-day work of schools.

Even though they are generally not included in a schematic presentation of Jewish education, we suggest that commercial publishers of textbooks and other educational materials should be considered among the factors which give shape to practice. This is particularly so in those parts of the country distant from bureaus and the services provided in large centers of Jewish population. Teachers and principals of less than adequate preparation and of loose ideological identity very often find the commercial material more helpful than that produced by the national

commissions. The point is important we think because it notes that the formal mechanisms of Jewish education do not always satisfy the needs of the populations they are intended to serve.

What we have brought thus far may be represented as a series of concentric circles with the school at the center. The farther an agency is away from the school, the lesser its influence on teaching and learning. However, the school need not always be the intended target. JESNA, for instance, expends a great deal of effort in attempting to influence policy-makers in federations. At a certain point in its history, the United Synagogue Commission on Jewish Education was concerned primarily with eliminating the Sunday School and guiding school boards to adopt standards for the three-day-a-week Conservative congregational school. The adoption of codes of practice was for many years a major concern of professional organizations. Looking at the diverse tasks undertaken by different agencies and the audience to which each addresses itself is one way of clarifying the relationship between them.

This patterned patchwork of educational activity is, as we have already indicated, less a system than a network of agencies, individuals, and institutions. The looseness of this voluntary association does not altogether eliminate centers of authority whose decisions effect others. The opinions of rabbinical authorities are binding on certain day schools. A bureau may establish standards and eligibility for schools applying for communal financial support. The workings of the enterprise depend, however, far more on influence than on authority. The adoption of a new program promoted by an agency outside the school depends largely on the skills and qualities of the personnel involved in the proposed program, the level of expertise and services provided by the sponsoring agency, and the fit between the proposal and the needs of the school. National agencies planning the introduction of new programs and practices must surely know that their success depends not on an authority they lack but on the influence they can bring to bear on local affiliates.*

---

* The following, I think, nicely illustrates the distinction between authority and influence:
A number of years ago, the United Synagogue of America, the national organization of Conservative synagogues, invested considerable effort and moral fervor in a campaign against Bingo. Congregations which did not stop the gambling were threatened with expulsion from the organization. No comparable sanction was employed, or even suggested, in the case of congregations who continued to maintain one-day-a-week schools for children over eight even after the United Synagogue Commission on Jewish Education had declared the three-day-a-week school the desired norm. The goodwill of rabbis and educators provided fertile ground for the efforts of persuasion of the Commission; in time the overwhelming majority of Conservative synagogues opted for the more intensive form of schooling.

The public understanding of Jewish education confines its location to the school. School people understandably adopt this position and tend to reinforce it as occasion permits. There is much to support that point of view—over the years the idea of Jewish learning has been inextricably connected with the school. As a text-centered tradition, Judaism requires the ". . . deliberate, systematic and sustained effort. . . ."[18] of a school to equip youngsters with the skills and competencies required for understanding and informed practice. The specific task of the school and the particular kind of learning experience it provides ought not, however, lead us to deny the educational potential of non-school settings. Recent social science and historical research indicates that a wide variety of agencies inform, socialize, open avenues of identification, and provide meaning. Indeed institutions of formal instruction are only one element in the configuration of instrumentalities by which ". . . a culture transmits itself across generations."[19] The influence of the family, of course, is the most prominent and powerful.

Modern Jewish communities contain, nourish, and support an extraordinary variety of non-school settings capable of educating: community centers, camps, *havurot*, membership organizations, youth movements, fundraising campaigns, synagogues, service organizations, newspapers, radio programs, television programs. These non-school settings may relate to one another because of some common interest. They may even be part of a larger organization, such as the JWB, or the umbrella organizations of the Conservative, Orthodox, and Reform denominations. On the whole, however, they are quite independent of one another and generally far removed from schools and other settings of formal education. Within limits that is not necessarily a bad thing; some degree of isolation in protection of distinctiveness guarantees a variety which can only enrich a community.

Schools and non-school settings differ from one another in many different ways.[20] The general lack of contact between the two worlds stems, in many instances, from a lack of understanding of the role of each and perhaps even disdain of one by the other. Competition for a limited pool of participants and finite resources sharpens the divide and obscures potentially complementary relationships.

A practitioner whose training has taught him/her how to move from one setting to another with competence and commitment is one way of bridging the gap and developing a fruitful utilization of the possibilities inherent in each type of setting. The idea of moving from one setting to another, back and forth and in and out, applies to teachers as well. The total educational experience, hopefully lifelong, should be seen as a process which consists of different elements—schools, camps,

retreats, Israel, and the like. At one point in life school may be the most important; at another stage the experience of a non-school setting may be more appropriate. We need also to understand how each form of education relates to and affects the other.

The creation of the connections noted above, however, are beyond the abilities and interests of individual educators. The structure implicit in the development of significant relationships requires both resources and a climate which encourages cooperation. Examples are available: a college of Jewish studies which offers courses for Jewish Community Center personnel; a bureau of Jewish education which turns to a family service agency for help in developing a family education program. I have chosen these examples deliberately—in each case the parties involved are school and non-school settings and are communal agencies supported, at least in part, by federation allocations. The federation framework is a vehicle for creating structure and encouraging relationships. Indeed, that may be its major organizational function.

Tracing the development of Jewish education in North America discloses the changing and increasingly significant role of federations. The Federation for the Support of Jewish Philanthropic Societies of New York City ". . . was organized under a plan which contemplated the exclusion of religious educational activities." That position was changed in 1917 when a special committee recommended the inclusion of religious schools among federation beneficiaries because they ". . . work . . . as moral influences in the community for bridging the gap between parents and children and for maintaining the influence of the home and the family."

That halting beginning—reflecting the attitudes of New York's established Jews of German origin toward more recently arrived Eastern European immigrants and the fear of the effect of local Talmud Torah campaigns on citywide fundraising[21]—has moved, over a period of almost three quarters of a century and through numerous controversies, from restricted funding to a pattern of comprehensive communal planning which profoundly effects Jewish education. Commissions recently established in a number of major communities—i.e. Commission on the Jewish Future in Los Angeles—are yet another manifestation of what is obviously an evolving process. Past experience clearly teaches that events in the community or the society at large very often dictate evaluation of existing patterns and the design of new modes of interaction.

The planning process, intended to rationalize organized communal activity, is clearly a mechanism which encourages the establishment of relationships. In many communities it has brought together educational agencies that had previously had

no contact with one another. At the same time it should be recognized that planning is not a "neutral" activity; it is based on assumptions not always congruent with particularistic conceptions of education. Moreover, as an activity sponsored by an organization which can function only as it achieves consensus among participants, there is the danger that planning in such a context must cater to the lowest common denominator.

The idea of centrally organized planning is, of course, an expression of the positivism which has shaped modern society. For all its advantages and even necessity, it would be well to remember its limitations. The most significant developments in Jewish education in North America since the end of World War II—the expansion of the day school movement, the increase in Hebrew-speaking camps, the spread of university programs of Jewish studies, the founding of CAJE, the rise of *havurot*—occurred outside the framework of organized and directed communal activity and planning. Similar developments in the public sector, together with suggestive findings of recent research, have led theoreticians and practitioners alike to think of planning less as a prescriptive measure than as a means of using communal resources as a lever for the inculcation of an ethic of accountability and encouraging individual units in the system to adopt initiatives which celebrate their uniqueness. In such a context the idea of structure assumes new and interesting characteristics.

Notes

1. Grinstein, Hyman, B. "In the Course of the Nineteenth Century." In *A History of Jewish Education in the United States*, edited by Judah Pilch, 46-47. New York: American Association for Jewish Education, 1969.

2. Hurwich, Louis. *Zicronot M'Chanech Ivri*, Vol. II. Boston: Bureau of Jewish Education, 1960, pp. 277-290.

3. Goren, Arthur. *Quest for Community*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1970.

4. Ibid., 92.

5. Ibid., 133.

6. Benderly, Samson. "The Purpose and Work of the Bureau of for Jewish Education. In *Central Community Agencies for Jewish Education*, edited by Abraham Gannes, 202-217. Philadelphia: Dropsie College, 1954, pp. for Jewish Education, Philadelphia: Dropsie College, 1954.

7. Pich, Judah. *Op. cit.*, p. 188.

8. Dushkin, Alexander, M. and Uriah P. Engleman, *Jewish Education in the United States* New York: American Association for Jewish Education, 1959, p. 147.

9. "Proceedings of the Sixteenth Annual Conference of the National Council for Jewish Education." *Jewish Education* 13:3 (January, 1942): 217-223.

10. "Bureau and Congregational School Relationships" in Gannes, Abraham, *op. cit.*, pp. 231-233.

11. Dinin, Samuel. "Jewish Education Faces the Future." *The Reconstructionist* 13:3 (February, 1948): 16.

12. *Jewish Education* 53:4 (Winter, 1985).

13. *Jewish Education* 56:4 (Winter, 1988).

14. Elazar, Daniel J. *Community and Polity: The Organizational Dynamics of American Jewry*. Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1976, p. 130.

15. "Report of Commission on Jewish Education" *Yearbook of Central Conference of American Rabbis*, vol. 33, 1923, pp. 307-343.

16. Fishman, Joshua A. *Language Loyalty in the United States*. The Hague: Mouton, 1967.

17. Ackerman, Walter I. "The Status of the Professional Jewish Educator". In *To Build a Profession: Careers in Jewish Education*, edited by Joseph Reimer, 27-41. Waltham: Hornstein Progress in Jewish Communal Service, Brandeis University, 1987.

18. Cremin, Lawrence, A. *American Education: The Colonial Experience (1607-1783)*. New York: Harper and Row, 1970, p. XIII.

19. Bailyn, Bernard. *Education in the Forming of American Society*. New York: Vintage Books, 1960, p. 14.

20. "Report of the Special Committee of Seven on Religious Educational Societies Made to the Organization Committee of the Federation for the Support of Jewish Philanthropic Societies of New York City, March 12, 1917" in Gannes, Abraham P., *op. cit.*, pp. 180-190.

21. Ibid.

BUILDING THE PROFESSION:
In-service Training

I. In-service training as a focal point of the CIJE effort of "Building the Profession" implies at least three things: Jewish education is a profession; a significant number of practitioners of Jewish education, in all its various settings, have had little or no professional training; professionally trained personnel will make Jewish education more effective and attractive. I think it important to note that the first of these propositions is arguable, as is the case with education in general; the second is demonstratable; the third is supported by a growing body of research which indicates that there is a positive relationship between their effectiveness and the subject-matter knowledge and training which teachers bring to their work - we do not, however, know how that knowledge and training are best acquired.

