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 Folder 34 14

MEF. Staff meetings. Correspondence and notes, 1995-1996.

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

MET

Minutes of meeting in Ann Arbor, MI, 1/15/95 Adam Gamoran, Ellen Goldring, Annette Hochstein, Alan Hoffmann Minutes prepared by Adam Gamoran

I. In the first part of the meeting, we discussed an overall strategy for MEF which consists of three "prongs": evaluation of CIJE programs, policy-oriented research, and influencing CIJE's strategic agenda.

A. Evaluation of CIJE programs

Our current activity in this area is the evaluation of TEI. We described our approach briefly but did not debate the content of the evaluation. Alan noted that standards of evidence is an important question. For example, how will we know that changes reported after TEI are real changes? There was consensus about evaluating change in communities as the approach to evaluating CIJE initiatives (as contrasted with evaluating changes in individuals or evaluating CIJE itself).

B. Policy-oriented research

Annette reminded us that this came about because originally we had no programs to evaluate, and our mobilization reports were of limited usefulness. As it turned out, our analyses of educators have had a major impact on CIJE's activities. Annette recommended a new project that could have similar impact, namely a study of content in Jewish education. Alan pointed out that calling for this research assumes that richer content leads to more learning, and Adam and Ellen indicated that substantial research in general education supports this assumption. Ellen observed that there could be political difficulties in analyzing content because of variation across the movements, e.g. Orthodox vs. reform. Adam suggested using indicators of depth, higher order thinking, and substantive conversation to indicate the quality of content, without valuing one specific Jewish content over another. Ellen noted that many Jews do not care about content in Jewish education because they are seeking affective outcomes. In response, Annette suggested we need to convince people that better content leads to better affect.

Adam noted that a study of content could include informal as well as formal settings. He argued that to be meaningful, it would have to include observations of interactions between educators and learners, and this would make it a very large undertaking.

No decision was reached on Annette's suggestion, but we will discuss it with the CIJE NY staff.

C. Influencing CIJE's strategic agenda

We discussed various modes of operation, and reached consensus that it is appropriate for MEF to describe and analyze the changes through which CIJE has gone, for consideration by the director, the advisory board, and the steering committee.

**Note from Adam: In light of our subsequent discussion, I do not think there is a mandate for MEF to evaluate CIJE's operation and changes over the past four years.

MEF can also influence CIJE's strategic agenda by making a case for particular interpretations of data, for new data collections, or for addressing particular policy issues.

II. In the second part of the meeting, we discussed how we might structure a process of reviewing what we have learned about CIJE and its work. The more we discussed the idea, the less convinced we became that this would be a fruitful exercise. We postponed a final decision for a conference call scheduled for Wednesday, Jan. 31, at 3:00pm Eastern Time, but we left the meeting leaning against this idea. For the record, I will summarize our discussion.

A. Audience and schedule

The audience would be an internal one consisting of the CIJE staff, including the new director, and the MEF advisory committee including possible new members.

The best date seemed to be July 3, 1996. Other possibilities were August 21, 1996 or some time in November, 1996.

B. Content

Alan initiated a list of nine topics that could be examined in a review process:

- 1. the idea of CIJE
- Lead Communities
- content and goals
- 4. community mobilization and lay leadership
- 5. building the profession
- 6. the role of MEF
- 7. the intersection of 3, 4, 5, and 6
- 8. why informal education (and other topics) have been left out so far
- 9. the challenges ahead

After some discussion of difficulties in examining this list, including its vast scope and the need to avoid a simplistic chronological approach, Alan suggested a more thematic approach:

- 1. Does the model of federation as convener, developing a coalition of lay leadership, and focusing on professional development work?
- 2. Is it possible to think about systemic change without visions of educational outcomes?
- 3. Is working at the national and local levels simultaneously an effective strategy?

- 4. How has the problem of limited human capacity affected CIJE's endeavors?
- 5. How has the role of the synagogue and rabbi figured in what has occurred in the communities in which CIJE has worked?

The idea here would be to take three or four seminal questions and subject them to intense examination, possibly along with a cross-community mobilization report. Ellen suggested that such questions could be addressed through different lenses that represent different approaches to studying change. Annette expressed concern that this procedure, while interesting, may not lead to concrete policy decisions.

After further discussion it became apparent that MEF did not have enough information to examine questions with this broad scope. Alan then suggested a more modest approach, where the questions would be: "What have we learned from MEF?" "What has MEF taught us about CIJE's work in communities?" While this approach is feasible in that we have plenty of evidence to answer the questions, it's not clear how much we would learn, and whether it would contribute substantially to CIJE's strategic thrust.

