



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

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

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

Subseries 3: Lead Communities, 1988–1997.

---

Box  
34

Folder  
12

MEF. Plan for Evaluation of the CIJE Teacher-Educator Institute,  
January 1995.

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

---

## UPDATE ON TEACHER EDUCATOR INSTITUTE

to Lester &  
Mort  
July

The first seminar of the CIJE Teacher Educator Institute is planned for the end of July. Between 15 and 20 central agency professionals, supplementary school principals and early childhood directors will attend. It will be held in Cleveland at the Glidden House. This first cohort will be involved in 5 seminars this year and two next year (1996-97).

In so far as this Institute is designed to improve professional development in supplementary schools, it is synonymous with the "creation of a cadre of mentor trainers" in the Cummings Grant. It goes beyond that grant in conception in two significant ways:

- a. We invited the participation of teams of professionals from communities with an emphasis on central agency personnel
- b. We invited a small group of early childhood educators to be part of this first cohort as well.

**Central Agencies:** In order for change to take place in this area we felt that central agencies had to be involved in this process from the beginning. Even though many central agency directors do not themselves deliver direct service (run workshops, consult with teachers and schools), we felt that they needed to understand the theory and practice of professional development that we will be developing over the course of the Institute. While it is important that what is currently being done be done better (and we will share current thinking about characteristics about "good professional development" professional), this Institute will suggest new approaches to the area of professional development as well. We, therefore, "recruited" directors of central agencies from the communities. Atlanta, Baltimore, Cleveland, Milwaukee, and San Francisco (and perhaps Chicago) will indeed be sending their directors as members of larger teams.

**Early Childhood:** It is very clear from the CIJE Study of Educators that serious attention needs to be paid to the area of Early Childhood. As part of our commitment to be involved in developing personnel for early childhood, we included early childhood directors in the educational leadership seminar at the Harvard Principals Center last fall. We have been involved in designing a pilot project for early childhood educators (Machon L'Morim: Breishit) described briefly by Genine Fidler at our last board meeting. We wanted to include several early childhood educators in this project after our first consultation because we felt that the design for the Institute and its contents were very appropriate to the their needs.

The conceptualization for the Institute grew out of two separate consultations. The first was a two day consultation (May 31 and June 1) and was devoted specifically to professional development in supplementary school settings, the mandate of the



Cummings Grant Proposal. The second was devoted to early childhood issues in particular and was held on June 15.

Drs. Deborah Ball and Sharon Feiman-Nemser, both professors at Michigan State University and senior researchers at their National Center on Research on Learning to Teach will be serving as faculty for this seminar along with Barry Holtz and Gail Dorph and have spent two additional days working with us on developing the specific curriculum of the first seminar itself.

All of the planning for this project has been sensational. By this I mean, the advisory groups were enthusiastic about the project, read and commented on all of the written materials that we sent out to them in advance and continue to be in touch with us as they see other academic articles, papers and projects that touch on this work. Deborah and Sharon have really taken this on as though they own it, more than as though they are outside consultants. We have been in communication weekly through e-mail in terms of the details of the first seminar in addition to our face to face meetings. Just this morning, I received their latest e-mail, jointly written jointly on their return flight from planning meeting in which they moved the details of our planning even further ahead.

The Grant provides for the development and production of a series of videotapes which can be used as part of professional development seminars. Sharon and Deborah have provided us with two models of tapes that have been produced: one by the National Center for Research on Teacher Learning and one by the Michigan Partnership For New Education. Yesterday, we developed a plan for using two videotapes (one from general education, one from Jewish education) in this first seminar to create a context for talking about learning and teaching and as a model of how tapes can be used in professional development. So much for this level of detail. I could actually say "a ton" more about what I call the "insides" of the Institute, but perhaps I will wait to see you and talk to you in person about it.

*Thank you  
early childhood  
consultants*

I want to thank you for taking the time to participate in our recent CIJE consultation. I am enclosing your honorarium with this letter.

Two issues emerged loud and clear from our day together:

1. If we want to change teaching in early childhood settings, we need to take institutional context and the role of the educational leader very seriously. Attention to school mission and philosophy need to be addressed as seriously as issues such as, as how we believe children learn and what is developmentally appropriate.

2. An important component of work with teachers must address issues of personal meaning as it is connected to their own Jewish identity and to the particular subjects that they are teaching.

We will certainly be incorporating these insights into our plans for our CIJE Teacher Educator Institute. As currently construed, we are describing its theme as "Teaching for Understanding and Personal Meaning." We think this will allow us to address the content and leadership issues that we have identified.

I look forward to our continuing collaboration.

Sincerely,

Gail Dorph  
CC: Alan Hoffmann  
Barry Holtz

To: Staff

From: Bill Robinson

Re: TEI •

Date: 1/16/95

Please review the following three documents concerning the MEF evaluation of TEI for the staff meeting on January 22<sup>nd</sup>.

Please take special note of the document entitled "Document #1: Working Hypotheses and Revised Time Line."



## MEF PLAN FOR EVALUATION OF THE CIJE TEACHER-EDUCATOR INSTITUTE

The CIJE Teacher-Educator Institute is a three-year project to create a cadre of outstanding teacher trainers for supplementary and early childhood education. The project will bring together teams of educational leaders from communities across North America to become a network of teacher educators who share a vision of teaching and learning, and who support one another in developing new models for professional development. During the course of the project, the community teams will meet periodically for intensive programs of study, discussion, analysis, and reflection. Also, during the course of the project, the participants will begin to transform the structure and content of opportunities for the professional development of teachers in their respective communities. It is expected, through participation in the project, that the educational leaders will improve in their abilities to design, implement, and evaluate communal and school in- service programs.

The Monitoring, Evaluation, and Feedback (MEF) team of the CIJE is assigned the task of evaluating the CIJE Teacher-Educator Institute. The evaluation of the project will focus on outcomes for schools and communities. Specific working hypotheses will be developed and investigated concerning changes, in the structure and content of local (communal and school) in-service offerings, expected to occur during the course of the project. These working hypotheses will be derived primarily from the underlying assumptions of the project held by the CIJE staff, and their investigation will yield findings that can further the CIJE's understanding of how to enhance local opportunities for the professional development of teachers. For example, one such hypothesis may concern how the relationship between central agency staff and supplementary school educational directors affects the nature and degree of change in the structure and content of local in-service offerings.

The MEF team will produce three documents as part of the evaluation process:

1. In the short term: A document stating the goals of the project, how and why participants were selected, and the relationship between the goals and the selection processes, in order to delineate some of the

working hypotheses underlying the project. These working hypotheses will help guide the evaluation of the project. This document will draw on written materials describing the project (e.g., the Cummings proposal), and on interviews with the CIJE staff.

2. In the medium term: A document, focusing on a subsample of communities participating in the Institute, describing in depth the nature and extent of opportunities for the professional development of teachers in each focal community. The purpose of this document is to establish a baseline so that change can be assessed in the future. In addition, this document may serve as a stimulus for reflection on what participants decide to work on in their communities, as well as for reflection on the working hypotheses that will guide the evaluation. This document will draw on interviews with participants and others from the focal communities, and on MEF reports on teachers in the Lead Communities.