The Policy Brief of CIJE which deals with the background and professional training of teachers in the schools of the three Lead Communities - Atlanta, Baltimore and Milwaukee - reports that " ... only 40% of the day school Judaica teachers are certified as Jewish educators [and that] in supplementary and pre-schools the proportions are much smaller. Overall, only 31% of the teachers have a degree in Jewish Studies or certification in Jewish education."

Inadequately trained personnel has been one of the most persistent, and even intractable, problems of Jewish education in the United States. It is instructive, I think, to compare the data gathered by CIJE with the 1959 report of the Commission for the Study of Jewish Education in the United States. The earlier study found that "Only a minority (40%) of the Jewish teachers in all schools - one-day-a-week, mid-week afternoon, and day - had received pedagogical

training." Teachers, particularly in smaller communities removed from metropolitan centers, lack not only an adequate knowledge of the material they teach and a solid grounding in the theories which point to the methods most appropriate for teaching that material, they also - and particularly so in non-orthodox settings - do not accept or observe the beliefs and practices they attempt to transmit to their students.

It is important to note that an all too high number of those engaged in Jewish education of all kinds and at all levels are part-time personnel. This is less a function of commitment and interest than a consequence of the way in which the enterprise is organized. The overwhelming majority of children enrolled in Jewish schools in the United States are "part time" pupils in "part-time" schools. Only a combination of jobs - a day school and an afternoon school or a weekday school and a weekend school - brings a teacher, and sometimes even an administrator, close to what might reasonably be considered full time employment. These circumstances make it difficult to create a sense of professionalism, both among practitioners and the public they serve. Whether or not training can change the image even while the structure remains the same is, it seems to me, an important question.

Questions of structure and organization are outside the scope of this paper. The concern here is to remedy the lack of Jewish knowledge and skills of pedagogy which characterize a troublesome proportion of those engaged in Jewish education. No less important is the matter of the educator as a person - the personal behavior and attitudes he/she brings to the tasks of Jewish education. Employment patterns which offer entry to unqualified personnel and provide only part-time work for even the properly trained cannot, however, be altogether ignored. Why should anyone who works in such circumstances make an

investment of time, effort and probably money as well to acquire new knowledge and skills? What might be appropriate incentives?

II. A program of in-service training for teachers, not unlike pre-service programs, must be based on a conception of the domains of knowledge which constitute the basis of professional teaching. Despite some differences about detail, there is today a general agreement regarding the basic elements of "teaching knowledge:"

1. Content knowledge
2. General pedagogical knowledge, including principles and strategies for classroom organization and management
3. Curriculum knowledge, including materials and programs
4. Pedagogical content knowledge, an amalgam of content and pedagogy that is teachers' special form of professional understanding
5. Knowledge of learners and their characteristics
6. Knowledge of educational contexts, including the characteristics of classrooms, schools, communities, and cultures
7. Knowledge of educational ends, purposes, and values, and their philosophical and historical grounds

In addition discussions about the knowledge base for teaching have begun to emphasize the importance of helping teachers develop a reflective stance toward teaching. Similarly thought should be given to creating settings which provide opportunities for practice under supervision.

In-service training for teachers in Jewish schools can be organized in at least two

ways: 1) programs which lead to a degree from an accredited institution; 2) short-term programs of varying time span which planfully deal with various aspects of the "teaching knowledge base." The first is preferable if for no other reason than the way in which a degree contributes to the image of the Jewish teacher; the second seems more feasible and likely of implementation. The full benefits of that alternative demand long-term planning which views particular courses, workshops and other learning experiences as part of an embracive conception which systematically engages teachers with the different domains of the "knowledge base" of teaching.

III. Programs of in-service training intended to enrich the knowledge base of teachers in Jewish schools do not require new institutions. The available resources include: Colleges of Jewish Studies, central agencies of Jewish education, general universities, professional organizations and, conceivably, Israel's Open University. The Colleges and the central agencies currently conduct in-service programs for school personnel in their immediate vicinity. In the case of central agencies, participation is sometimes limited to personnel serving in schools located in the geographic area served by the Federation with which the agency is affiliated. To my knowledge there is no reliable data available regarding these programs - their content and form, the target populations and number of participants, intended purposes and actual effect. <u>It seems to me that "Building A Profession" might well investigate this area of activity - not only to get a picture of what is going on but also in order to think about improving practice. The vast majority of Jewish educators are located in the areas directly served by these institutions.</u>

The centers of Jewish life in the United States are surrounded by smaller

communities which do not have easy access to either a College or central agencies, even though they are often located in places where there is a general college or university. In-service training for personnel in these communities - together they count approximately 20% of the total Jewish population in the United States - requires a special effort.

The Colleges of Jewish Studies should be placed at the center of the effort to reach these smaller communities - the other agencies mentioned above are resources to be used when occasion dictates. In-service training can be conceived as a partnership based on a contractual agreement between a College and a community or communities. The active role of the community is critical - recruitment, provision of incentives, public recognition; it is unlikely that many teachers on their own will respond to a general announcement of an in-service program in another community. The Colleges for their part may perhaps require some prodding; the expansion of their activities into the area of in-service programs would strain reflectively meager resources. Both the communities and the Colleges need an intervener from the outside - CIJE?

The design of a program requires careful attention. Even in a small community there may be different populations - those who want to work for a degree and others who look to periodic participation in short term seminars or institutes. Questions of venue are critical - how much of the instruction will take place in the community and how much at the College. The formats of instruction similarly require consideration - courses as organized in regular college settings, modules of concentrated time spread out over a semester, a higher percentage of independent study than is ordinarily the case, etc. Perhaps we need to study similar efforts in general education - not just for educational personnel but training for all manner of occupation and profession.

The increasing importance currently ascribed to the pedagogic practices component of the "knowledge base" suggests that a College designate a school in its vicinity as a professional development institution. I will not here describe in detail all that is involved in the creation of such a setting. I raise the matter to call attention to the fact that significant improvement in the quality of instruction in Jewish schools is unlikely without a serious investment in pedagogic training.

I think we must also examine the use of technology in in-service programs. Indeed efforts to reach teachers in outlying communities must remain small scale and high cost labor intensive without the techniques of the technology of distance education.

Cleveland is a case point. The College of Jewish Studies is currently involved in discussions with a number of communities regarding in-service training for teachers. Without additions to faculty the spread of the effort is necessarily limited; even were faculty available, there remains the question of how much time an instructor should or can spend "on the road." The traditional patterns of adding to faculty do not seem to me to be adequate to the task of providing high quality, ongoing - not one shot deals - in-service training to personnel in outlying communities. Technology currently available can help overcome this problem. Indeed it is possible to think of a "national" faculty - instructors from similar institutions all over the United States engaged in a common project of in-service training.

IV. The Cleveland College of Jewish Studies has, as indicated, initiated contact with a number of communities in its hinterland in order to explore the possibility of collaborative efforts in in-service training. The willingness of the institution to

engage in such activity recommends it as the site for a pilot program. Steps should be taken to establish a formal relationship between the College and CIJE for the purpose of designing a format of in-service training for teachers along the lines described above.

Dr. Walter I. Ackerman

April 1995

Cleveland, Ohio

69C

REFORMING JEWISH EDUCATION*

A recent publication of the Jewish Education Service of North America (JESNA) reports that "...many communities in recent years have been examining the roles, functions and service, and structure of their communal service bodies for Jewish education. In some communities, major changes in the mission, organization structure and funding of these institutions has been proposed and in some cases already implemented. At the same time, other communities are seeking to strengthen their existing communal service bodies or to establish new instrumentalities."[1]

An elaboration of that statement which a) describes the traditional functions of communal agencies for Jewish education, b) notes and tries to explain the reasons for the current review of those functions, and c) reports on the results of that examination can provide a useful framework for detailing developments in Jewish education in the United States since the start of the present decade.

Communal offices of Jewish education, variously known as a bureau, board or agency, are an institutional expression of the idea that the community bears a major responsibility and should play a significant role, not unlike municipal, state and federal governments in public education, in the complex process of transmitting Jewish culture, however defined, from one generation to another.[2] The first such agency - the Bureau of

---

* I gladly take this opportunity to thank colleagues all over the United States for their gracious response to my many requests for information and material regarding the work of the institutions with which they are associated. I am particularly indebted to Mark Gurvis, Managing Director of the Jewish Education Center of Cleveland, for his patient explanations of the work of the Continuity Commission of that community and for sharing with me his intimate knowledge of the process which led from the establishment of the Commission to the implementation of its recommendations.

Jewish Education of the Kehillah of New York City - was established in 1910. Judah Magnes and his associates in the leadership of the Kehillah thought the creation of the Bureau rather than direct grants to existing schools the most effective possible use of $50,000 contributed by Jacob Schiff to the Kehillah for "the improvement and promoting of Jewish religious primary education in the city.[3]" The program and activities of the New York Bureau forged a pattern which was the model for the work of similar agencies, subsequently established in cities all over the United States and Canada.[4]

These agencies worked mainly with schools. Only rarely were they involved with informal education - camps, youth groups, weekend retreats, trips to Israel. The concentration on formal schooling is easily explained: the literary character of the Jewish religious tradition and the centrality of learning in that tradition leads inevitably to according the school and its "deliberate, systematic and sustained effort" pride of place among educational settings. Knowledge is the key to practice and the avenue of identification.

Over the years central agencies, particularly those in larger cities, have moved away from direct involvement with schools. Where once they expended resources on supervision, setting standards and evaluation, today they see themselves in a supportive role which provides resources and consultations to schools and other educational institutions. While some of them conduct schools - communal day schools or high schools and largely in smaller communities - most are involved in planning activities, gathering data, advocacy, professional growth programs, resource dissemination and services to teachers and principals.[5] The Association of Jewish Communal Education Agencies in North America, a recently organized group, defines its member bodies as the "...local community's hub for educational advocacy, central services, communication, planning and administration...[they] must work with all interested parties and across

denominational and disciplinary lines...the agency [is] the primary focus for the synthesis of theory, planning and practice in Jewish education."