The idea of the review will be discussed at the staff meeting on Jan 21, and in a conference call of Annette, Alan, Ellen, and Adam on Jan 31, when a final decision will be reached.

**Note from Adam: If we decided against the review, Adam and Ellen will still prepare a substantial briefing for the new director, addressing the question of what we have learned from MEF. Thus, this important function of the review would not be lost, even if we decide not to hold the review.

III. Next, Alan provided an update on the Evaluation Institute. He discussed its aims, how it fits into CIJE's mission, and the steps we are taking to bring it about. We listed elements of a possible curriculum for the Institute, including:

- -- The CIJE Study of Educators
- -- CIJE's experiences in community mobilization
- -- Ilana' Shohamy's assessment of Hebrew in day schools
- -- the Nativ study of the Israel Experience
- -- a manual for program evaluation in Jewish education

This last item, a nuts-and-bolts manual for program evaluation, must be produced by CIJE by August 1996. Alan will hire someone to write this manual.

IV. Adam gave an update on publications in the pipeline, including:

- -- 3-city ed leaders report (on hold)
- -- 3-city teachers report (will be distributed shortly)

- -- memos on TEI (doc #1 to be discussed at Jan 22 staff mtg)
- -- teacher power and teacher in-service (due Jan 31)
- -- "levers" paper (revision pending new analysis)
- -- leaders paper for AERA (will be completed by April)

We then discussed possible ideas for new policy briefs. Alan expressed the concern that policy briefs must be accompanied by plans for action, including CIJE's own plans. Annette noted that it is important to keep the debate alive, and producing policy briefs helps us do that. Alan proposed, therefore, that we write a policy brief on early childhood, using leaders and teachers data, for release at the 1996 GA. He gave the following reasons for the importance of this topic:

- -- early childhood education is growing
- -- it is therefore an opportunity to attract more children to Jewish education
- -- moreover, good early childhood education involves parents, so it is an opportunity to increase the Jewish learning and involvement of families
- -- early Jewish education leads to later Jewish education
- -- early childhood education crosses denominations and settings (including JCCs), so it is of broad interest

This idea will be discussed at the staff meeting on Jan 22 to see how it fits into the rest of CIJE's agenda.

Possibly by November of 1997 we will be ready to produce a policy brief on leaders.

V. Finally, we decided that we will not be able to hold a meeting of the MEF advisory committee on Feb 18, because the planning committee for the "professors in Israel" program has greater urgency. Instead, we will decide about the most pressing issue -- whether or not to carry out a review procedure -- in a conference call on Jan 31.

1/26/95

To: Annette From: Adam

CC: Ellen, Bill, Alan, Barry, Gail, Nessa, Dan P.

Annette, I'm writing to give you a report on the MEF section of the CIJE staff meeting on Jan 22. The MEF topics were: TEI evaluation, review of CIJE, data collection on content, the Research Network conference, and policy brief of early childhood.

(Really I should be saying "Research and Evaluation" instead of MEF, since we aren't doing MEF in Lead Communities any more, and since that's what the CIJE domain is called. But MEF is shorter.)

A. TEI evaluation

The staff regards the evaluation plan as acceptable as far as it goes, but pointed out four limitations that should be addressed if possible:

- 1. The evaluation plan as stated does not address participants' thinking about professional growth, but that is a chief mechanism through which change is expected to occur. In response, we need to incorporate this issue into the interviews with targeted participants that we have scheduled for this spring.
- 2. We plan to assess change in professional growth opportunities with survey questions administered before and after. A weakness in this plan is that we will not have observations to confirm that reported changes have actually occurred. In response, we hope to use follow-up surveys of lead community educators to triangulate, so that we will have evidence from beyond the TEI participants themselves.
- 3. The TEI evaluation does not assess change in teacher-student interactions in classrooms, nor does it assess change in student outcomes. In response, near the end of the three-year TEI program, we may ask participants to collect baseline data in areas in which positive results of their professional development offerings are most likely to occur. (Adam's note: This is a good idea, but it may not be practical because it puts a heavy burden on TEI participants.
- 4. The issue of funding for professional development is absent from our evaluation. (Adam's note: This is a separate topic and cannot be incorporated in our TEI evaluation.)

B. Review of CIJE or MEF

We reported on our meeting of Jan 15, concluding with the recommendation that we not put the review on MEF's work plan. Staff members found the decision understandable, but had some regrets. Both Nessa and Barry were particularly concerned that we have not done enough with what

we have learned, and that we did not have advice to offer other communities or change agents.