3. In the long-term: A document, or a series of documents released periodically, focusing on the same subsample of participating communities, evaluating changes in the structure and content of their communal and school in-service offerings, during the course of the project. These reports will draw on interviews with participants and others from the focal communities, as well as on observations of in-service activities in the communities.

In addition to the methods already mentioned, the MEF team will also obtain data from documents produced by the participants during the course of the project and participant-observation of the Institute meetings.

The precise long-term changes to be examined will be determined during the first phase of the project, but based on preliminary discussions with the CIJE staff and attendance at planning meetings, these key outcomes may include:

1. Fewer isolated workshops, more extensive use of on-going, coherent professional growth activities.
2. Less use of programs assuming all teachers need the same professional development, more



use of programs targeted to teachers' varied needs.

3. Movement from fragmented approach to in-service towards community plan with opportunities for teachers to grow in a variety of ways.
4. Increase in classroom and school support for change, e.g. in the form of coaching or collegial planning and feedback.
5. Development of ongoing formats for site-based discussions of teaching and learning; this may involve "upgrading" of faculty meetings, institutionalization of study groups, etc.
6. Expanding the ways in which the individual participants view their roles in terms of their own professional growth as well as their responsibilities toward enhancing the professional growth of other staff members in their institutions.
7. Evaluation of change in classroom practice as part of new initiatives.
8. New uses of incentives to stimulate professional growth among teachers.

The subsample of communities will consist of Atlanta, Baltimore, Hartford, and Milwaukee.

These communities were selected for the following reasons. First, baseline data already exists on the three Lead Communities (Atlanta, Baltimore, and Milwaukee). Second, the differences in the institutional composition of the teams coming from these four communities will provide an opportunity to examine the effects of varied institutional relations on the ability of project participants to enhance the nature and extent of in-service offerings in their respective communities. While Atlanta is sending three participants (one each from the central agency, the JCC, and a synagogue), and both Baltimore and Milwaukee are sending at least one central agency person and one person from either a synagogue or the JCC, Hartford is sending a single participant (from the central agency).



From: gail dorph  
TO: bill  
CC: Adam  
Alan  
Barry  
gail  
Ginny  
RE: evaluation of CIJE Teacher Educator Institute

hi bill, here's how we're thinking about outcomes/success in terms of the institute and its participants.

We have what might be called "course objectives" -- our hopes for all individuals who are participating in the "two year program" and then we have measures of success beyond what these individuals will be "learning to do" that we would hope we will see over time in the communities in which we are working. The latter fit into what we hope will eventually emerge from the development of the communal personnel action plans. These teacher educators are part of what will enable communities to actually plan and deliver the "insides of these plans. By the end of the program, we see them as holding on to the requisite knowledge to describe and analyze current offerings and plan and implement "different offerings." the study group model is in fact not only the model for our institute, but a model we would like them to "try out" in their own communities and institutions.

On Monday, I will fax you a document that we received from Cummings about things they would like evaluated. Their list grows out of their reading of the grant and is fairly descriptive.

I am separating out individual outcomes from communal/institutional indicators for this first cut into outcomes.

What we would like to see in terms of participants as individuals:

1. Each participant will be able to articulate a credible vision of "that kind of teaching" with regard to at least two areas of Jewish subject matter content (in appropriate setting and age range...holiday teaching in early childhood classrooms of ages 3-4)
2. Each participant will "implement" (plan and run) a pilot study group in their own community/institution (may be that one team does one or that each member of team "does" their own)
3. Each participant will be able to choose a selection of taped lesson and be able to write a lesson plan for using that tape for an inquiry about teaching and learning "x"

In terms of communal outcomes:

1. Each community/individual will create a map of current in-service offerings in order to help us create a baseline picture of what currently exists.
2. Based on the map, we will be interested in tracking new initiatives and "improved" versions of present programs in terms of the following criteria:
  - a. movement from one shot to ongoing
  - b. movement from one size fits all offerings to targeted offerings
  - c. movement from buckshot approach to in-service to community plan with opportunities for teachers to grow in a variety of ways.
  - d. movement from no classroom support for change to classroom/institutional support for change; either in the form of coaching or collegial planning and feedback
  - e. presence of ongoing formats for site based discussions of teaching and learning from "upgrade" of current institutional staff meetings to institutionalization of institutional study groups.
  - f. presence of evaluation of change in classroom practice as part of new initiatives
  - g. role of incentives

With regard to the other issues that you raised in your document, Bill:

about reflexivity, Barry and I will talk to Sharon and Deborah next week about how best to describe that issue in terms of outcomes.

teams need some further thought on our part, I think that there will be working groups of community teams and setting/age teams working throughout each seminar.

comm mob -- who needs to know, etc is still an issue. at present I am about to prepare an update memo. some version will go to lester pollack and mort mandel, rachel cowan of cummings, our steering committee, seymour fox and then we'll have to figure out in terms of both press coverage and community info what happens next -- perhaps in terms of communities of participants, this needs to be on the agenda of participants as a topic.

talk to you soon, gail



According to the "MEF Plan for Evaluation of the CIJE Teacher Educator Institute (TEI)", the first document that the MEF team will create will state the goals of the project, how and why participants were selected, and the relationship between goals and the selection process, in order to delineate some of the working hypotheses underlying the project. In order to proceed toward creating this first document, I would like to interview the three of you (either separately or together). The interviews (if done separately) should take about 90 minutes (estimate!), and slightly longer if done together.

I would like to conduct these interviews within the next two weeks, over the phone. Perhaps the best way to schedule these interviews is for each of you (or together) to suggest 2 to 3 times that are convenient. (My schedule is very flexible.) Keep in mind that I have a mapping exercise that I would like each of you to complete BEFORE the interview. The mapping exercise and a selection of questions (that I will ask DURING the interview) follow below.

Bill

### **MAPPPING EXERCISE -**

Before interviewing you, I would like you to engage in the mapping exercise assigned to the TEI participants. Either separately or together, could you delineate a map of a **SUCCESSFUL COMMUNITY** - that is, a hypothetical community that has participated in the TEI FOR THREE YEARS and AS A RESULT of that participation has made **SUBSTANTIAL IMPROVEMENTS IN ITS PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT OPPORTUNITIES.**

As taken from the "Work Plan Possibilities" sheet handed out in Cleveland, the map should contain the following structural features of your envisioned successful community, for a **SELECTION** of professional development activities:

- Sponsoring Institution
- Target audience
- Program Goals
- Duration of Program
- Evaluation Strategy
- Nature of Incentives
- Role of principals in determining content and agenda
- Role of teachers in determining content and agenda
- Role of outside experts
- Role of classroom context in framing issues and content
- Inquiry-orientation vs. Technique/hands on

In addition, please consider the following two issues:

- Preparation and follow-up with teachers attending local professional development activities
- Relations of in-service activities to each other (part of overall plan? cumulative process?).

The map should be as detailed as necessary to provide a comprehensive and concrete understanding of what successful outcomes may entail.

## QUESTIONS THAT WILL GUIDE THE INTERVIEW -

The following questions, among others, will be addressed during the interviews.