Communal Talmudei Torah, when they existed, and later congregational mid-week afternoon and one-day-a-week schools have been the core constituency of bureaus, if for no other reason than that they are the overwhelming majority of Jewish schools in the United States. The growth of day schools challenged central agencies to develop new services and competencies.

Communal education agencies around the country are organized in different ways and occupy different places in the structure of the communal apparatus. In some places the educational arm of the community is an autonomous agency with its own independent board. In others it is a functional committee of the Federation; the degree of autonomy the agency enjoys under this arrangement varies from community to community. Neither of these models is a considered conclusion drawn from the assumptions of either organizational or educational theory. By and large they are rooted in communal history and a skein of personal relationships. There is no evidence at all which indicates that one pattern, or a variant thereof, provides more effective delivery of services than the other.

Even though some communal educational agencies raise money on their own, their funding comes almost completely from the local federation and is subject to the demands of the allocation process. Despite this critical factor, federations have only rarely been involved in any meaningful way in the governance of the educational agency and even less in the practical aspects of its day to day work. Indeed the two often viewed one another, no matter the formal relationship between them, as belonging to two different, if not hostile, worlds. Recent developments in Jewish education, particularly on the level of policy and planning, have changed the patterns detailed here.

II

In the last five years the organized Jewish community has accorded Jewish education, or perhaps more properly the task of keeping Jews within the fold, a prominence quite unmatched in the history of American Jewry. The findings of the National Jewish Population Survey of 1990[6] and its dismaying statistics of intermarriage rates are cited by many as the proximate cause of the new interest in education. The celebration of Jewish achievement in the United States, most markedly observed in Charles Silberman's A Certain People,[7] was necessarily muted in the light of the increasingly large percentage of young Jewish people who chose to marry non-Jews and withdraw from Jewish life.

The wave of concern which washed over Jewish life in this country in the first half of the present decade had actually begun its flow several years earlier. The report of the Joint Federation/Plenum Commission on Jewish Continuity, published in 1988 at the conclusion of a process which had begun three years earlier in Cleveland, reflects the concern of a major Jewish community for its future - "Now that we are free to be Jews, how can we be sure that we will remain Jews, and what kind of Jews will we be." The Commission on the Jewish Future of Los Angeles, created in 1988, gave voice to a similar concern when it noted that "The primary motivations for the establishment of the Commission were the deeply troubling statistics as well as our awareness and concern that intermarriage is increasing at an alarming rate, that ever fewer Jewish children receive a Jewish education, [that] affiliation with Jewish religious and communal/philanthropic organizations is dropping and that the sense of identification with Jewish history, tradition, religion and community diminishes with each generation."[8]

The Cleveland Commission on Jewish Continuity, generally considered the first of its kind, was convened in 1985 by the lay and professional leadership of the local federation "...to strengthen Jewish continuity and identity."[9] The primary goals of the commission were, among others, "To raise the level of consciousness, promote a community dialogue and serve as an advocate for programs that promote Jewish continuity ... To create an atmosphere conducive to the implementation of a sound program, including formal/informal educational strategy ... that uses an interdisciplinary, inter-agency approach and makes the best possible use of communal resources and expertise...[and] to help identify the financial resources for the implementation of these models."

The work of the Commission was guided by a number of assumptions, the most important of which is "... that we must recognize that traditional supplementary Jewish school education can no longer approach the unrealistic expectations of the past. Our community must refocus its efforts on strengthening the ability of each school and congregation to integrate parent and family education into the experience of each family that enters its doorway. We must integrate proven "beyond the classroom" education programs into each child's Jewish education experience. We must enhance the ability of our day schools to provide intensive Jewish educational experiences."[10] When translated into the language of practice, that statement was taken to mean that a) "the community must invest significantly to build a Jewish education profession; b) each child should have opportunities for educational experiences that provide a Jewish living environment...retreats, Israel trips, summer camps, and other 'beyond the classroom' programs and because Jewish schooling for children can succeed only if supported in the home environment, c) parents...need more tools and skills than their own childhood Jewish education afforded them ... if they are to represent Jewish values, attitudes and behaviors to their children."[11]

The major recommendations of the report of the Commission were formulated by three separate task forces - one dedicated to Beyond the Classroom Education, another charged with Parent and Family Education, and a third which dealt with personnel. Conceived as an integrated whole, the proposed initiatives included:*

Cleveland Fellows -- The College of Jewish Studies will develop a graduate program in Jewish education for students from Cleveland and elsewhere. The faculty and students will be engaged in study, teaching, and program development, within congregations, schools, and agencies. They will raise the level and quality of the local field of Jewish education and lead to positive ramifications beyond Cleveland.

Fellows Graduates Positions -- The graduates of the Cleveland Fellows program will be hired to fill many of the new positions in new area mandated by the Commission on Jewish Continuity. The positions will include congregational family educators, retreat specialists, master teachers, school directors, and others.

In-Service Education Package -- The Bureau of Jewish Education and College of Jewish Studies will develop a program of individualized professional growth and in-service education to guide teachers already working throughout the community.

---

* I give the descriptions of the programs as they appear in the report. I do so not only for their content but also to provide a sense of the rhetoric, an important part of the work of the Commission.

The Personal Growth Plan starts with individual teachers at their various levels of experience, knowledge, and commitment, and helps lead them to degrees, licensure, or other advances in professional preparation. In addition, the community will implement teacher and institutional stipends to encourage participation in teacher education programs.

IISP -- The Israel Incentive Savings Plan attracts 100 new enrollments each year. The potential for additional growth is tremendous. The community will now approach recruitment differently, targeting specific congregations and schools to develop school-based trips that go hand-in-hand with IISP enrollment. This should dramatically increase the number of Cleveland youth who will have an Israel experience. Also, the shares of funding by the family, the school, and the community will be increased to reflect the current cost of Israel trips.

Curriculum Renewal -- Many of the community's schools operate with out-dated or ineffective curriculum. Also, new family education, Israel studies, and "beyond the classroom" education programs should be integrated into school programs. The Bureau's pilot program, Project Curriculum Renewal, should be expanded to work with each school on this critical concern.

Congregational Enrichment Fund Expansion -- This fund has enabled the congregations to develop important new programs in recent years in the areas of parent and family education, and "beyond the classroom" education. Funding has decreased since the program was initiated in 1982. An expansion of funds is now recommended to enable congregations to increase programming.

The total cost of implementing the recommended programs over a four year period was estimated at $5,687,422.[12]

Within a short time, communities all over the country initiated processes similar to that followed in Cleveland. Continuity, a term coined by deliberate choice*, became a slogan not unlike others used so effectively by federations in fund raising campaigns. A survey conducted in 1993 among 158 Jewish communities elicited 67 responses; of this number, 42 reported that they "... had created a community wide planning process (whether through a special commission or task force or through the work of an ongoing body) on Jewish continuity, identity and/or education."[13] Among the issues identified by respondents we find "[the] ability to identify and reach the unaffiliated; avoiding duplication of efforts by congregations, agencies and institutions [and] reaching consensus regarding priorities and/or special initiatives (e.g. a community in which there was some feeling that there was too much emphasis on the Israel Experience)"[14]

The reports of the various commissions and committees are strikingly the same, not a surprise considering their provenance. An analysis of sixteen mission statements discloses that Jewish continuity means different things in different places.[15] In some communities continuity was equated with Jewish education, values and culture; in others it was comprehended as ensuring the vitality of the Jewish community; another group thought of it as promoting the Jewish identity of individuals. The content of the various reports is arguably less important than the process of deliberation they reflect. Hundreds of people all over the country were engaged in serious discussions about the maintenance of Jewish life. The participants were by and large already engaged in

---

* Private communication from a member of the Cleveland Commission. It was felt that a more evocative symbolic sign than education was needed in order to marshal the resources, both in personnel and finance, required by the proposed programs.

communal affairs. They were chosen ad hominum or served as institutional/organizational representatives.

The inclusionary character of the idea of continuity brought synagogues into the process, both as participants in determining policy and in planning and as beneficiaries of implementations. The Cleveland commission was a coalition of federation professionals and lay people of the Congregational Plenum, the organization of the city's synagogues. This is a departure from traditional federation practice; the new alliance was a breach in the wall which divided between "church and state." It was also a belated recognition of the fact that synagogues are where you find people, their children and the schools they attend.[16]

While I doubt that there is any direct connection, the documents produced by the various commissions call to mind reports dealing with public education in the United States which appeared in 1983. The best known of these was A Nation at Risk.[17] A consideration of the various reports raises issues pertinent to efforts to improve Jewish education - a tendency to underestimate the complexity of the educational process; the failure to involve teachers and other professional educators in the deliberative process; the need to maintain public interest and avoid disenchantment; the necessity of continual attention to the structure of the decision making process.[18]

The move from the determination of policy through planning and finally to implementation raises important questions of governance - who will oversee the new programs recommended and funded by a Continuity Commission? In some cities the task was assigned to the already existing communal agency for Jewish education. In others the central agency was reorganized and federation assumed a major role in its operation. Cleveland is an example of this approach; the Bureau of Jewish Education has been replaced by the Jewish Education Center of Cleveland, an agency jointly

managed by a professional educator and a federation executive. The new entity was created in order to "institutionalize the work of the Commission on Jewish Continuity in the organizational life of the community." More specifically it was believed that federation involvement in the day to day details and management of the community's educational system would keep top leadership involved, guarantee the continuation of the planning process begun by the commission and facilitate coordination between the central educational Jewish agencies of the city.* It is obvious that the federation has here taken on an operational responsibility for an educational agency - a new and sometimes controversial role.

The prodding of federations, sometimes bitterly resisted by long-time lay and professional supporters of bureaus, has led to the reorganization of central agencies in several cities. Striving for a more equitable distribution of community funding has led in Detroit to the replacement of the United Hebrew Schools, perhaps the only real communal system of education in the country, by the Agency for Jewish Education; the Chicago Board of Jewish Education is now the Community Foundation for Jewish Education; significant structural changes - all of them guaranteeing federation a prominent role - have also taken place in Baltimore and Atlanta.

The proposal for the reorganization of the Chicago Board of Jewish Education, long one of the country's leading central agencies, reflects a widely shared perception - "... we need a communal entity with the capacity to: lead a reassessment of the traditional supplementary school model; generate a sense of excitement about Jewish education in

---

* The reference is to the Cleveland College of Jewish Studies and the Jewish Community Center of Cleveland which together with the Bureau (now the JECC) are considered the major communal agencies. Note the parity given the JCC.

the community; create enthusiasm for Jewish involvement among students and their families; and attract top leadership and substantial new resources."[19] A change in structure and governance was deemed an essential condition for the attainment of these objectives, the difficulty of assessment notwithstanding.