The staff decided to hold a 1-day staff meeting on "what have we learned," for which each staff member would prepare a 2-page memo about their own insights and conclusions. This would help satisfy our need for self-reflection without draining staff energies more than is warranted. Possibly, after going through this process, we may decide to work on a document for an external audience.

C. Data collection on content

The staff found your idea about a new data collection on content to be intriguing and provocative. There was some concern that the response to such a study would be "so what," unlike the response to the study of educators. Most staff members think the American Jewish audience would not be particularly concerned about weak content.

One idea that resulted from this discussion is that we could begin work in this area by examining content in a setting that is working with the Goals Project. In a subsequent discussion with Dan Pekarsky (who was unable to attend the staff meeting), he was very interested in the idea of examining content in a pilot site before and after working with him. This could constitue evaluation of a Goals Project pilot project. We plan to explore this idea further.

D. The Research Network conference

The conference is scheduled for July 29-August 1, 1996, in Israel. It does not fit my schedule or Ellen's, but Alan is very eager for us to make a major presentation that would inform this audience -- which, this year, will include many Israeli academics -- about the whole CIJE Study of Educators. (This is particularly important because last year's presentation, unfortunately, failed to show CIJE in its best light.)

Barry Holtz will approach the conference organizers about the possibility of devoting a session to a CIJE symposium on our study. The session would include 5 papers:

- (1) Background to the CIJE Study of Educators: Theory and Policy Context
- (2) Instruments for the CIJE Study of Educators
- (3) Research findings: Commitment in a non-professional context
- (4) Policy implications: Building the personnel of Jewish education
- (5) Implementation of policy: Improving opportunities for professional growth

In addition, Dan P. is submitting a paper on goals and Barry is submitting a paper on best practices for presentation at the conference.

D. Policy brief on early childhood

We decided to hold off on the policy brief on early childhood for now, possibly waiting until 1997. The reason for this decision is that we do not yet know what CIJE's policy response will be, and we do not yet know whether new data may be required to support that policy response.

I think we could tell a good story about Jewish early childhood education, using the data we already have. But is it a story that would further CIJE's policy efforts? That's what is not yet clear.

Should we return to the idea of a policy brief on leaders? There, too, CIJE's policy response is not yet determined. But I am concerned about Annette's point about maintaining momentum and keeping the attention of the North American audience.



FROM: INTERNET:GOLDRIEB@ctrvax.Vanderbilt.Edu,

INTERNET:GOLDRIEB@ctrvax.Vanderbilt.Edu

TO: (unknown), 73321,1220

Sandra L. Blumenfield, 76322,2406

DATE: 2/17/95 5:16 PM

Re: Re: March 5 - 6, 1995 - New York City

Sender: goldrieb@ctrvax.vanderbilt.edu

Received: from ctrvx1.Vanderbilt.Edu by dub-img-1.compuserve.com (8.6.9/5.941228sam)

id RAA12487; Fri, 17 Feb 1995 17:13:55 -0500

From: <GOLDRIEB@ctrvax.Vanderbilt.Edu>

Received: from ctrvax. Vanderbilt. Edu by ctrvax. Vanderbilt. Edu (PMDF V4.2-15

#7190) id <01HN5SQIMXUS8XBFR0@ctrvax.Vanderbilt.Edu>; Fri,

17 Feb 1995 15:30:17 CST

Date: Fri, 17 Feb 1995 15:30:17 -0600 (CST) Subject: Re: March 5 - 6, 1995 - New York City

To: 76322.2406@compuserve.com

Cc: 73321.1220@compuserve.com, gamoran@ssc.wisc.edu Message-id: <01HN5SQIN7HY8XBFR0@ctrvax.Vanderbilt.Edu>

X-VMS-To: IN%"76322.2406@compuserve.com"

X-VMS-Cc: IN%"73321.1220@compuserve.com", IN%"gamoran@ssc.wisc.edu"

MIME-version: 1.0

Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

Sandy, this is to confirm plans for the March 6th MEF meeting in NY. I will come in on the 5th to have dinner with Alan, and Adam will stay and have dinner with Alan on the 6th. Please arrange hotel reservations for us: Adam, Bill, R. and myself. I will need one night, only the 5th, you should check with Adam and Bill about their needs beyond the 5th, please guarentee reservations for late arrival. We assume we will begin around 9:00 AM on the 6th on the 6th, is this correct?