### A. On the map:

1. What makes this (hypothetical) community a success?
2. How did it become a success over the last three years?

### B. On the relationship between participation in the TEI and the envisioned successful outcomes:

1. How will participation in the CIJE TEI enable participants to create successful outcomes in their communities?
2. What role will the videotapes play in enabling participants to create successful outcomes in their communities?
3. How do you envision the participants from each community working together, or not?

### C. On the relationship between the selection of participants for the TEI and the envisioned successful outcomes:

1. Why did you invite the communities that you did?
2. Why did you invite the people in each community that you did?
3. Who did you really want to invite, but wasn't able to? Why?
4. Who (of the current participants) do you think are most likely to create successful outcomes in their communities and why? Who are the least likely and why?





TO: MEF GANG

Atlanta leaders — part 2

Gail  
8/30

P. 16

section on entering Jewish ed never makes the case clearly that because majority of leaders entered as teachers and became leaders "by accident", their profile resembles teacher profile. Is this correct understanding of what you think? If so, should the point be made more clearly. It has to do then with issues of extrinsic rewards too as developed on p. 17. In that case, is it that extrinsic rewards are known to be poor and therefore, field is self selected in terms of those for whom extrinsic is unimportant?

P. 19

omit still on third line of third para., it's awkward.

In that same para., do we want to be using the career path of someone who began at 14. 2 questions emerge: Are we saying something about nature of career path in Jewish ed being different than general ed and not comparable. And if we're counting from fourteen, does being in 10 years matter for much?

P. 21

at top, 28%, is that about current setting?

In chart, 8% is in the wrong place and the 12% unsure have been omitted, so when one reads chart 12% of pop is unaccounted for.

In description of chart in sentence "Only 8% of Atlanta's leaders in the three communities — last phrase not correct.

P. 22

second para. Ongoing in last sentence may be problematic as it assumes that they are currently effective.

I think "most ed leaders are not pursuing this avenue" needs to be stronger. Perhaps not expected, or required to pursue....

In last para., I'd change the shoulds to coulds. And I'd add some caveat about given proper training and support could....

P. 24

case is made about importance of issues as levers for change. Aren't they also impt for other reasons, such as creating new impressions of what career is about.

P. 26

what's difference between ½ or more, mostly —first is used to describe day school; second to

describe supp school —is there a difference or are we talking about the same thing. It's not clear.

P. 28

Las sentence of whole para. This is primarily the case — does the this apply to whole para. Or only pro dev. It's not clear.

P. 29

in implications second para., is sentence "most think their salaries.... does not feel strong enough if we want to make a case about salary.

In next para, salary and benefits, I'm not sure about policy question as you raise it. The job of day school principal in free standing institution is much more complex than the job of congregational school principal.

P. 30

I'm not sure what sentence in first para. Beginning with "in addition," means.

Last para. Next to last sentence, I think replacing and with "as well as" would make a stronger case.

P.31

second para. Day school principals are not in the middle of hierarchy and so this may be misstated.

Later in para. You speak about role partners, I'm not sure that's a cler concept

in third para. Who does they refer to?

P. 33

is there no difference in issue of rabbis for day and supplementary and pre-schools? Doesn't fit my impressions at all.

P. 35

first para. People will explain away this finding because of part time-ness of teachers in setting. Do you want to say something about this?

Is finding about pedagogy outside of classroom, true across settings?

In last para., similarly doesn't make sense. Makes more sense without that word.

P. 36

although first and last sentence of first para. Under lay leader don't contradict, they feel as though they do. Is there a way to make the point clearer.



In next para. I'm not sure what "are not as satisfied with" is being compared to.

P. 37

first word at top needs to be "an"

The "however" as opening sentence about pre-schools is not a good linking word there. Point is better made without however and also without the word "actual" in that sentence.

P. 38

I think in second para., third sentence "overall" should follow "across all settings"

In para. Beginning "some ed leaders" needs some work. I'd omit "at the same time." I'd add to sentence about JCC's something that explains why they encounter a special challenge. Note also either is last sentence of para. Or does not fit in section on lay leaders. If you keep it in, you need to say how it fits here as part of picture of folks not really valuing pre-school education and the skills and knowledge one needs to have in order to do the job.

P. 39

Although you state that role of ed leader is paramount, you never (as far as I remember) make that case, perhaps you need to say a few words about what we know about the importance of leader in school climate, student achievement etc (you know that stuff better than I)

P. 40

#(4) "receive" feels like the wrong verb.

In next to last sentence at bottom, I'd change "expected" to required or demanded to make a stronger case.

It's also not clear what makes the last sentence true. Do you want to make a stronger statement about renewal as imp't aspect of pro dev even for those adequately trained as we did in policy brief?

I like the box on pre-school ed. Leaders. I think it's really clear and makes a strong case.

P. 41

Given lack of training, what makes us think that these guys will do a "good job" for us. Why won't it be business as usual, which is after all what they know from experience. Also they all lack subject matter knowledge, will they really be able to help teachers do what they need to do?

If high standards of training are implemented — does this refer to pre or in-service stuff?

In second para., perhaps or is better than and in last sentence between background and pro growth.

There's some problem in third para with the first sentence ..of some of the....

What are you saying about impt roles in the school and comm if they were full time? Like what?

I think in last para. While it is true that teacher-leader contact should not be tied only to contract hours, it is perhaps more impt that contracts and work need to be rethought in order to make this kind of communication possible. Just saying it this way "contract hours" makes it sound as though teachers are chintzy with their time rather than that the system in order to be reformed needs to be rethought.





## **MEF Plan for Evaluation of the CIJE Teacher-Educator Institute**

**September 1995**

The CIJE Teacher-Educator Institute is a three-year project to create a cadre of outstanding teacher trainers for supplementary and early childhood education. The project will bring together teams of educational leaders from communities across North America to become a network of teacher educators who share a vision of teaching and learning, and who support one another in developing new models for professional development. During the course of the project, the community teams will meet periodically for intensive programs of study, discussion, analysis, and reflection. Also, during the course of the project, the participants will begin to transform the structure and content of opportunities for the professional development of teachers in their respective communities. It is expected, through participation in the project, that the educational leaders will improve in their abilities to design, implement, and evaluate communal and school in-service programs.

The Monitoring, Evaluation, and Feedback (MEF) team of the CIJE is assigned the task of evaluating the CIJE Teacher-Educator Institute. The evaluation of the project will focus on outcomes for schools and communities. Specific working hypotheses will be developed and investigated concerning changes, in the structure and content of local (communal and school) in-service offerings, expected to occur during the course of the project. These working hypotheses will be derived primarily from the underlying assumptions of the project held by the CIJE staff, and their investigation will yield findings that can further the CIJE's understanding of how to enhance local opportunities for the professional development of teachers. For example, one such hypothesis may concern how the relationship between central agency staff and supplementary school educational directors affects the nature and degree of change in the structure and content of local in-service offerings.