The internal organization of the new bodies is less important than the functions they are assigned. The example of the proposals in Chicago is instructive: The new "Community Foundation for Jewish Education will be disassociated from operating responsibilities for Jewish education ... it will not be part of a delivery system ... although it may undertake experimental or demonstration projects." The traditional service activities of the Board will be transferred to other agencies. The new Foundation will engage in " ... coordinating events, ... planning and priority setting; constituency building (or advocacy for Jewish education) and the development of new sources of funds for Jewish education."[20] The plan of governance of the foundation includes a board consisting of representatives of the Board of Jewish Education, Chicago Federation of the Union of American Hebrew Congregations, the Jewish Federation of Chicago, the Midwest Region of the Federation of Reconstructionist Congregations and Havurot, and the Midwest Region of the United Synagogue of Conservative Judaism.

Yet another model of implementation is the Jewish Continuity Commission of the New York U.J.A.-Federation established in 1993. An outcome of a Strategic Plan, the commission administers a Grants Program and is engaged in a major effort." ... to increase the number of teens participating in Israel Experience programs." During the 1994-95 year the Commission, a new entity with no formal connection to the New York Board of Jewish Education, will spend over $900,000 for scholarships, strengthening marketing and partnerships with 39 congregations which seek to establish a "Gift of Israel" as the "gift of choice" for children and their families at Bar/Bat Mitzvah" The total budget for the agency for 1994-95 was 2.2 million. Twenty one grants were

awarded to enable " ... a number of institutions to undertake initiatives to strengthen (if not transform) themselves as settings for Jewish living and learning." Among the recipients of the grants were the Hillel Foundation at Hofstra University for an outreach initiative, the Board of Jewish Education of Greater New York for the development of a Jewish Family Education Training Program, the Jewish Community Center of Staten Island for a five-year plan for varied programs designed to strengthen Jewish content throughout the Center, and the National Jewish Outreach Program to create opportunities in at least ten Hebrew schools for parents and children to study Hebrew simultaneously. The Commission directs its grants primarily toward institutions which serve the "marginally affiliated" - families with children, college students, singles and young adults and new Americans. It plans to develop a design for the assessment of the designated projects in order " ... to learn more about what is required to achieve institutional change."

Experience in Boston is also worth noting. The Commission on Jewish Continuity in that city is an agency of the Combined Jewish Philanthropies which is funded from the income of restricted gifts and the establishment of endowment funds. The role of the commission, a new player on the educational scene, is best described as "enabling" - its funds and support have made possible the Jewish Family Education Initiative, a two year certificate program for training Family Educators run by the Hebrew College of Boston. A similar pattern - providing existing agencies with the means necessary for the development of new programs - is evident in the Youth Education Initiative Pilot Project, a program managed by the Bureau of Jewish Education and the Synagogue Council of Massachusetts, which is intended to enrich programming for youth and to raise the level of expertise of professional youth workers in the community. Me'ah, an adult Jewish literary program, likewise utilizes already available resources.

What I have brought thus far permits the following summary and comments:*

1. Problems and their solutions are defined by individuals with particular perspectives. Training, experience and the need to maintain position condition perspectives and determine reactions. The programs and shifts in organization I have discussed are all first order changes - they deal with what exists and ask only how it can be made more efficient and effective. Just as in public education, this approach draws its understandings from the concern with product in the corporate world. There is no indication in the hundreds of pages of reports, based on countless hours of discussion, that anyone questioned the assumptions or principles which guide educational efforts in the Jewish community today or seriously examined the possibility that the problems of our times can be solved, if at all, only by altering the way all those engaged in Jewish education conceive and perform their roles.

   There is, for example, a disturbing discrepancy between the laudable efforts of federations to achieve some degree of coordination between the various educational agencies and institutions in the community and the absence of any significant effort in training institutions - teacher-training, rabbinical seminaries and schools of communal service - and in-service programs to provide students and practitioners with the understandings needed for the networking and interactions with disparate professionals and distinct competencies which are essential to the implementation of an embracive communal educational strategy.

---

* Much of what I bring here is based on interviews with educators and federation executives in several cities.

On another level, it is a known but little acted upon fact that the structure of the congregational supplementary school prevents the possibility of full time employment for teachers. Training which prepares students for classroom teaching only meets neither the future economic needs of the student nor the demands posed by the increasingly variegated pattern of educational activities in the synagogue. Programs of professional preparation would more wisely serve their student by thinking in terms of the multiplicity of tasks which graduates will be required to perform upon entering the field.

2. Jewish education in the United States today enjoys a level of interest and funding without parallel in the history of the American Jewish community. Both the interest and the funding are fueled by the statistics of intermarriage and disaffiliation. The data have shaped educational strategies. The key words are identity and identification rather than Talmud Torah.

3. Jewish education is now comprehended in much broader terms than has been the case in the past. The perceived failures of the supplementary school - the standards of measurement are rarely defined - and the conviction that its work must be buttressed by "beyond the classroom" activities has raised informal education to a level of parity, if not higher, with formal schooling. One third of the grants distributed by the UJA Federation Jewish Continuity Commission of New York were awarded to programs in community centers. Jewish Family Education ranks high on the agenda; investments in camping and retreat programs create opportunities for providing youngsters with the experience of "Jewish living" unavailable in their homes; and above all, the Israel Experience - a tacit admission that the American Jewish community by itself is unable to guarantee an adequate quality of Jewish life.

Identity formation and the nurturance of identification are legitimate goals of education, at least according to some educational theories. It is difficult, if not foolish, to deny the important role that experience plays in these developmental processes. What is less clear, however, is the way in which Continuity Commission documents perceive the place of "knowing" on the road which leads to a sense of self and one's relationship to the collective. It is not always obvious that "beyond the classroom" activities lead back to the kind of learning essential to an adequate understanding of Judaism and its traditions.

There is now a new configuration of Jewish education; institutions not previously considered educational - or at least not seriously so - are now part of a network of agencies that are expected to interact with one another and with the larger Jewish community. Within that broadened framework, school people and others associated with formal education are no longer the sole educational authorities of the community. That change in status has not been easily assimilated. More than that, the call for "reform" implies that those charged with certain educational responsibilities have not met communal expectations. Continuity commissions and their counterparts that have not involved school people in their deliberations, as is the case in several communities, have done little to enhance the status of the profession, a step considered critical to renewal.

The urge to "reform" always stands on the thin line which separates between formative criticism and the undermining of public confidence. The critique of the supplementary school, so common a feature of Continuity Commission reports, even if not intended for that purpose, places personnel identified with that kind of institution in an intolerable position. The declaration of failure easily leads to doubting the possibility of rehabilitation, no matter the intensity of effort.

4. The reorganization of the structure of Jewish education, as distinct from the work of line units like schools, community centers and camps, is driven by federations. While federation interest, advocacy and support of Jewish education is welcomed in all quarters - no one would deny the incomparable ability of a federation to galvanize an entire community - its more active involvement in the day to day activities of communal educational agencies has spawned a literature of concern, and even complaint.

There is a history of antagonism between federation loyalists, professional and lay alike, and Jewish education professionals, increasingly and today almost completely associated with religious institutions. Together with the feeling of never having been adequately appreciated and funded by federations, Jewish educators remember the agencies principled, and often unreasonable opposition to day schools and the use of communal funds to support them. Significant changes in postures and shifts in pattens of allocation have not entirely erased notions which claim that federations are more interested in hospitals than in schools and that many of the activities they support contribute little to maintaining Jewish life. Indeed some arguments maintain that the emphasis on informal education is less an outcome of empirical evidence of their effectiveness and more an attempt by federations to highlight the area of their expertise and maintain control.

Federation involvement in education has also given rise to discussions about "organizational cultures." There are those who fear that the purposes, attitudes, values, language and behaviors of federations clash with those of educational institutions, particularly when those are embedded in the life of a synagogue community. They each have different goals and serve a different kind of

clientele - givens which condition internal priorities and external postures. Federations are primarily concerned with providing goods and services for Jews; educational institutions are dedicated to "... creating communities of Jewish learning."[21] The functions of federations require compromise and consensus; the purpose of education in a free, democratic society is to motivate autonomy. These differences will neither change nor disappear; the task is rather that of forging patterns of contact and cooperation which use the strengths of each to create new opportunities for educating.

No matter the relative influence of each of the participating institutions - federations, bureaus, schools and synagogues - the introduction of change in educational systems remains a complicated matter. Educational programs mandated from above - as is the case in most reported programs - are rarely as effective as hoped. The links in the chain which connects idea and practice are weak, even in systems for more formally structured than Jewish education. The work of the individual assigned the task of implementation - classroom teacher, youth activities director, family educator - is by its nature isolated and beyond the correcting influence of even enlightened supervision.

5. The "continuity process" has, at least in intention, challenged the assumption that the communal structure, as represented by federations and the synagogue world are two separate domains.[22] The recognition that " ... Jewish continuity is inextricably tied to Jewish religion and spirituality and that congregations must be part of the process through which we address challenges"[23] has gained ground and changed the landscape of communal activity in education. The commission in Cleveland was a joint effort of federation and the Congregational Plenum; five congregations were among the beneficiaries of grants in New York.

The emerging relationship between federation and synagogues lends credence to the position which holds that " ... effective education takes place in settings where ideological references are strongly expressed in practice and life style. One cannot have effective Jewish education without denominational perspectives which provide a base for induction"[24] At the same time, religious bodies fear that newly available funding will be used primarily to support Jewish educational programs sponsored and directed by federations.

6. It is not clear that communities around the country have devoted sufficient attention to developing criteria which order priorities. The increase in the variety of educational settings eligible for communal funding does not mean that all of them are equally capable of achieving desired outcomes. Some knowledgeable observers question the wisdom of investments in programs for the marginally affiliated or outreach activity in the direction of those not at all connected. They maintain that "pay-offs" are more likely when resources are applied to those already committed.