Thanx! Shabat SHalom, Ellen

To: Alan Hoffmann, Adam Gamoran, Ellen Goldring, and Gail Dorph

From: Bill Robinson

Re: Conference call of April 4th.

met fill

A. We focused on the MEF work plan, as outlined in Adam's memo of March 8th.

- 1. It was affirmed that the full integrated report on teachers in the lead communities would be completed in August, the four reports on educational leaders (one for each lead community and a combined report) will be completed in May, and the Research Paper on levers for change in extent of in-service will be completed in June.
- It was also affirmed that when the NY staff receives the combined educational leaders report, they will decide on whether or not the Policy Brief for this year will deal with the educational leaders.
- 3. The Module for The CIJE Study of Educators will be completed (in draft form) and ready for presentation to the Board Steering Committee at their meeting on April 26th (see below). As part of this process, Adam will identify anchor items in the CIJE Educators Survey.
- Whether or not the other two Research Papers (on teacher power and teacher in-service) will be done awaits a decision by Alan.
- 5. Concerning, the proposed MEF evaluation of the CIJE's training of trainers and training of goals coaches, the MEF team awaits information from the NY staff and Dan Pekarsky (respectively) regarding the objectives of the programs, as well as when and where they will be taking place.
- 6. Alan stated that in his conversations with communities, they expressed excitement about the idea of an Evaluation Institute. The next step will be to obtain Board approval. Alan met with a woman who would be perfect for the position of administrator of this project, but she is more interested in conducting evaluation than doing administration. Alan will continue to look for a part-time administrator to coordinate the proposed Evaluation Institute.
- 7. MEF should move ahead with thinking about how to do research on informal education.
- 8. Alan expressed his concern about the cost of a CIJE seminar in Jerusalem to discuss "what we have learned from three years of MEF". He will consider ways to do this less expensively. He

- suggested the possibility of Adam, Ellen, Annette and himself meeting in Jerusalem to develop briefing papers for the envisioned new academic advisory committee of the whole CIJE (see below). The four would design a mini-conference on what we have learned for people who know very little about the CIJE (i.e., the new academic advisory committee - as a means of bringing them up to speed).
- B. We discussed the upcoming Board Steering Committee meeting and the meeting of the Board Subcommittee on Research and Evaluation.
 - 1. It was decided that Adam/Ellen will present a few "nuggets" from the educational leaders data at both meetings.
 - 2. It was also decided that Adam/Ellen will present (a draft of) the Module for The CIJE Study of Educators at both meetings.
 - 3. It was also decided that the concept of the Evaluation Institute would be presented and discussed at both meetings. The Steering Committee will be asked to make a decision on whether CIJE should go ahead with this project. It was not decided who would present this to the Steering Committee.
 - 4. Adam & Ellen will compose a letter to be sent to the Board Subcommittee on Research and Evaluation from Esther Leah Ritz that outlines what will be discussed at the meeting, as well as a two page memo detailing what MEF has done since the last Board Subcommittee meeting and what MEF is currently engaged in. Either Adam or Ginny will contact Esther to obtain her consent to compose and distribute the letter and memo.

C. Other

- Alan authorized the purchase of a software program and a manual (cost of approximately \$100) to be used by MEF for producing the Module for The CIJE Study of Educators.
- 2. Alan mentioned that a new academic advisory committee may be formed whose domain would encompass the whole CIJE (as opposed to just the MEF). A tentative idea is to have this academic advisory committee meet for two days in October of 1995. Ellen and Adam suggested Susan Stodolsky as a possible member of this new committee. She's a published educational researcher (University of Chicago Press), with expertise in program evaluation (qualitative and mixed methodologies) and as a content specialist (social science and mathematics). She's also Jewish.
- 3. Conference calls with Alan, Gail, Adam, Ellen, and Bill will be a regular occurrence, scheduled to take place approximately every other week. However, the next conference call will be on Tuesday, April 11th at 8:00 a.m. Central Time. Debra will coordinate the

call. Among the agenda items will be the MEF evaluation of the CIJE's own work (i.e., training of trainers and training of goals coaches), and the "talking points" for presentation of the proposed Evaluation Institute to the Board Steering Committee.



mot ble

From: Bill Robinson

TO: Alan Hoffmann

CC: Gail Dorph

Adam Gamoran Ellen Goldring Debra Perrin

DATE: 4/11/95

RE: Conference call of 4/11

A. Informal education:

1. We briefly discussed some of the issues involved in doing research on informal education:

- Is "building the profession" an appropriate building block for informal education?