The MEF team will produce three documents as part of the evaluation process:

1. In the short term: A document stating the goals of the project, how and why participants were selected, and the relationship between the goals and the selection processes, in order to delineate some of the working hypotheses underlying the project. These working hypotheses will help guide the evaluation of the project. This document will draw on written materials describing the project (e.g., the Cummings proposal), and on interviews with the CIJE staff.
2. In the medium term: A document, focusing on a subsample of communities participating in the Institute, describing in depth the nature and extent of opportunities for the professional development of teachers in each focal community. The purpose of this document is to establish a baseline so that change can be assessed in the future. In addition, this document may serve as a stimulus for reflection on what participants decide to work on in their communities, as well as for reflection on the working hypotheses that will guide the evaluation. This document will draw on interviews with participants and others from the focal communities, and on MEF reports on teachers in the Lead Communities.
3. In the long-term: A document, or a series of documents released periodically, focusing on the same subsample of participating communities, evaluating changes in the structure and content of their communal and school in-service offerings, during the course of the project. These reports will draw on interviews with participants and others from the focal communities, as well as on observations of in-service activities in the communities.

In addition to the methods already mentioned, the MEF team will also obtain data from documents produced by the participants during the course of the project and participant-observation of the Institute meetings.

The precise long-term changes to be examined will be determined during the first phase of the project, but based on preliminary discussions with the CIJE staff and attendance at planning meetings, these key outcomes may include:



1. Fewer isolated workshops, more extensive use of on-going, coherent professional growth activities.
2. Less use of programs assuming all teachers need the same professional development, more use of programs targeted to teachers' varied needs.
3. Movement from fragmented approach to in-service towards community plan with opportunities for teachers to grow in a variety of ways.
4. Increase in classroom and school support for change, e.g. in the form of coaching or collegial planning and feedback.
5. Development of ongoing formats for site-based discussions of teaching and learning; this may involve "upgrading" of faculty meetings, institutionalization of study groups, etc.
6. Expanding the ways in which the individual participants view their roles in terms of their own professional growth as well as their responsibilities toward enhancing the professional growth of other staff members in their institutions.
7. Evaluation of change in classroom practice as part of new initiatives.
8. New uses of incentives to stimulate professional growth among teachers.

The subsample of communities will consist of Atlanta, Baltimore, Cleveland, Hartford, and Milwaukee. These communities were selected for the following reasons. First, baseline data already exists on the three Lead Communities (Atlanta, Baltimore, and Milwaukee). Second, the differences in the institutional composition of the teams coming from these four communities will provide an opportunity to examine the effects of varied institutional relations on the ability of project participants to enhance the nature and extent of in-service offerings in their respective communities. Atlanta is sending three participants from different institutions (one each from the central agency, the JCC, and a synagogue). Both Baltimore and Milwaukee are sending at least one central agency person and one person from either a synagogue or the JCC. Both Cleveland and Hartford are sending participants only from their central agency.

*CIJE Teacher-Educator Institute*

## MEF Evaluation

**Document #1: Working Hypotheses and Revised Time Line**

revised January 1996

The *CIJE Teacher-Educator Institute* is a three-year project designed to create a cadre of outstanding teachers for supplementary and pre-school education. In the first year, a group of eighteen educational leaders will meet together during several seminars to study how to improve professional development in Jewish education. During this year and through the following two years, the participants will be asked to develop and implement in-service educational programs for supplementary and/or pre-school teachers in their communities. Several of these participants will serve as program faculty for the second year. In the second year, the first cohort will meet twice more and a new group of educational leaders and outstanding teachers will begin studying together. These second-year participants also will be asked to develop and implement in-service educational programs within their communities. Finally, the process will be repeated in the third year, using several participants from the second year as faculty, and bringing together a new group of educational leaders and outstanding teachers.

In the first year of the *CIJE Teacher-Educator Institute*, participants will consist of teams from eight Jewish communities in North America: Atlanta, Baltimore, Boston, Chicago, Cleveland, Hartford, Milwaukee, and San Francisco. The intent of the CIJE was to have each community



team include three educational leaders: the director of the local central agency (i.e., Bureau of Jewish Education) and educational directors from two schools (either supplementary or pre-schools). The central agency directors were asked to attend for two reasons. First, the CIJE anticipated that through their participation the *Institute* will impact upon community-level professional growth activities. Second, by including them in the project, the CIJE hoped that the central agency directors will provide essential support to school-based efforts in professional development by assisting educational directors in the development, implementation, and evaluation of in-service offerings within their schools. In lieu of either the central agency director or an educational director, the CIJE encouraged the attendance of the central agency staff responsible for community professional development. The CIJE hopes that a relationship of critical collegueship will develop within each community team, in which they meet frequently to support and discuss their efforts to develop and implement in-service educational programs in their respective domains (i.e., school or community).

Participants who will attend the *CIJE Teacher-Educator Institute* are as follows:

|                    |  |
|--------------------|--|
| Atlanta (3):       | the central agency director, a supplementary school educational director, and a pre-school director.         |
| Baltimore (3):     | the central agency director, a central agency staff member, and a supplementary school educational director. |
| Boston (1):        | a central agency staff member.   |
| Chicago (3):       | the central agency director and two central agency staff members.  |
| Cleveland (3):     | the central agency director and two central agency staff members.  |
| Hartford (1):      | the central agency director.   |
| Milwaukee (2):     | the central agency director and a pre-school director.   |
| San Francisco (2): | the central agency director and a central agency staff member.   |

During the course of the *Institute* seminars, the participants will explore areas of critical concern for the improvement of professional development in Jewish education. These areas will include:

- What is "good teaching"?
- How does "good teaching" balance respect for students and subject matter?
- How is "good teaching" supported by a clear sense of goals?
- How do teachers learn to engage in "good teaching"?
- What do teachers need to learn in order to engage in "good teaching"?
- How can professional development programs enhance teachers' ability to engage in "good teaching"?
- How can we (the participants) improve the professional development offerings in our communities and schools, so that they more effectively encourage "good teaching"?

During the *Institute*, the participants will experience several different types of professional development including curricular investigation, videotaping, field-based projects, and journal writing. The activities of the *Institute* will provide a model of effective professional development and a framework for participants to reflect upon their roles as teacher-educators.

Through participation in the *CJIE Teacher-Educator Institute*, it is envisioned that the participants will be able to design and implement improved in-service educational programs within their schools and communities. This constitutes the general hypothesis guiding the MEF evaluation of the *Institute*. The following statements, divided into eight topics, comprise what the CJIE faculty considers to be the qualities of improved in-service programs. These statements read as "Participation in the *CJIE Teacher-Educator Institute* will lead to a communal environment in which ...", constitute the set of hypothesis to be tested by the MEF team.

#### A. Focus

1. Programs are targeted to specific populations.



2. Programs have goals designed to meet the particular needs of the specific populations.
3. Programs are part of an overall community plan for professional development.

#### **B. Honoring the Triangle**

4. Programs honor equally the participants (personal meaning), their students (pedagogy), and the subject matter (Jewish content).

Not every program needs to contain each element. If program participants are expected or required to attend a series of programs, each program may focus on a different area. In addition, program participants already may have skills or knowledge in one area. Thus, a program for Orthodox teachers may focus on pedagogy, while a program for early childhood educators may focus on personal meaning and Jewish content.