The minutes of a meeting in one community are instructive:

> *Weiss (Orthodox):* Why are we doing this prioritizing? What does voting on priorities mean? Does it mean how dollars will be spent? Or does it just mean how things are valued? For example, trips to Israel, which everyone valued high, versus day schools. Trips to Israel might be valued high, but that doesn't mean that a great deal of money should be spent on them.
>
> *Yitzchak Weinstein (an educator):* Note the emphasis on the word *schooling*. this is formal education. Then there is also communal education. And informal education ... isn't' Israel a school in itself? All three -

schooling, communal and informal - should be integrated. Let's deal with these issues by going through specific recommendations...

Jerome Orenstein (a traditional religious non-Orthodox leader): I think there is a continuum, formal and informal. One is not more important than the other. The valuation here is that all are equal.

Silver (chair): Don't worry about money yet.

Weiss [to those around him]: But that's what it is all about.

Silver [he reads]: "Increase salaries and benefits": day schools will come in with a proposal that fits in. But there could be someone defined as a teacher at the Jewish Community Center.

Hammerman (Orthodox): Formal and informal education are not the ends of a continuum. They are different.

Silver: Let's avoid dividing up into formal and informal. Doing that would lead to conflict, no decision, no consensus....[25]

7. The goals of the continuity process are all too often too broadly stated. There is no way of ever "knowing" whether or not they have been achieved. At the same time there is in some places a naive expectation of immediately visible results - "After all the money we've put into that place, why doesn't my grandchild like Hebrew school?" Goals should be formulated in a manner which permits measurement and the identification of the effects of an intervention.

III

An account of developments in Jewish education in the United States today must consider the increasingly visible role played by private family foundations. One observer estimates that Jewish sponsored foundations in this country spin off approximately $500 million a year.[26] There is even a suggestion that " ... within a few years the total amount of money given away by endowment funds and family foundations will exceed the total dollar amount from the annual campaigns of federations.[27]

Private foundations, an expression of the volunteerism deTocqueville found so impressive and also of the Protestant ethic of stewardship, play an important role in American society. That example, together with the Jewish tradition of *Tzedakah*, guaranteed the creation of Jewish family foundations once sufficient wealth had been accumulated. Critics of private foundations complain that they are capable of influencing public policy without paying the price of accountability. The truth of that charge must be weighed against the fact that the freedom enjoyed by foundations permits risk-taking and a margin for experimentation and innovation not easily matched by established institutions tied to the consensus policies of communal funding. A student of American philanthropic foundations wisely notes that "The only total mistakes which a foundation can make are in its investment policy, not in its granting policy..."[28]

It is , of course, impossible to list here all those foundations which award grants to educators and educational institutions or to list the activities they support. Several of them, however, have achieved a special prominence. The Crown Family Foundation, for example, working together with JESNA, which administers the program, has established the Covenant Awards and Grants. The Awards go to individual educators in

recognition of "excellence, effectiveness and creativity". A member of the family describes the purpose of the awards in less official terms: " ... to locate talent and provide it with some venture capital or a little time in the limelight and some breathing space and mobility."[29] The grants are made available to institutions " ... to provide seed funding...to develop and implement significant and cost effective approaches to Jewish education that are potentially replicable..." The program receives as many as 400 proposals a year.

The configuration of Jewish education has been altered also by the work of two other foundations. The Wexner Graduate Fellowship Program is dedicated to attracting " ... promising men and women into professional leadership careers in Jewish education, Jewish communal service, the rabbinate and cantorate and Jewish studies. "The Fellowships cover all tuition costs and fees of the schools of choice and also provide annual stipends. At this point we do not know whether the program has attracted young people previously not committed to careers in the Jewish "civil service" or whether it serves those who have already made the choice. One of the original Wexner programs, now discontinued, provided institutional grants for graduate professional schools and training programs in order to " ... stimulate improvement in the core curricula of those institutions which train professionals for service in the Jewish community". The Foundation ..." particularly [sought] to encourage more effective communication among the various denominations and professional groups within the organized Jewish community." Grants amounted to as much as $75,000 a year for a maximum of three years.

The decision of the Wexner Foundation to concentrate its efforts in one area - leadership for the Jewish community - is intended to avoid the dangers of "scatterization" - the dilution of effect which results when relatively small sums of money are awarded to a large number of individuals and institutions that lack any evident connection with one

another. That same policy has been followed by the Bronfman family which believes that " ... if you want to change something, you'd better narrow your focus ... get down to something that you really can accomplish."[30] The CRB Foundation has made the Israel Experience its primary focus and in addition to the summer program in Israel which it operates, the foundation is a major factor in efforts to reach an exponential increase in the number of young people who will spend time in the Jewish state as an integral part of their Jewish education.

The Israel Experience, whether sponsored by local institutions and agencies working together with national organizations and offices in Israel or "sold" by private entrepreneurs has gained a prominent place on the map of Jewish education. I will not here attempt an analysis of its educational significance. I will, however, note that the expectations of transformation attached to programs in Israel are sometimes unrealistic.

While the foundations I have mentioned thus far are interested in changing American Jewish education, they have chosen to work through individuals and single institutions, or a consortium of institutions, without addressing themselves to systemic issues. The Mandel Associated Foundations has chosen a different role. From the convening of the Commission on Jewish Education in North America, together with the Jewish Welfare Board and JESNA in collaboration with the Council of Jewish Federations, to the activities of the Council for Initiatives in Jewish Education (CIJE), a product of the deliberations of the Commission,[31] the foundation has addressed itself to developing a strategic design for the systemic change of Jewish education. The areas of CIJE concern - building the profession of Jewish education, mobilizing community support, and developing a research capacity - are testimony to the broad scope of the undertaking.

The Lead Community project is the major CIJE activity to date. It is an interesting and instructive example of the way in which an independent agency, unrelated in any formal

way to communal organizations nor constrained by their investment in what is, can mobilize an entire community in the name of Jewish education.[32] The project also demonstrates the ways in which goodwill and influence rather than authority work in a voluntary system.

Aided by the support and consultation services provided by CIJE, the three lead communities - Atlanta, Baltimore and Milwaukee - were chosen from among 23 applicants - are intended to provide an example of " ... what can happen when there is an infusion of outstanding personnel into the educational system, when the importance of Jewish education is recognized by the community and its leadership, and when the necessary funds are secured to meet additional costs." The design of the project requires that each community articulate communal goals for education and develop pilot programs which will be monitored and evaluated. One of the major functions of CIJE is to disseminate the information gained from the work of the Lead Communities and to encourage the replication of these efforts in other places. Indeed the publications of CIJE to date[33] are already an important contribution. The entire enterprise is guided by the assumptions that systemic change requires a community wide effort rather than innovations in individual programs and institutions.

The work plan of CIJE calls to mind the activities of the Fund for the Advancement of education established by the Ford Foundation in 1951. During the 16 years of its existence the fund disbursed more than 70 million dollars. Conceiving of itself as a source of "risk capital" to be used in trying out new approaches to public education, the fund chose three areas of concentration: improving the quality of educational personnel, improving the quality of educational programs and improving the relationships between educational institutions and society. The press release of April 30, 1967 which announced the conclusion of the program of the Fund and the integration of its activities with those of the Ford Foundation state that " ... the Fund has sought to encourage

practical and effective change in the form of new and better educational practices. It has had the satisfaction of seeing ideas which it assisted on a pilot basis widely adopted in the schools and colleges. Team teaching, use of teacher aides, institutional television, programmed learning, new methods of preparing teachers, cooperative work study programs, early childhood education and enrichment of school programs in deprived areas are examples ... the Foundation itself will keep open wide the door and keep strong the hand of support for good ideas to advance education and for the imaginative people to strengthen education.[34]

It is still too soon to assess the impact of the efforts of CIJE; that is the case also regarding the efforts of the other foundations. Graduates of the Wexner Fellowship programs have not yet been in the field long enough to permit judgement; in any event it will be difficult to tease out the influence of the financial aid and participation in the programs and seminars sponsored by the foundation itself. We have no record of the long term effects of the projects funded by the Covenant grants. It is important to realize that there are some things we will never know; the very rightness of the intention which accompanies the support should supply sufficient warrant for its continuation. We <u>can</u> say that the generosity of the foundations has inspired imaginative efforts and a great deal of thought about how to <u>do</u> Jewish education. The art of writing a proposal creates opportunities for the kind of reflection without which education cannot rise above the ordinary.

IV

The consensus regarding the importance of the recruiting, training and retention of talented young people for the field of Jewish education turns attention to training institutions. The Wexner Foundation, the Covenant Grants and the CIJE committee for

"Building the Profession" have all recognized their importance. A variety of programs are planned to strengthen their faculties, enrich their programs and augment their training capability. The recent gift of $15,000,000 to the Jewish Theological Seminary for its School of Education in perhaps a breakthrough which will encourage contributions to other schools.

The traditional training role of teachers colleges, Colleges of Jewish Studies and the schools of education of rabbinical seminaries has recently been modified by an initiative undertaken by the Rhea Hirsch School of Education of the Hebrew Union College - Jewish Institute of Religion in Los Angeles in cooperation with the Commission on Jewish Education of the Union of American Hebrew Congregations and the help of the Cummings Foundation. The Experiment in Congregational Education is an effort to encourage a small number of Reform congregations " ... to rethink and restructure the full range of their educational programs as they affect all age groups. Its ultimate goal is to widen the definition of education in the congregational setting and to assist congregations in their efforts to transform themselves into learning communities." The assumption of the experiment is that the bifurcation which separates the school from the rest of the congregation and its activities is an obstacle to educational effectiveness which must be removed. It is not my purpose here to discuss the details of the program. The point is to note a major departure from a traditional role. A training institution has moved out of a narrow frame and moved into the field in order to effect a radical change in the institutions to which it sends its graduates.

A similar purpose informs the work of the Cleveland Fellows, a program of the Cleveland College of Jewish Studies initiated and funded by the community's Continuity Commission. Participants in the program are trained as family educators and mainly work in congregational settings both during and after the completion of their studies. While not as elaborate as the Experiment in Congregational Education in

either design or implementation, the Cleveland Fellows Program seeks also to make learning the business of the entire congregation.

Discussions about the role of the training institutions make but passing mention of their place and function in the development in a research capability of the service of Jewish education. While research in general education has much to teach us and can provide paradigms of inquiry, the particular demands of Jewish education warrant a particularistic effort. Broadening the area of their activities to include research will enhance the academic stature of the training institutions and brighten the image of the profession.