- Are issues of access and Jewish program content more important?
- Are issues of content intrinsically tied to issues of personnel?
- Should we focus on educational leaders in informal settings, as opposed to educators?
- 2. Then, we discussed how to raise the issue of research on informal education with the Board Steering Committee. It was decided that the issue was too complicated for an open-ended discussion. Instead, we decided to inform the Steering Committee (and the Board Subcommittee on Research & Evaluation?) that the CIJE staff will discuss this issue at their staff meeting in the afternoon.
- B. The MEF presentation to the Steering Committee:
 - 1. The "comparability of data" issue will be addressed when the Module is discussed.
 - 2. The agenda:
 - a. Educational Leaders Data (10 -15 minute presentation)
 - b. Towards an Evaluation Capacity
 - the Module for The CIJE Study of Educators (10 minute presentation)
 - Evaluation Institute (brief presentation)
- 3. Each part of the agenda will be followed by a discussion. The whole section will be allocated one hour.

C. MEF report to the Board

1. It was decided that Gail would make the needed changes to Adam's written report to the Board on the activities of the MEF. These changes were discussed.

D. MEF work plan

- 1. The work plan matrix was reviewed briefly. It was affirmed that Gail owes MEF a discussion on "Evaluation of training trainers" (2.1). It was affirmed that Barry and Dan owes MEF a discussion on "Evaluation of training goals coaches" (2.2). Alan said that he would be talking with Annette on "Taking Stock of CIJE in the Lead Communities" (2.3).
- It was decided that the matrix would not be presented to the Board Subcommittee on Research and Evaluation.
- We discussed the possibility of the research paper on "levers for upgrading in-service education" (3.1) becoming a policy brief. This will be explored.
- 4. We discussed the proposed research papers on "teacher power" and "in-service training" (3.2). Alan decided to commission Julie and Roberta to write them. It was thought that each paper should have an introduction on what is CIJE and on the nature of in-service training, as well as a more developed discussion on power.

Also, the papers should deal with the policy implications of the research, to whatever degree that is possible. Additionally, it was suggested that Nessa work with them (specifically, on the introductory parts about CIJE & in-service training). Alan will talk with Sheila Allenick on authorizing the funding for this. He thinks that this will not be a problem. Adam will talk with Julie and Roberta to get their commitment and to set forth the expectations of the project.

5. Adam has been in contact with Bob Torren, as well as Julie and Roberta, concerning the latter's research proposal for Cleveland. As revised, Julie and Roberta will engage in a survey of informal and formal educators, and evaluate Cleveland's four programs. Adam will e-mail a more complete discussion of this. Debra & Gail,

Here are a compilation of Adam's, Ellen's, and my notes on the CIJE staff meeting. Sorry for the delay.

Bill

- 1. Gail and Barry explained the "virtual college" Training of Trainers for which the CIJE has received a Cummings Grant. Most of what was explained is contained in the grant. Of note (and not in the grant) is the following. The first cadre of trainers will be people whose current job involves training teachers (i.e., central agency people and principals). The second cadre of teachers may contain those who do not (currently) have positions in which they train people. It was decided to do it this way, because the CIJE could not promise (yet) that there would be appropriate jobs available for those who went through the program.
- 2. The MEF will evaluate the Training of Trainers virtual college. This assignment was written into the Cummings Grant. Some tentative ideas on how the evaluation could be done were included in the grant. Adam & Ellen will outline the possible options for evaluation, focusing upon the entry points for evaluation. Bill will attend the planning meeting for this project on May 31st and June 1st.
- 3. The planned Teachers Training Teachers (TTT) project was briefly explained. As the Training of Trainers is for supplementary schools (given the interest of the Cummings Foundation), the TTT will be for day schools. They are both part of the same "virtual college" and it is envisioned that they could be merged down-the-line.
- 4. Barry and Dan explained the Training of Goals Coaches, the community seminars Dan ran in Milwaukee and plans to run elsewhere, and the relation of these to the institutional-based part of the Goals Project. Of note, Dan envisions that only 3-4 institutions will take in goals coaches and begin the institutional-based part of the Goals Project.
- 5. The MEF has been asked to evaluate the Goals Project. There was much discussion concerning the point at which evaluation should begin. Four options were delineated: (a) with the community seminars; (b) with the training of goals coaches; (c) when institutions begin to create visions/goals; and (d) when institutional practices are supposed to begin changing in response to new visions. Either (a) or (b) could be evaluated without evaluating the other, but once either is done evaluation will continue through points (c) and (d). If evaluation starts with point (c), then it will continue through point (d).
- 6. The general feeling was that evaluation should probably start at point (c), when institutions commit to taking on a goals coach (and begin to engage in creating goals and linking them to practice). However, Adam also delineated a possible evaluation strategy by which three groups would be compared: those who participated in the community seminars but elected not to continue, those who participated in the community seminars and elected to continue with the Goals Project, and those who did neither.