#### **C. Powerful and Empowered Learning**

5. Programs offer opportunities for intensive, investigative learning through case studies and field-based projects.
6. Programs empower the participants through including them in the design, implementation, and evaluation of the program.
7. Programs run for a substantial duration and include a large number of meetings, each meeting running for a considerable length of time.
8. Program meetings build on what was learned in previous meetings or in previous courses.

#### **D. Bridges to the Classroom**

9. Participants are encouraged (especially by their principals) and afforded the opportunity to translate what they have learned into new or revised classroom practices.
10. Participants have opportunities to discuss their efforts at translation with other educational professionals outside and inside the school.
11. Principals and teachers participate in the programs as teams.

#### **E. Institutional Relations**

12. School-based educational leaders and central agency personnel jointly design and implement in-service programs.
13. Incentives are provided to encourage participation in the programs (e.g., release time, salary increases, certification).

14. Both the central agency and the schools contribute to the provision of incentives for programs run either by the central agency or the schools.

#### **F. Lay and Rabbinic Support**

15. Lay leaders and rabbis are involved in the design and implementation of the program.

16. Teacher contracts incorporate in-service requirements and resources (incentives) to enable teacher participation.

17. Programs exist that are specifically designed for lay leaders and rabbis.

#### **G. Evaluation**

18. Program evaluation focuses on classroom outcomes.

#### **H. Implementation**

19. Participants in the *CJIE Teacher-Educator Institute* who attended as a community team that includes both a central agency staff member and an educational director will be more successful at implementing programs with the qualities delineated in the preceding statements than the other participants.

### **EVALUATION DESIGN**

During their first year in the *CJIE Teacher-Educator Institute*, participants will be asked to complete a questionnaire for each in-service program that their institution (i.e., central agency, supplementary school, pre-school) sponsors. They will be asked to complete questionnaires again during their second and third years of participation. Following each round of questionnaires, the *Institute* participants and other key community members from a subsample of communities (i.e., Atlanta, Baltimore, Cleveland, Hartford, and Milwaukee) will be interviewed by the MEF Research Team. The data will provide five case studies detailing communal- and institutional-level efforts to change the structure and content of professional development in Jewish education. From these five cases studies, comparisons will be made over time and across communities.



The questionnaire, entitled *CIJE TEI Professional Development Program Survey*, will provide information to evaluate whether and to what degree changes have been made in regard to the above hypotheses. In addition, the questionnaire will provide baseline data on the number of in-service educational programs being offered in a community, the number of participants in these programs, and the types of participants attending the programs. Furthermore, every supplementary and pre-school director in the communities who have sent a team to the *Institute* will be asked to complete a questionnaire for each in-service program that their institution offers. This will provide a comprehensive map of community professional growth opportunities.

The interviews will provide information on the participants' efforts to improve the quality of professional development in their community and schools. The following areas will be explored:

- What actions are they taking to improve the quality of professional development?
- With whom are they working?
- How has their role in the community and/or school(s) changed?
- What successes have they experienced?
- What problems have they encountered?

In addition, the interviews will clarify the information obtained from the questionnaire and extend our understanding of the professional development opportunities being offered in each community.

## TIME LINE

| Activity  | Date of Completion |
|---|--------------------|
| 1. Design of the <i>CIJE TEI Professional Development Program Survey</i> .  | December, 1995     |
| 2. Initial completion of the <i>CIJE TEI Professional Development Program Survey</i> .                                      | January, 1995      |
| 3. Document #2a (baseline data) written. See MEF Plan for Evaluation of the <i>CIJE Teacher-Educator Institute</i> .        | February, 1995     |
| 4. Design of interview protocol.  | March, 1995        |
| 5. Interviews conducted with <i>Institute</i> participants and other key community members.                                 | April, 1995        |
| 6. Document #2b written.  | May, 1995          |
| 7. Second completion of the <i>CIJE TEI Professional Development Program Survey</i> .                                       | ?                  |
| 8. Second round of Interviews conducted with <i>Institute</i> participants and other key community members.                 | ?                  |
| 9. Document #3 (evaluation of changes) written. See MEF Plan for Evaluation of the <i>CIJE Teacher-Educator Institute</i> . | ?                  |



**Council for Initiatives In Jewish Education****Teacher-Educator Institute****PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM SURVEY**

Please complete a Professional Development Program Survey for each program that is offered by your institution.

Answer all of the questions as completely as possible. If you have any difficulty in answering a particular question, indicate why next to the question.

Please include a COURSE OUTLINE and EVALUATION FORM for the program, if available.

Name of Program \_\_\_\_\_

Sponsoring Institution \_\_\_\_\_

Name and Title of Person Completing Survey \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

**I. PROGRAM AUDIENCE**

The following questions ask you about the educators who attend the program.

1. The program participants work in the following ROLES:  
(Check all that apply)

- ☐ a. Teacher
- ☐ b. Teacher Aide
- ☐ c. Educational Director or Principal
- ☐ d. Assistant Educational Director or Principal
- ☐ e. Department Head (e.g., Hebrew department chair, director of primary program)
- ☐ f. Tutor
- ☐ g. Central Agency Staff
- ☐ h. Other (specify) \_\_\_\_\_

2. The program participants work in the following SETTINGS:  
(Check all that apply)

- ☐ a. Day School
- ☐ b. Supplementary School
- ☐ c. Pre-school
- ☐ d. Adult Education
- ☐ e. Central Agency
- ☐ f. Other (specify) \_\_\_\_\_



3. The program participants work in schools with the following AFFILIATIONS:  
(Check all that apply)

- ☐ a. Reform
- ☐ b. Conservative
- ☐ c. Traditional
- ☐ d. Orthodox
- ☐ e. Reconstructionist
- ☐ f. Community
- ☐ g. Jewish Community Center
- ☐ h. Other (specify) \_\_\_\_\_

4. The program participants work with the following POPULATIONS:  
(Check all that apply)

- ☐ a. Early Childhood
- ☐ b. Kindergarten
- ☐ c. Elementary
- ☐ d. Junior High
- ☐ e. High School
- ☐ f. Adults
- ☐ g. Other (specify) \_\_\_\_\_

5. The program participants have the following level(s) of EXPERIENCE:  
(Check all that apply)

- ☐ a. Novice in Jewish Education (5 years or less)
- ☐ b. Experienced in Jewish Education
- ☐ c. Other (specify) \_\_\_\_\_

6. The program participants have the following type(s) of TRAINING:  
(Check all that apply)

- ☐ a. No Formal Training
- ☐ b. Trained in Education
- ☐ c. Trained in Jewish Content
- ☐ d. Trained in Educational Administration/Leadership
- ☐ e. Other (specify) \_\_\_\_\_

## II. PROGRAM DESIGN

The following questions ask you about the goals, content, and format of the program.