V

I have elsewhere dealt with the organization and structure of Jewish education in North America.[35] This paper is a complement to that earlier work. As before, I have not dealt with schools; they require a separate effort. I have also omitted reference to the Joint Authority for Zionist Jewish Education, an institutional merger of the educational agencies of the World Zionist Organization and the Jewish Agency for Israel, because its establishment has not resulted in any conceptually critical change in the nature of the relationship between Jewish education in North America and Israel. I have here tried to deal with developments which seem to me central to the maintenance and enhancement of the educational enterprise of the organized Jewish community. Continuity commissions, foundations and training institutions in different measure and in different ways have forged a new configuration of Jewish education. The new pattern is an effort to change and improve what exists - mainly through the creation of a network of

programs and activities designed to compensate for the shortcomings of the supplementary congregational school. Its weave is a combination of rhetoric and resource which is more evocative and plentiful than what has been available to previous attempts to raise public consciousness and enlist material support for Jewish schooling and other educational activities. Whether or not it will achieve more or better than its predecessors remains to be seen.

Walter I. Ackerman
Shane Family Professor of Education
Ben Gurion University;
Visiting Professor of Jewish Education,
Cleveland College of Jewish Studies

March 1995
Cleveland, Ohio

1. Board Task Force Report on Communal Service Bodies for Jewish Education, New York, Jewish Education Service of North America, 1993, p. 1.

2. I am here guided by the definition of education as "...the entire process by which a culture transmits itself across generations." Bailyn, Bernard, Education in the Forming of American Society, New York, Vintage Books, 1960, p. 14.

3. Goren, Arthur, Quest for Community, New York, Columbia University Press, 1970, p.2.

4. Gannes, Abraham, Central Community Agencies for Jewish Education, Philadelphia, Dropsie College, 1954. See also my The Structure of Jewish Education, Cleveland, Commission on Jewish Education in North America, 1990.

5. Isaacs, Leora, Communal Service Bodies for Jewish Education, New York, Jewish Education Service of North America, 1993.

6. Kosmin, Barry et. al. Highlights of the CJF 1990 National Jewish Population Survey, New York, Council of Jewish Federations, 1991.

7. Silberman, Charles. A Certain People, New York, Summit Books, 1985.

8. If We Don't Act Now, Report of the Commission on the Jewish Future of Los Angeles, Jewish Federation Council of Greater Los Angeles, 1992.

9. Report of the Joint Federation/Congregational Plenum Commission on Jewish Continuity, Cleveland Jewish Community Federation, 1988, Appendix I.

10. Ibid, p. 2.

11. Ibid, pp. 5-6.

12. Ibid, p. 9.

13. Preliminary Survey on Jewish Continuity Planning: Summary Report, New York, Jewish Education Service of North America (n.d.).

14. Ibid, p. 9.

15. Dashefsky, Arnold and Bacon, Alyson L. "The Meaning of Jewish Continuity in the American Jewish Community: A Preliminary Empirical Assessment," Agenda, No. 4 (Spring 1994), pp. 22-28.

16. Dresner, Samuel; Eisen, Arnold; Shrage, Barry. Federation and Synagogue: Toward a New Partnership, Boston and Los Angeles, Wilstein Institute of Jewish Policy Studies (n.d.).

17. A Nation at Risk: The Imperative for Educational Reform, Washington D.C., The National Commission on Excellence in Education, U. S. Department of Education, 1983

18. "Symposium on the Year of the Reports: Responses from the Educational Community," Harvard Educational Review, 54:1, (Fall 1987), p. 131.

19. Insuring our Future: A Report on Jewish Education in Chicago, Commission on Jewish Education of the Jewish Federation of Metropolitan Chicago, Nov. 1991.

20. Ibid.

21. Lee, Sara S. "Alliance or Partnership: Synagogues and Community Confront Jewish Continuity," Agenda, #4 (Spring 1994), pp. 28-31.

22. Ibid.

23. Shrage, Barry, op. cit.

24. Jewish Education in the Conservative Movement: Leadership in the Continuity Process, May, 1993.

25. Baum, Howell S. "Community and Consensus: Reality and Fantasy in Planning," Journal of Planning Education and Research, 13, 1994, pp. 251-262.

26. Bronfman, Charles in The Impact of Foundations with Jewish Interests in the North American Jewish Community, Waltham, Maurice and Marilyn Cohen Center for Modern Jewish Studies, Brandeis University, 1994, p. 7.

27. Tobin, Gary. Ibid, p. 32.

28. Dickinson, Frank G. Philanthropy and Public Policy, New York, National Bureau of Economic Research, 1962, p. 63.

29. Crown, Susan, in The Impact of Foundations with Jewish Interests in the North American Jewish Community, p. 21.

30. Bronfman, Charles. Ibid.

31. A Time To Act: The Report of the Commission on Jewish Education in North America, Landham, University Press of America, 1991; see also "Reaction to `A Time To Act'", Jewish Education, 59:2, Fall 1991, pp. 2-38.

32. Tammivaara, Julie, Mobilizing to Support Jewish Education, Baltimore, MD. 1992-93.

33. Ibid; Best Practices Project: The Supplementary School, 1993; Best Practices Project: Early Childhood Education, 1993.

34. Woodring, Paul. Investment in Innovation: An Historic Appraisal of the Fund for the Advancement of Education, Boston, Little-Brown, 1970, pp. 287-288.

35. Ackerman, Walter I. The Structure of Jewish Education, Commission on Jewish Education in North America, 1990.

C-3

DRAFT PROPOSAL

CIJE EVALUATION INSTITUTE

PURPOSE

A guiding principle of the CIJE has been that initiatives in Jewish education need to be accompanied by evaluation. In this context, evaluation has three basic purposes: (1) to assist efforts to implement ongoing programs more effectively; (2) to determine, after an appropriate period of time, whether a program is sufficiently successful to warrant further effort and resources; and (3) to provide knowledge about what works and how, so that successful programs can be replicated in new places.

CIJE has tried to foster an "evaluation-minded" approach to educational improvement in its Lead Communities. In this effort we have seen some success. Federation staff at least pay lip service to the need to evaluate any new programs that are under consideration. More concretely, budgets for evaluation are being included in new programs. Most important, key staff and lay leaders in all three communities recognize the value of basing decisions on substantive information; as a case in point, they are using the findings of the CIJE Study of Educators as a basis for decision-making.

Our experience in the Lead Communities has made it clear that as in other areas, community agencies lack the capacity to carry out external evaluations of programs. One theory, put forth by a CIJE board member, is that agency staff simply do not know what to do. Another theory, suggested by MEF researchers, is that agency staff avoid evaluation for the usual reasons: (1) They are too busy running programs to carry out evaluation; (2) Evaluation often brings conflict, and avoiding conflict is a high priority for agency staff. Yet a third barrier to evaluation, experienced in Cleveland, is that it is difficult to find qualified outsiders to carry out an evaluation that is knowledgable, informative, and fair.

The proposed CIJE Evaluation Institute would address each of these problems. It would provide knowledge and motivation for evaluation by sharing expertise with a carefully chosen set of individuals from the communities with which CIJE is working.

DESIGN

The Evaluation Institute would consist of three separate but related ongoing seminars:

Seminar I: The Purpose and Possibilities of Evaluation

This seminar is intended for a federation professional and a lay leader from each community. Its purpose is to help these leaders understand the need for evaluation, as well its limits and possibilities. Participation in this seminar will provide local leadership with the "champions" for evaluation that will help ensure its role in decision-making.

Seminar II: Evaluation in the Context of Jewish Education

This seminar is intended to create an "evaluation expert" in each community. Participants should be trained in social science research at the Ph.D. level, and experienced in research on education, communities, public agencies, or related areas. The purpose of this seminar is to provide a forum for discussing specifically evaluation in Jewish education. Through this seminar, participants will become a source of expertise upon which their respective communities can draw.

There are two important reasons for including such local experts in the evaluation institute. First, and most essential, by engaging such experts in a long-term, ongoing relationship, communities can ensure continuity in their evaluation and feedback efforts, instead of one-shot projects that typically characterize evaluation when it does occur. Second, by entering into a relationship with a local expert, organized Jewish communities can exhibit their commitment to take evaluation seriously.

Seminar III: Nuts and Bolts of Evaluation in Jewish Education

This seminar is intended for the persons who will actually be carrying out the evaluation of programs in Jewish education. It will cover such topics as instruments, procedures, coding, analysis, and writing reports. Participants in the three seminars would also meet together. Evaluation research must be tailored to the political and cultural context in which it is to be conducted and interpreted. The best way to achieve this is to bring together those who "know" the context and those who "know" about evaluation. The CIJE evaluation institute could facilitate a learning process among the federation lay and professionals and the evaluation experts in which they teach one another in a structured and supportive context.

CONTENT

The content of these seminars will be drawn up by whoever is engaged to direct the evaluation institute. Instructors for the seminars will be drawn from a wide variety of fields, including both general and Jewish education. Within CIJE, we have substantial expertise in the study of personnel, including leadership, and we expect this to form a major part of the content for the first year. However, since we expect the Lead Communities to participate in the seminars, the personnel study cannot constitute the entire curriculum.

STAFF

To create this institute, it will be necessary to hire a director, who would work perhaps 12 hours per week PLUS the time spent at the seminars themselves. The institute director would be supervised by the CIJE executive director. CIJE office staff would need to provide support for the director and the seminar.

39

DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT

GUIDELINES FOR CIJE AFFILIATED COMMUNITIES

PREFACE

CIJE is an independent organization dedicated to the revitalization of Jewish education across North America through comprehensive, systemic reform. In November 1990, the Commission on Jewish Education in North America released A Time to Act, a report calling for dramatic change in the scope, standards, and the quality of Jewish education on this continent. **It concluded that -- whatever the setting or age group -- the revitalization of Jewish education will depend on two essential tasks: 1) building the profession of Jewish education; and 2) mobilizing community support for Jewish education.** CIJE was established to implement the Commission's conclusions.

Created as a catalyst for change, CIJE promotes reform by working in partnership with individual communities, local federations and central agencies, continental organizations, denominational movements, foundations, and educational institutions.