- 7. Dan mentioned that evaluation should not only acquire base-line data (etc.), but should be an integral part of the process. Evaluation (in this case, "taking stock") should facilitate the process of creating goals and linking them to practice, as it evaluates this process. [This was also reiterated in relation to the Training of Trainers.] Thus, it was suggested that the Training of Goals Coaches include a presentation and discussion of institutional stock taking. Bill and Dan have been assigned to delineate the options for evaluating the Goals Project. Bill will attend (and possibly present the piece on taking stock at) the Training of Goals Coaches seminar from July 30th to August 2nd.
- 8. Nessa mentioned that we need to always think about (and act upon) what needs to be in place (nationally and locally) to support our projects. This was not given substantial consideration during the meeting.
- 9. After the two memos on evaluation options are written, another staff meeting will be held with Alan (possibly over the phone) to review the memos and decide upon the directions that evaluation should take.
- 10. There was a preliminary discussion of informal education. Barry pointed out, citing Chazan, that the formal/informal distinction is something of a false dichotomy, in that there are informal aspects of formal education, and formal aspects of informal education. Informal settings were listed, including:
 - -- camps
 - -- day / residential
 - -- secular but attended by Jews / Jewish communal with little Jewish content / Jewish educational
 - -- youth groups
 - -- Israel trips
 - -- cultural arts programs
 - -- college campus activities
 - -- family education
 - -- informal adult education
 - -- cyberspace (virtual education)
 - -- retreats
 - -- holiday programs

Adam maintained that although informal education occurs in institutions such as JCCs and synagogues, one would not want to simply list these as settings because formal education and, in the case of JCCs, secular activities occur in these institutions as well. It is probably better to think about programs within JCCs and synagogues for our purposes -- just as we have for formal education.

One idea discussed was a survey of key actors in informal education; Dan advocated focusing on camp directors, youth group leaders, Israel trip leaders, retreat program directors, and museum directors. Others added Hillel directors, synagogue family programming directors, and regional

youth directors. This could be a survey of professionals working in informal education. However, the purpose of such a survey was not discussed.

That's it.



I need his for more felicon on Thorm

STAFF MEETING NOTES: APRIL 26

present: Gail Dorph, Adam Gamoran, Ellen Goldring, Barry Holtz, Ginny Levi (for a part), Dan Pekarsky, Bill Robinson (by phone)

The purpose of the meeting was to

- share information and make sure that we were all up to date on CIJE projects and initiatives
- 2. to discuss the evaluation component of these projects
- 3. to move ahead in the discussion of CIJE and informal education/educators

One of the things that became clear again was that our internal communication is not yet what it needs to be. Too much time had to be spent on explanation of the Cummings Grant and the Virtual College idea and of the Goals seminar this summer. Some of it was due to lack of informational communication (that would account for the lack of knowledge about goals project). Since Cummings Grant had been distributed in writing, I think the problem there was the confusion of the concept Virtual College (the big picture) and the Cummings Grant (one project that is part of the big picture).

One organizational suggestion that was made: Danny should include Adam, Ellen and Bill on e-mail communication that has to do with the Goals Project and MEF team should include Danny on their e-mail communication roster.

I'm wondering if better than that would be a bi-weekly e-mail assignment for every domain summarizing what's going on in each. Perhaps that's more efficient that copying everyone on all this other stuff which may not get read because of the pace and detail of some of the communications.

Virtual College:

Suggestions about the project itself: think through the relationship of goals and goals coaches to leadership seminars and mentor-trainer program.

Include in first cohort principals as well as central agency personnel otherwise we may fall into the "same scene" that currently exists, top down-central agency delivered models not particularly tied to institutional contexts.

Bill will attend the planning sessions May 31 and June 1 so that MEF will be in at beginning of formal planning and training process. MEF will monitor process and evaluate outcomes. Although CIJE has not yet given MEF team specific written goals, it is clear that we expect those who participate in the program to engage in

the planning and delivery of professional development opportunities either at institutional and communal level and that we have ideas about the elements of educational practice that ought to characterize their work. Gail and Barry will actually write up specific goals for the project after the two day consultation.