7. Please specify the primary goal(s) of the program.

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

8. Please specify the primary content(s) of the program (e.g., Hebrew language, life cycle, lesson planning).

---

---

---

---

---

---

---



9. What is(are) the primary format(s) of the program?  
(Check all that apply)

- ☐ a. Lecture
- ☐ b. Lecture and Discussion
- ☐ c. Case Studies
- ☐ d. Field-based Projects
- ☐ e. Internships
- ☐ f. Other (specify) \_\_\_\_\_

10. Are there activities which link the program to practice?

Yes ☒ 1 No ☒ 2 (If No, skip to Question #12)

11. Please indicate which activities are undertaken that link the program to practice:  
(Check all that apply)

- ☐ a. Observation and Feedback
- ☐ b. Peer Collaboration
- ☐ c. Mentoring
- ☐ d. Curriculum Development
- ☐ e. Application and Reporting Back
- ☐ f. Other (specify) \_\_\_\_\_

12. Who are the faculty of the program?  
(Check all that apply)

- ☐ a. Teachers
- ☐ b. Principals or Educational Directors
- ☐ c. Central Agency Staff
- ☐ d. Rabbis
- ☐ e. Lay Leaders
- ☐ f. Outside Experts (specify) \_\_\_\_\_
- ☐ g. Other (specify) \_\_\_\_\_

13. Who designed the program?  
(Check all that apply)

- ☐ a. Teachers
- ☐ b. Principals or Educational Directors
- ☐ c. Central Agency Staff
- ☐ d. Rabbis
- ☐ e. Lay Leaders
- ☐ f. Outside Experts (specify) \_\_\_\_\_
- ☐ g. Other (specify) \_\_\_\_\_

14. Were the specific people who served as faculty also involved in designing the program?

Yes

☐ 1

No

☐ 2

---

III. PROGRAM PARTICIPANTS

The following questions ask you for additional information about the program participants.

---

15. Typically, how many participants attend the program? \_\_\_\_\_

16. Do participants attend as individuals, members of a school team, or along with their entire faculty?  
(Check all that apply)

- ☐ a. Individuals
- ☐ b. School Team without Principal
- ☐ c. School Team with Principal
- ☐ d. Entire Faculty
- ☐ e. Other (specify) \_\_\_\_\_

If you checked more than one response, please explain.

---

---



17. What incentives and/or supports are available to participants?  
(Check all that apply)

- ☐ a. None
- ☐ b. Stipend
- ☐ c. Salary Increase
- ☐ d. Release Time
- ☐ e. Academic Credits
- ☐ f. License or Certification
- ☐ g. CEU (Continuing Education Units)/  
SDU (Self Development Units)
- ☐ h. Trip to Israel
- ☐ i. Required by Contract
- ☐ j. Other (specify) \_\_\_\_\_

18. Are incentives provided to the school(s) for their educators' participation in the program?

Yes ☐ 1 No ☐ 2

If Yes, please describe the incentive(s) and the criteria for awarding it.

---

---

#### IV. PROGRAM MEETINGS

The following questions ask you about the duration and intensity of the program, as well as the relationship between program meetings and other programs.

19. In total, how many meetings occur during the course of the program? \_\_\_\_\_

20. How often do the meetings occur? \_\_\_\_\_

21. On average, how many hours is each meeting of the program? \_\_\_\_\_

22. Over what period of time does the entire program run? \_\_\_\_\_

23. Is the content of one meeting related to the content of subsequent meetings?

Yes ☐ 1

No ☐ 2

If Yes, please explain.

24. Is there a relationship between the content of this program and any other program being offered in the community?

Yes ☐ 1

No ☐ 2

If Yes, please explain.



**V. PROGRAM EVALUATION**

**The following questions ask you about the evaluation of the program.**

25. Is the program being evaluated?

Yes

☒ 1

No

☐ 2

(If No, you have completed this questionnaire.)

26. What is the focus of the evaluation?

(Check all that apply)

- ☐ a. Participants' Satisfaction
- ☐ b. Participants' Knowledge
- ☐ c. Participants' Attitudes
- ☐ d. Participants' Skills
- ☐ e. Students' Classroom Behaviors
- ☐ f. Students' Knowledge
- ☐ g. Students' Attitudes
- ☐ h. Other (specify) \_\_\_\_\_

27. Who designed the evaluation?

(Check all that apply)

- ☐ a. Faculty
- ☐ b. Participants
- ☐ c. Outside Experts (specify) \_\_\_\_\_
- ☐ d. Other (specify) \_\_\_\_\_

**Thank you very much for your cooperation!**

Date: Sun, 17 Sep 1995 16:22:00 -0600 (CST)  
Subject: JESNA meeting  
To: GOLDRIEB@ctrvax.Vanderbilt.Edu, 74104.3335@compuserve.com,  
73321.1217@compuserve.com, 73321.1220@compuserve.com,  
74671.3370@compuserve.com  
Cc: 73321.1220@compuserve.com, Annette@vms.huji.ac.il  
Message-id: <01HVE0J7ABNM068X1K@ssc.wisc.edu>  
X-VMS-To: ELLEN, BILL, GAIL, BARRY, NESSA  
X-VMS-Cc: GAMORAN, ALAN, ANNETTE  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: TEXT/PLAIN; CHARSET=US-ASCII  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

① Not  
② evaluation  
institute  
→

I spoke with Alan today about the JESNA meeting. I was worried because it seemed to me that we were entering the meeting with a blank slate. That's not the case at all. Rather, we have a clear, coherent approach for the meeting:

We've designed a plan for an institute for evaluation. This plan satisfies a number of our varied goals: Dissemination of our approach to studying communities, building capacity for evaluation in communities, and establishing a national data base on the Jewish educational workforce. The plan involves a three-tiered seminar with strong linkages within and across communities.

The purpose of this meeting is to find out whether JESNA can help us implement this plan. We would welcome their participation, if we feel confident that it would be high quality. As you know, Alan has been working for some time to figure out a way to collaborate with JESNA, and this may be it, but only if JESNA's contribution is high quality. Most likely, this would require some sort of CIJE oversight of JESNA's role. But if JESNA can do some of the work, and do it well, that would be good for CIJE, since there is more than enough work to keep all of us busy for a long time.

If JESNA wants to implement some different program, or wants to participate in ours in a way that is not satisfactory to us, then we would decide to go our different ways.



*CIJE Teacher-Educator Institute*

## MEF Evaluation

**Document #1: Working Hypotheses and Revised Time Line**

revised January 1996

The *CIJE Teacher-Educator Institute* is a three-year project designed to create a cadre of outstanding teachers for supplementary and pre-school education. In the first year, a group of eighteen educational leaders will meet together during several seminars to study how to improve professional development in Jewish education. During this year and through the following two years, the participants will be asked to develop and implement in-service educational programs for supplementary and/or pre-school teachers in their communities. Several of these participants will serve as program faculty for the second year. In the second year, the first cohort will meet twice more and a new group of educational leaders and outstanding teachers will begin studying together. These second-year participants also will be asked to develop and implement in-service educational programs within their communities. Finally, the process will be repeated in the third year, using several participants from the second year as faculty, and bringing together a new group of educational leaders and outstanding teachers.