THE PARTNERSHIP OF CIJE AND LOCAL COMMUNITIES

Structure and Process
CIJE CIJE will help orient communities' educators and lay leaders to the purposes and importance of CIJE's rationale. This will include rationale for involvement in the CIJE Study of Educators.
CIJE will provide ongoing consultation for communities in the areas of building the profession of Jewish education and mobilizing community support for Jewish education.
CIJE will provide regular opportunities for its affiliated communities to network. This will include sharing experiences and knowledge and learning from outside experts.
CIJE will provide community with "communication" support.
CIJE will help prepare local personnel to conduct program evaluation.
Communities The CIJE project will be viewed as central to the mission and activities of the federation by its professional, educational and lay leadership.
Communities will develop a cadre of lay leaders committed to Jewish educational issues.

Communities will ensure that local educators play a significant role in the planning and implementation of the entire project.

Communities will create a plan for a structure in the community to organize and direct the project.

The plan will address:

a. issues of coordination with other agencies within the Federation (committees such as planning and allocations, etc.)
b. agencies outside of Federation (e.g. synagogues, Central Agency for Jewish Education, JCC, etc.),
c. lay involvement, representation and structure (e.g. "wall to wall" coalition)
d. coordination with national organizations where appropriate (e.g. JESNA, JCCA, denominational organizations, etc.)

Communities will designate a person to lead the process.
Person's responsibility will include:

a. managing the process
b. communicating the process and products appropriately throughout the community.

Communities will commit themselves to a process of ongoing evaluation of its educational system, projects and outcomes.

The CIJE Study of Educators

CIJE

CIJE will provide a module to help communities implement a study of its educators
This may mean:

a. seminar describing implementation of project
b. series of seminars on analyzing survey results
c. seminars on conducting and analyzing interview study
d. prepare local person to manage entire process.

Communities

Communities will conduct a study of its educators.
This means:

a. use CIJE's Study of Educators Module
b. contribution of findings to the CIJE national database
c. designation of local person to lead this process.

Personnel Action Plans

CIJE

CIJE will help communities develop a personnel action plan.

a. CIJE will provide regular seminars to share provide expertise and opportunities for networking.
b. CIJE will consult with community on the process and content of the plan.

Communities

Communities will develop a personnel action plan and a strategy for implementing the plan.

The Goals Project

CIJE

CIJE will conduct a series of seminars around the issues of communal and institutional goals to help initiate and guide a goals process. CIJE will train goals coaches to facilitate this process.

Communities

Communities will engage in the Goal's Project.
This may mean:

a. engagement in searching for communal goals
b. seminars for leadership of educational institutions (synagogues, schools, JCC's) about the goals of their institutions
c. individual institutions engaged in articulating their vision.

Pilot Projects

CIJE

CIJE will consult on a select number of pilot projects.
These projects must.

a. be oriented toward one of the "building blocks"-- 1) building the profession and 2) mobilizing community support
b. have implications for adaptation and replication in other communities
c. have an evaluation component built into the project from the beginning.

Communities

Communities will initiate a select number of pilot projects.

The Best Practices Project

CIJE

CIJE will provide communities with results of its best practices projects and opportunities to use these results with both lay leaders and professionals in a variety of settings.

Communities

Communities will create opportunities for lay leaders and educators to learn about and use the Best Practices Project.

May 31, 1995

6 F

CIJE Workplan and Budget
Fiscal Year 1995: Draft 4 [1/12/95]

I. INTRODUCTION

In 1995, as in no previous year, CIJE will be able to focus all of its energy on implementing the major elements of its mission. 1995 will focus primarily on the CIJE building blocks:

- addressing the shortage of qualified personnel - in particular through in-service training;
- community mobilization for Jewish education.

Planning efforts will continue in the other areas prescribed by the Commission: developing a plan for building the profession, building research capacity and enhancing North American Jewish community capability for the strategic planning of quality Jewish education; enlarging the understanding of what CIJE is and does.

Past years - including much of 1994 - have been devoted in large measure to building CIJE's own capacity through hiring staff and consultants, setting up a lay Board and Steering Committee and dealing with issues of image, perception and CIJE's place and role within the North American communal framework.

By the latter part of 1994, much has been achieved in:

- building an outstanding expert staff
- recruiting consultants
- forging strategic alliances with key organizations in North America
- completing comprehensive surveys of all teachers and principals in the three laboratory communities and publicizing the key findings.
- engaging these and other communities to consider issues of content through the goals project and best practices
- convening a seminar for 50 principals at Harvard University's principal center to demonstrate models of in-service training new to Jewish education
- convening in Jerusalem a seminar on the goals of Jewish education, for lay and professional leaders from the lead communities together with the Mandel Institute
- restructuring the board and the board process

- creation and publication of policy brief on "The Background and Professional Training of Teachers in Jewish Schools"
- distribution of policy brief to 3,000 GA attendees and CIJE sponsored forum on the data
- coverage of policy brief data in Jewish and some general media outlets

By the November 1994 General Assembly, CIJE was able to bring to the North American community, for the first time, a diagnostic profile of its educators. The main issue facing CIJE towards 1995 is:

How can CIJE maximize the impact of MEF's survey findings and use it as a catalyst for the development of in-service training capacity in various regions on the North American continent?

We recommend developing strategies that will respond to the critical issue of capacity. Two **examples** for consideration and discussion:

a. In 1995 CIJE will begin the process of creating capacity for teacher and leadership training. One possibility is to identify a finite cadre (no more than 45) of outstanding educators and training them to be teacher-trainers for select CIJE communities. The training of such trainers could be in cooperation with the Mandel Institute. In each of the following years, this cadre could be enlarged as needed.

b. Another possibility is for CIJE to develop with one of the local training colleges (the Cleveland College of Jewish Studies, for example,) a fully fleshed-out plan for becoming a regional in-service training institution.

* *
*

II. WORKPLAN

In light of the above it is proposed that in 1995 the CIJE should focus primarily on the following:

A. BUILDING THE PROFESSION

To include:

a. *Impacting **in-service training** strategically through developing a plan to build capacity for training nationally, regionally and locally and then testing the plan.*

b. *First steps towards a **comprehensive plan** for building the profession*

a. in-service training

Based upon the major findings of the educators survey and the interest and opportunities that it generates, 1995 will see a major focus of CIJE's activities in the area of in service training of educators in CIJE laboratory and selected communities. These should include:

1. Developing and implementing a plan for a finite pool of high quality teacher trainers who can implement in-service education in communities and institutions. CIJE will develop the strategy and will be directly involved with pilot implementation. It is anticipated that the Mandel Institute will participate in the training of these trainers. Where possible, implementation will also be handed over to others.

2. Offering selected communities guidance in preparing their comprehensive in-service training plan based on the Study of Educators.

3. Exploring ways to mobilize existing training institutions, central agencies, professional organizations, and the denominational movements to the endeavor. A model plan for developing regional in-service training capacity should be crafted. Over a period of years this should include Institutions of Higher Jewish Learning, some general universities and regional colleges.

concepts, curricula and standards.

b. comprehensive planning for Building the Profession

An ongoing function of the CIJE has to be the development of a comprehensive continental plan for building the profession. First steps towards this plan will be taken in 1995 by:

Establishing an academic advisory group to define and guide the assignment. This group will articulate the charge to a planner to be commissioned in 1996.

* * *

B. MOBILIZING THE COMMUNITY

At the heart of CIJE is an axiom that national champions, local community leaders, intellectuals, scholars and artists need to be mobilized to ensure that Jewish education emerges as the central priority of the North American Jewish community.

In 1995 this will be translated into 4 major foci of our work:

1. CIJE Board, Steering Committee and Committees

This involves the continued mobilization of outstanding lay leaders to CIJE leadership positions through:

- Appointment of vice-chairs to the CIJE Steering Committee which will meet 5 times in 1995
- Addition of 8 - 16 Board members in 1995 (4 - 8 at each of two meetings) and 6 - 12 additional committee members (3 - 6 at each board meeting)

2. Impacting on the Jewish educational agenda of an ever-increasing number of communities

This involves:

- Ensuring that an ever-increasing number of North American Jewish communities are engaged in comprehensive high quality planning for Jewish educational change. Our target for December 1995 is 9 communities engaged in this process.
- Articulate a plan for creating a network of "affiliated" or "essential" communities leading to a definition of such a community and a proposed time line and outcomes in creating the network.
- Working closely with the CJF and its new standing committee to focus CJF's central role in continental community mobilization for Jewish education.

3. Telling the Story

This means articulating CIJE's core mission to the most significant lay and professional audiences so as to help build the climate for change. This will involve:

- Dissemination of policy brief to key constituencies
- preparing and disseminating 3 - 4 CIJE publications selected from:
  - guidelines on preparation of local personnel plan from educators' survey

- guidelines on in-service training
- policy brief: on the remuneration of Jewish educators
- occasional paper: the goals project
- occasional paper: best practices on in-service training

- Development of a data base both for distribution of all our materials and for ranking and tracking of professional and lay leadership
- Distribution plan for Best Practices volumes
- Creation of small advisory group (e.g. Finn) for strategizing media and communication opportunities
- Develop a publicity program with future targets
- Planning and preparation for 1995 GA

4. **A Strategy for engaging potential community champions**
   - Develop think piece toward a 1996 first iteration of a plan for engaging major community leaders in Jewish education.

* * *

C. MONITORING, EVALUATION AND FEEDBACK

The workplan for monitoring, evaluation and feedback has been developed in consultation with the advisory committee and reflects the completion of some work in progress and some new directions for this project.

The main areas of work for 1995 that are proposed are:

1. Analysis and Dissemination of Community Data on Educators and Survey Methods
This includes:

- Further analysis of Educators' Survey data in the CIJE laboratory communities including further Policy Briefs on: Salaries and Benefits; Career Plans and Opportunities and Teacher Preferences for Professional Development; Educational Leaders
- Full Integrated Report across all three communities
- Development of a "module" for studying educators in additional communities which involves refining the survey instruments and interview protocols and making them available to other communities by writing descriptions of the procedures.

2. Monitoring and Evaluation of CIJE-initiated Projects
In CIJE selected communities, MEF will:

- Guide communities to monitor and evaluate Personnel Action Plans
- Monitor and evaluate Goals Project activities
- Analysis of changing structures of Jewish education in North America (Ackerman)

3. Conceptualizing a Method for Studying Informal Education and Educators
A process of consultation with experts and thinking to result in a design by the end of 1995 for implementation in 1996

4. Leading Educational Indicators
In place of monitoring day-to-day process in the Lead Communities, the MEF Advisory Committee has suggested the development of Leading Educational Indicators to monitor change in North American communities.