Goals Coaches:

A suggestion was made about content of seminar: issue of taking stock and creating base line data needs to be folded in to content of the seminar and needs to be part of the process of creating goals and linking them to practice and seems to be a prerequisite to engaging in this project institutionally.

Bill will attend the seminar for coaches to be held July 30 to August 2 in Cleveland.

Since we do not necessarily expect everyone who comes to seminar to become an institutional goals coach, the question of what needs to be evaluated generated a discussion of a variety of option:

- a. community seminars (for example: there has been a four session seminar in Milwaukee Dan has run --no MEF component has been part of it)
- b. training seminar for goals coaches at end of July
- c. institutional goals process starting when they begin to work toward creation of goals
- d. institutional goals process starting when they are trying to implement "new vision and goals"

After some discussion, it was agreed that given our approach, it would not be appropriate to begin at point d. C and D are definitely on the docket --that is, CIJE will definitely become involved in an evaluation process at the point when institutions commit to taking on a goals coach and begin to engage in creating goals and linking them to practice. A and B still need to be discussed.

Adam also suggested a strategy that we might want to think about an evaluation strategy by which three groups could be compared: those who participate in the community seminars but elect not to continue; those who participate in community seminars and elect to continue; and those who do neither.

Clearly the issue of the role and nature of evaluation and the goals project has not yet been resolved. MEF will prepare two memos on evaluation options: one for goals project and one for Cummings grant. Staff will then need to review memos and decide on the direction that the evaluations of these project will take.

Community Mobilization:

Nessa raised the "stepchild" nature of community mobilization in the creation and implementation of all of our projects to date. Her sense is that community mobilization is not integral to our planning and continues to be an afterthought in terms of:

who needs to know what
when do they need to know it
by what means should they get the info needed
how is information about any of our products or programs disseminated to
larger audience than the "who needs to know" for purposes of funding
and carrying out the program

Example: at Goals Coaches seminar, should there be a half day open to lay leaders in Cleveland?

Example: what's our ongoing communication with Harvard participants like? how have we used them to continue the community mobilization stuff? Her sense: as long as community mobilization gets shunted off into "a project for Nessa" rather than integrated into each and every aspect of the work, it will not happen properly.

Needs further discussion and some strategizing if we are to take any serious action.

Informal Education:

Adam's feeling is that we need to address informal ed from a different perspective than formal ed. and his suggestion was that we look at the issue of settings.

We then generated a list of settings in which informal education takes place: camps, cultural arts programs, youth groups, Israel trips, retreats, college campuses, family and adult ed in synagogues and JCC's. As we continued our work, we found that this particular while interesting did not move along the question of "learning more about building the profession" of informal Jewish education.

Danny then suggested that we look at the people doing the work who were in "director" type positions. The list we generated included:: camp directors, directors of youth program opportunities, Israel trip leaders, retreat programmers, museum educators, family education programmers, synagogue programmers, Hillel professionals and perhaps program directors, JCC Jewish educators.

Question: What should be the nature of this study of informal education? Is it comparable to our study of formal educators? That is, are we asking, who is the

formal Jewish educator and based on that knowledge hoping to create a plan for "building the profession" of the informal Jewish educator? If so, then the last list we made may be a promising way to begin thinking about the questions we need to be addressing. We need to clarify our goals with regard to this study before we can even bring the issue to our steering committee. Again today, we got to this agenda item at the very end of our meeting, allowing only a half hour for our deliberation. This needs more staff time devoted to the issue. Perhaps a way to go might be to convene a very select group of the top professionals in the informal realm and add them to our group for purposes of this discussion.



MEF Telecon Agenda Tuesday, May 9, 1995

- I. Training of Evaluators
- MEF proposals to evaluate Goals Project II.
- III. Educational Leadership material
- IV. Invite AG/EG to NYC for meeting before the Steering Committee

Their gende.

1. Mari for Summer

V. Hurhham.

MEF telecon on July 6th

To: CIJE Staff

From: Bill Robinson

Re: Minutes from MEF Conference Call on May 23rd, 1995

(Present: Alan Hoffmann, Gail Dorph, Adam Gamoran, Ellen Goldring, Bill

Robinson)

A. Taking Stock of the CIJE in the Lead Communities

The planned meeting in Israel on an envisioned CIJE review of the work of the CIJE in its Monitoring, Evaluation and Feedback activities in the three Lead Communities will most likely will be postponed until after the Summer. Annette will contact Adam and Ellen to discuss alternative times to schedule the review. The last week in December or the first week in January 1996 continue to be good dates for the North Americans.