In the first year of the *CIJE Teacher-Educator Institute*, participants will consist of teams from eight Jewish communities in North America: Atlanta, Baltimore, Boston, Chicago, Cleveland, Hartford, Milwaukee, and San Francisco. The intent of the CIJE was to have each community

team include three educational leaders: the director of the local central agency (i.e., Bureau of Jewish Education) and educational directors from two schools (either supplementary or pre-schools). The central agency directors were asked to attend for two reasons. First, the CIJE anticipated that through their participation the *Institute* will impact upon community-level professional growth activities. Second, by including them in the project, the CIJE hoped that the central agency directors will provide essential support to school-based efforts in professional development by assisting educational directors in the development, implementation, and evaluation of in-service offerings within their schools. In lieu of either the central agency director or an educational director, the CIJE encouraged the attendance of the central agency staff responsible for community professional development. The CIJE hopes that a relationship of critical collegueship will develop within each community team, in which they meet frequently to support and discuss their efforts to develop and implement in-service educational programs in their respective domains (i.e., school or community).

Participants who will attend the *CIJE Teacher-Educator Institute* are as follows:

|                    |  |
|--------------------|--|
| Atlanta (3):       | the central agency director, a supplementary school educational director, and a pre-school director.         |
| Baltimore (3):     | the central agency director, a central agency staff member, and a supplementary school educational director. |
| Boston (1):        | a central agency staff member.   |
| Chicago (3):       | the central agency director and two central agency staff members.  |
| Cleveland (3):     | the central agency director and two central agency staff members.  |
| Hartford (1):      | the central agency director.   |
| Milwaukee (2):     | the central agency director and a pre-school director.   |
| San Francisco (2): | the central agency director and a central agency staff member.   |



During the course of the *Institute* seminars, the participants will explore areas of critical concern for the improvement of professional development in Jewish education. These areas will include:

- What is "good teaching"?
- How does "good teaching" balance respect for students and subject matter?
- How is "good teaching" supported by a clear sense of goals?
- How do teachers learn to engage in "good teaching"?
- What do teachers need to learn in order to engage in "good teaching"?
- How can professional development programs enhance teachers' ability to engage in "good teaching"?
- How can we (the participants) improve the professional development offerings in our communities and schools, so that they more effectively encourage "good teaching"?

During the *Institute*, the participants will experience several different types of professional development including curricular investigation, videotaping, field-based projects, and journal writing. The activities of the *Institute* will provide a model of effective professional development and a framework for participants to reflect upon their roles as teacher-educators.

Through participation in the *CJIE Teacher-Educator Institute*, it is envisioned that the participants will be able to design and implement improved in-service educational programs within their schools and communities. This constitutes the general hypothesis guiding the MEF evaluation of the *Institute*. The following statements, divided into eight topics, comprise what the CJIE faculty considers to be the qualities of improved in-service programs. These statements read as "Participation in the *CJIE Teacher-Educator Institute* will lead to a communal environment in which ..." , constitute the set of hypothesis to be tested by the MEF team.

#### **A. Focus**

1. Programs are targeted to specific populations.



2. Programs have goals designed to meet the particular needs of the specific populations.
3. Programs are part of an overall community plan for professional development.

#### **B. Honoring the Triangle**

4. Programs honor equally the participants (personal meaning), their students (pedagogy), and the subject matter (Jewish content).

Not every program needs to contain each element. If program participants are expected or required to attend a series of programs, each program may focus on a different area. In addition, program participants already may have skills or knowledge in one area. Thus, a program for Orthodox teachers may focus on pedagogy, while a program for early childhood educators may focus on personal meaning and Jewish content.

#### **C. Powerful and Empowered Learning**

5. Programs offer opportunities for intensive, investigative learning through case studies and field-based projects.
6. Programs empower the participants through including them in the design, implementation, and evaluation of the program.
7. Programs run for a substantial duration and include a large number of meetings, each meeting running for a considerable length of time.
8. Program meetings build on what was learned in previous meetings or in previous courses.

#### **D. Bridges to the Classroom**

9. Participants are encouraged (especially by their principals) and afforded the opportunity to translate what they have learned into new or revised classroom practices.
10. Participants have opportunities to discuss their efforts at translation with other educational professionals outside and inside the school.
11. Principals and teachers participate in the programs as teams.

#### **E. Institutional Relations**

12. School-based educational leaders and central agency personnel jointly design and implement in-service programs.
13. Incentives are provided to encourage participation in the programs (e.g., release time, salary increases, certification).



14. Both the central agency and the schools contribute to the provision of incentives for programs run either by the central agency or the schools.

**F. Lay and Rabbinic Support**

15. Lay leaders and rabbis are involved in the design and implementation of the program.

16. Teacher contracts incorporate in-service requirements and resources (incentives) to enable teacher participation.

17. Programs exist that are specifically designed for lay leaders and rabbis.

**G. Evaluation**

18. Program evaluation focuses on classroom outcomes.

**H. Implementation**

19. Participants in the *CJIE Teacher-Educator Institute* who attended as a community team that includes both a central agency staff member and an educational director will be more successful at implementing programs with the qualities delineated in the preceding statements than the other participants.

**EVALUATION DESIGN**

During their first year in the *CJIE Teacher-Educator Institute*, participants will be asked to complete a questionnaire for each in-service program that their institution (i.e., central agency, supplementary school, pre-school) sponsors. They will be asked to complete questionnaires again during their second and third years of participation. Following each round of questionnaires, the *Institute* participants and other key community members from a subsample of communities (i.e., Atlanta, Baltimore, Cleveland, Hartford, and Milwaukee) will be interviewed by the MEF Research Team. The data will provide five case studies detailing communal- and institutional-level efforts to change the structure and content of professional development in Jewish education. From these five cases studies, comparisons will be made over time and across communities.

The questionnaire, entitled *CIE TEI Professional Development Program Survey*, will provide information to evaluate whether and to what degree changes have been made in regard to the above hypotheses. In addition, the questionnaire will provide baseline data on the number of in-service educational programs being offered in a community, the number of participants in these programs, and the types of participants attending the programs. Furthermore, every supplementary and pre-school director in the communities who have sent a team to the *Institute* will be asked to complete a questionnaire for each in-service program that their institution offers. This will provide a comprehensive map of community professional growth opportunities.

The interviews will provide information on the participants' efforts to improve the quality of professional development in their community and schools. The following areas will be explored:

- What actions are they taking to improve the quality of professional development?
- With whom are they working?
- How has their role in the community and/or school(s) changed?
- What successes have they experienced?
- What problems have they encountered?

In addition, the interviews will clarify the information obtained from the questionnaire and extend our understanding of the professional development opportunities being offered in each community.



## TIME LINE

| Activity  | Date of Completion |
|---|--------------------|
| 1. Design of the <i>CIJE TEI Professional Development Program Survey</i> .  | December, 1995     |
| 2. Initial completion of the <i>CIJE TEI Professional Development Program Survey</i> .                                      | January, 1995      |
| 3. Document #2a (baseline data) written. See MEF Plan for Evaluation of the <i>CIJE Teacher-Educator Institute</i> .        | February, 1995     |
| 4. Design of interview protocol.  | March, 1995        |
| 5. Interviews conducted with <i>Institute</i> participants and other key community members.                                 | April, 1995        |
| 6. Document #2b written.  | May, 1995          |
| 7. Second completion of the <i>CIJE TEI Professional Development Program Survey</i> .                                       | ?                  |
| 8. Second round of Interviews conducted with <i>Institute</i> participants and other key community members.                 | ?                  |
| 9. Document #3 (evaluation of changes) written. See MEF Plan for Evaluation of the <i>CIJE Teacher-Educator Institute</i> . | ?                  |

**Council for Initiatives In Jewish Education****Teacher-Educator Institute****PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM SURVEY**

Please complete a Professional Development Program Survey for each program that is offered by your institution.