- In 1995 to hold by June the first discussion with consultants on establishing some "Leading Indicators" and to begin gathering data on those indicators in the second half of the year.

5. Towards a Research Capacity
In the second half of 1995 develop a plan for creating a research agenda for North America.

D. CONTENT AND PROGRAM

The resources of both the **Best Practices** and **Goals** Projects will, in 1995, be primarily redirected to the CIJE efforts in Building the Profession and Community Mobilization. Thus:

Best Practices will:

- be designed around those best practices of in-service education with the preparation of shorter occasional papers on these practices
- be developed on the Jewish Community Center (in cooperation with JCCA) emphasizing the personnel aspects of these outstanding practices
- create one-day short consultations on aspects of in-service training as these emerge in the community personnel action plans
- make presentations to lay leaders as part of CIJE Community Mobilization efforts
- create two seminars for educators on Best Practices in local communities.

The Goals Project

- The Goals Project will, following the July 1994 seminar in Israel, engage with several "prototype-institutions" in order to show how increased awareness, attention and seriousness about goals has to be tied to investment in educators. This will also serve as a limited laboratory for CIJE to learn about how to develop a goals process. Seminars will take place in Milwaukee, Cleveland and Baltimore and in Atlanta CIJE will engage with a group of lay leaders planning to create a new community high school. An intensive goals project will not commence anywhere until additional capacity has been developed through training"coaches".

- CIJE will concentrate on developing "coaches"/resource people <u>for</u> 9 communities in order to seed Goals Projects in select communities. This will involve identifying and cultivating a cadre of resource-people to work in this project. This should take the highest priority of our work in the Goals Project.

* * *

E. FINANCE AND ADMINISTRATION

1. In the light of CIJE's recent 501C-3 and tax exempt status, several important areas of **administration and fiscal management** will need attention in 1995 These include:
   - Development of a fully-functioning independent payroll and benefits system centered in the New York CIJE office (January 1995)
   - Identification and training of a successor to Virginia Levi
   - Development of a full set of office and inter-office procedures and implementing them for fiscal management and control of CIJE expenses.

2. Developing and implementing a **fundraising plan** for CIJE with:
   - a fundraising subcommittee to approve supervise and cooperate on the plan
   - clear $ targets and clear allocation of responsibility
   - a system for monitoring fundraising income and regular solicitations

3. Managing the CIJE side of the **successor search**:
   - Contact with Phillips Oppenheim
   - Convening search committee

* *

III. HUMAN RESOURCES

a. In 1995 the CIJE core **full-time staff** will consist of:

Executive Director	Alan Hoffmann
Personnel Development	Dr. Gail Dorph
Content/Program and In-Service Education	Dr. Barry Holtz
Community Mobilization	Nessa Rapoport
Research and Data Analysis	Bill Robinson

b. Consultants on **ongoing fixed retainer basis**

MEF and Research Agenda	Dr. Adam Gamoran
MEF and Leadership	Dr. Ellen Goldring
Goals Project	Dr. Dan Pekarsky
Building the Profession	Prof. Lee Shulman

c. Consultants on an **ad hoc** basis

Monograph on Restructuring of Community Education + Regional Colleges	Prof. Walter Ackerman
CIJE Steering Committee meetings and Staff meetings	Dr. Ellen Goldring Dr. Adam Gamoran
Planning Consultant on Building Profession	(as yet not identified)
Community Organization	Stephen Hoffman (unpaid)

d. **Mandel Institute**

- Consultation on Goals, Planning and Building the Profession;
- Collaboration on Senior Personnel Development, pieces of in-service training and on Goals Project;
- Cooperation in fundraising.

e. **Successor Search**

Phillips Oppenheim & Co.

[See Exhibit 1 for matrix of allocation of staff/consultant time to major activity areas]

APPENDIX A: ISSUES FACING CIJE

Some conceptual issues have arisen regarding the preferred role for CIJE:

1. **With its outstanding education staff, should the CIJE develop and implement projects (e.g. seminars for principals) or should it enable others to implement, using its resources to develop the ideas, the plans and the policies that will enable others to implement and disseminate change?**

The 1995 workplan recommends a mid-position, with the CIJE devoting the largest share of its staff time to developing the appropriate strategies and leading others to implement them, while undertaking a small number of pilot field/implementation activities. These are required, we believe, in order to energize a depressed field and demonstrate that quality can be achieved and that serious content can make a difference.

2. How can CIJE influence existing organizations (JESNA, CJF, JCCA, universities, institutions of higher Jewish learning) so that their work in education reflects the priorities of our mission?

This workplan takes the position that in 1995 CIJE should engage with three carefully selected organizations - probably JESNA and JCCA - and develop joint planning groups to target specific areas of Jewish educational activity and plan for capacity and funding. In future years this function should be expanded to other organizations. In addition, the creation of the new standing committee on Jewish Continuity of the CJF in 1995 will have CIJE at the core of the framing of its mission.

3. How should we relate to projects of CIJE which could grow beyond the present mission in order to ensure their maximum contribution?

It is recommended that some time in the future some CIJE projects could be spun off into semi-independent activities which would both be highly attractive for fundraising and have a life of their own. The Goals Project could be considered as first in this category. In 1995 first steps could be taken to establish this as a "project" rather than a center at Harvard University in a relationship similar to that of the present Harvard-Mandel project. This could be a model for other areas of CIJE's work and has considerable potential for fund-raising.

EXHIBIT 1: TIME ALLOCATION BY PERCENTAGE OF STAFF AND CONSULTANTS

	CORE & BOARD	BUILDING THE PROFESSION	CONTENT & PROGRAM	COMMUNITY MOBILIZATION	RESEARCH & MEF	TOTAL
A. FULL-TIME STAFF						
ALAN HOFFMANN	40	25	15	15	5	100
GAIL DORPH	20	70	10	0		100
BARRY HOLTZ	20	40	30	10		100
NESSA RAPOPORT	40			60		100
BILL ROBINSON	10				90	100
ROBIN MENCHER	100					100
SANDRA BLUMENFIELD	100					100
B. CONSULTANTS ON RETAINER % of CIJE Time						
ADAM GAMORAN	10				90	100
ELLEN GOLDRING	10	20			70	100
DAN PEKARSKY	10	40	50			100
LEE SHULMAN	5	60			35	100
WALTER ACKERMAN	10	45			45	100
C. MANDEL INSTITUTE % of CIJE Consulting Time						
		40	40		20	100

PREMIER INDUSTRIAL CORPORATION

MASTER SCHEDULE CONTROL

76392 (REV. 12/86) PRINTED IN U.S.A.

Schedule No. 7

Calendar of Events - Council for Initiatives in Jewish Education

Date Prepared 12/17/93

ELEMENT													
1.													
2.													
3.													
4.													
5.													
6.													
7.													
8.													
9.													
10.													
11.													
12.													
13.													
14.													
15.													
16.													
17.													
18.													
19.													
20													

COUNCIL FOR INITIATIVES IN JEWISH EDUCATION

1995 BOARD OF DIRECTORS

David Arnow

Daniel Bader

Mandell Berman *

Charles Bronfman *

John Colman *

Maurice Corson

Susan Crown

Jay Davis

Irwin Field

Max M. Fisher

Billie Gold *

Charles H. Goodman

Alfred Gottschalk

Neil Greenbaum

David Hirschhorn *

Ann Kaufman *

Gershon Kekst

Henry Koschitzky

Mark Lainer *

Norman Lamm

Marvin Lender

Norman Lipoff

Seymour Martin Lipset

Morton L. Mandel *

Matthew Maryles *

Florence Melton

Melvin Merians *

Lester Pollack *

Charles Ratner *

Esther Leah Ritz *

William Schatten

Richard Scheuer

Ismar Schorsch

David Teutsch

Isadore Twersky

Maynard Wishner *

Bennet Yanowitz

* Executive Committee Member

2/14/95

CIJE COMMITTEE ASSIGNMENTS

As of 4-11-95

Building the Profession Committee

Lester Pollack, Chair
Gail Dorph, Staff
Steve Chervin
Max Fisher
Joshua Fishman
Charles Goodman
Alfred Gottschalk
Robert Hirt
Gershon Kekst
Norman Lamm
Norman Lipoff
Morton Mandel
Florence Melton
Richard Meyer
Ismar Schorsch
Louise Stein
Maynard Wishner

Community Mobilization Committee

Charles Ratner, Chair
Alan Hoffmann, Staff
Steve Hoffman, Staff
Nessa Rapoport, Staff
Charles Bronfman
Jay Davis
Darrell Friedman
Jane Gellman
Billie Gold
Neil Greenbaum
Ann Kaufman
Martin Kraar
Marvin Lender
Matthew Maryles
Melvin Merians
Arthur Rotman
Jonathan Woocher

Content & Program Committee

John Colman, Chair
Barry Holtz, Staff
Daniel Pekarsky, Staff
Daniel Bader
Mandell Berman
Chaim Botwinick
Maurice Corson
Alan Finkelstein
Henry Koschitzky
David Sarnat
William Schatten
Richard Scheuer
David Teutsch
Isadore Twersky (Also Building the Profession)
Ilene Vogelstein

Research & Evaluation Committee

Esther Leah Ritz, Chair
Adam Gamoran, Staff
Ellen Goldring, Staff
David Arnow
Ruth Cohen
Susan Crown
Genine Fidler
Irwin Field
David Hirschhorn
Mark Lainer
Seymour Martin Lipset
Richard Shatten
Bennett Yanowitz

COUNCIL FOR INITIATIVES IN JEWISH EDUCATION
STEERING COMMITTEE

AGENDA

Thursday, June 8, 1995, 9:30 AM -3:30 PM
New York

		Supporting Documents	Tab	
I.	Master Schedule Control		1	MLM
II.	Minutes		2	VFL
III.	Assignments		3	VFL
IV.	CIJE Update			ADH
V.	Regional Training Capacity	The Structure of Jewish Education	6a	W. Ackerman
		Building the Profession: In-Service Training	6b	
		Reforming Jewish Education	6c	
VI.	Evaluation Institute	Draft Proposal: CIJE Evaluation Institute	6d	AG
VII .	Committee Chairs and Staff Meet			
VIII.	Guidelines for CIJE Affiliated Communities	Guidelines	6e	GZD