Answer all of the questions as completely as possible. If you have any difficulty in answering a particular question, indicate why next to the question.

Please include a COURSE OUTLINE and EVALUATION FORM for the program, if available.

Name of Program \_\_\_\_\_

Sponsoring Institution \_\_\_\_\_

Name and Title of Person Completing Survey \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_



**I. PROGRAM AUDIENCE**

The following questions ask you about the educators who attend the program.

**1. The program participants work in the following ROLES:**

(Check all that apply)

- ☐ a. Teacher
- ☐ b. Teacher Aide
- ☐ c. Educational Director or Principal
- ☐ d. Assistant Educational Director or Principal
- ☐ e. Department Head (e.g., Hebrew department chair, director of primary program)
- ☐ f. Tutor
- ☐ g. Central Agency Staff
- ☐ h. Other (specify) \_\_\_\_\_

**2. The program participants work in the following SETTINGS:**

(Check all that apply)

- ☐ a. Day School
- ☐ b. Supplementary School
- ☐ c. Pre-school
- ☐ d. Adult Education
- ☐ e. Central Agency
- ☐ f. Other (specify) \_\_\_\_\_

3. The program participants work in schools with the following AFFILIATIONS:  
(Check all that apply)

- ☐ a. Reform
- ☐ b. Conservative
- ☐ c. Traditional
- ☐ d. Orthodox
- ☐ e. Reconstructionist
- ☐ f. Community
- ☐ g. Jewish Community Center
- ☐ h. Other (specify) \_\_\_\_\_

4. The program participants work with the following POPULATIONS:  
(Check all that apply)

- ☐ a. Early Childhood
- ☐ b. Kindergarten
- ☐ c. Elementary
- ☐ d. Junior High
- ☐ e. High School
- ☐ f. Adults
- ☐ g. Other (specify) \_\_\_\_\_

5. The program participants have the following level(s) of EXPERIENCE:  
(Check all that apply)

- ☐ a. Novice in Jewish Education (5 years or less)
- ☐ b. Experienced in Jewish Education
- ☐ c. Other (specify) \_\_\_\_\_



6. The program participants have the following type(s) of TRAINING:  
(Check all that apply)

- ☐ a. No Formal Training
- ☐ b. Trained in Education
- ☐ c. Trained in Jewish Content
- ☐ d. Trained in Educational Administration/Leadership
- ☐ e. Other (specify) \_\_\_\_\_

## II. PROGRAM DESIGN

The following questions ask you about the goals, content, and format of the program.

7. Please specify the primary goal(s) of the program.

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

8. Please specify the primary content(s) of the program (e.g., Hebrew language, life cycle, lesson planning).

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

9. What is(are) the primary format(s) of the program?  
(Check all that apply)

- ☐ a. Lecture
- ☐ b. Lecture and Discussion
- ☐ c. Case Studies
- ☐ d. Field-based Projects
- ☐ e. Internships
- ☐ f. Other (specify) \_\_\_\_\_

10. Are there activities which link the program to practice?

Yes ☒ 1 No ☒ 2 (If No, skip to Question #12)

11. Please indicate which activities are undertaken that link the program to practice:  
(Check all that apply)

- ☐ a. Observation and Feedback
- ☐ b. Peer Collaboration
- ☐ c. Mentoring
- ☐ d. Curriculum Development
- ☐ e. Application and Reporting Back
- ☐ f. Other (specify) \_\_\_\_\_

12. Who are the faculty of the program?  
(Check all that apply)

- ☐ a. Teachers
- ☐ b. Principals or Educational Directors
- ☐ c. Central Agency Staff
- ☐ d. Rabbis
- ☐ e. Lay Leaders
- ☐ f. Outside Experts (specify) \_\_\_\_\_
- ☐ g. Other (specify) \_\_\_\_\_



**13. Who designed the program?**  
(Check all that apply)

- ☐ a. Teachers
- ☐ b. Principals or Educational Directors
- ☐ c. Central Agency Staff
- ☐ d. Rabbis
- ☐ e. Lay Leaders
- ☐ f. Outside Experts (specify) \_\_\_\_\_
- ☐ g. Other (specify) \_\_\_\_\_

**14. Were the specific people who served as faculty also involved in designing the program?**

Yes

☒ 1

No

☒ 2

---

**III. PROGRAM PARTICIPANTS**

**The following questions ask you for additional information about the program participants.**

---

**15. Typically, how many participants attend the program?** \_\_\_\_\_

**16. Do participants attend as individuals, members of a school team, or along with their entire faculty?**  
(Check all that apply)

- ☐ a. Individuals
- ☐ b. School Team without Principal
- ☐ c. School Team with Principal
- ☐ d. Entire Faculty
- ☐ e. Other (specify) \_\_\_\_\_

If you checked more than one response, please explain.

---

---

17. What incentives and/or supports are available to participants?  
(Check all that apply)

- ☐ a. None
- ☐ b. Stipend
- ☐ c. Salary Increase
- ☐ d. Release Time
- ☐ e. Academic Credits
- ☐ f. License or Certification
- ☐ g. CEU (Continuing Education Units)/  
SDU (Self Development Units)
- ☐ h. Trip to Israel
- ☐ i. Required by Contract
- ☐ j. Other (specify) \_\_\_\_\_

18. Are incentives provided to the school(s) for their educators' participation in the program?

Yes ☒ 1 No ☒ 2

If Yes, please describe the incentive(s) and the criteria for awarding it.

---

---

IV. PROGRAM MEETINGS

The following questions ask you about the duration and intensity of the program, as well as the relationship between program meetings and other programs.

19. In total, how many meetings occur during the course of the program? \_\_\_\_\_

20. How often do the meetings occur? \_\_\_\_\_

21. On average, how many hours is each meeting of the program? \_\_\_\_\_

22. Over what period of time does the entire program run? \_\_\_\_\_



23. Is the content of one meeting related to the content of subsequent meetings?

Yes

☒ 1

No

☒ 2

If Yes, please explain.

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

24. Is there a relationship between the content of this program and any other program being offered in the community?

Yes

☒ 1

No

☒ 2

If Yes, please explain.

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

**V. PROGRAM EVALUATION**

**The following questions ask you about the evaluation of the program.**

25. Is the program being evaluated?

Yes

☐ 1

No

☐ 2

(If No, you have completed this questionnaire.)

26. What is the focus of the evaluation?

(Check all that apply)

☐

a. Participants' Satisfaction

☐

b. Participants' Knowledge

☐

c. Participants' Attitudes

☐

d. Participants' Skills

☐

e. Students' Classroom Behaviors

☐

f. Students' Knowledge

☐

g. Students' Attitudes

☐

h. Other (specify) \_\_\_\_\_

27. Who designed the evaluation?

(Check all that apply)

☐

a. Faculty

☐

b. Participants

☐

c. Outside Experts (specify) \_\_\_\_\_

☐

d. Other (specify) \_\_\_\_\_

**Thank you very much for your cooperation!**