B. Working with new affiliated communities

Most of the conference call focused on the following issue: what kinds of support could the CIJE offer to those additional communities that may become affiliated with the CIJE? The discussion centered on the type and extent of support that the MEF Research Team could provide the communities in (1) using the Educators Survey, (2) using the Educators Interview, and (3) creating policy-oriented community reports (based on the data obtained from using both instruments).

It was pointed out that currently, given its workplan, the MEF Research Team does not have the capacity to offer on-going, substantial support to these new communities, in the way we have provided support to the three "lead communities."

Instead, it was suggested that the proposed new Evaluation Institute be used as the vehicle for offering support to the new communities in the above stated three areas. Teams from each of the new communities would attend the proposed Evaluation Institute prior to conducting the quantitative and qualitative research and, then, prior to writing a report based on analysis of the collected data. Moreover, the Evaluation Institute could be a means for developing a network among these new affiliated communities and the initial three Lead Communities. Particularly, training in the analysis and writing of policy-oriented reports should be part of the institute.

In addition, it was suggested that the Evaluation Institute could be used to assure that the community reports are of a high quality. However, it was pointed out that, since the communities and not the MEF will be conducting the research and writing the reports, we can never guarantee the quality of the research or the reports. There is a risk that is unavoidable.

No firm decisions were reached concerning work with the new CIJE affiliated communities, though it was recognized that the affiliation document (which outlines the relationship of the CIJE to these new affiliated communities) may need to be rewritten in light of this discussion. Also, it was noted that a distinction needs to be maintained in thought and action, between these affiliated communities and those non-affiliated communities who may also attend the Evaluation Institute.

Finally, it was stated that to implement the Evaluation Institute, the CIJE needs to hire additional staff. Given the capacity limits of the MEF, this person could not be supervised by Adam within the present workplan.

C. Evaluation Institute

It was decided to present the design document of the Evaluation Institute (as drafted) to the Steering Committee. The document is attached.

MOT lib

Creary

Continuitary

mer

mi/cos 1) Projembre

Advisory BOARD C - ACATE WIT

- Adm a Ecron

- REVIEW

- No Insumerior for Suvery S - Banks on podron E capabilities - Brud Central Dara Base

Mormal es. File

To: Gail Dorph, Adam Gamoran, Ellen Goldring, Alan Hoffmann, Barry Holtz, and Nessa Rapoport

From: Bill Robinson

Re: Minutes of the CIJE Staff Meeting of June 6th - Studying Informal Education

The staff discussed several questions that were considered fundamental to planning a study of informal education. Should a study of informal education fall under the domain of "building the profession" or under the domains of "goals/vision" and/or "community mobilization"? In other words, what makes a difference in having a successful informal educational program? Second, is there a single profession which could be called "informal Jewish education"?

I. What makes a difference?

The staff first debated the issue as to what makes a difference in creating successful informal educational programs. This issue was considered primary, as it questioned the underlying assumption that the CIJE should look at informal education through the lens of "building the profession", as it had with Jewish day, supplementary, and pre-schools.

The argument was put forth that what makes an informal Jewish educational program (such as a camp) successful is the inculcation of educators and (through them) participants into the culture and tradition of the institution. The culture contained two essential elements: a sense of community and Jewish content. A "good" informal educational program would be successful at transmitting a strong sense of community and substantial Jewish content. (This was stated as one of several hypothesis raised during the discussion. For instance, another hypothesis focused on the sense of community, making the assertion that "substantial" Jewish content is not necessary.) If the transmission of culture is what is most vital to its success, then perhaps the CIJE should look at informal education through the lenses of "goals/vision" and "community mobilization".

In response, it was argued that (accepting the above assertion) for an informal educational institution to be successful it would still be necessary to have educators (and, at least, educational leaders) who have knowledge of Judaism and the ability to (a) transmit the culture and (b) critically reflect upon the institutions' and their own practices (thus avoiding reification of the culture).

While briefly noted, the question as to what would "count" as evidence of these abilities or knowledge - what would count as adequate training - was left open.

II. Is there a single profession?

The staff (during and after its focus on the above issue) discussed the issue of whether or not it was reasonable to consider those educators who work in "informal" educational programs to be within a single profession. Are the nature of camps, youth groups, family education programs, and JCCs so different as to warrant caution in considering what qualities must a professional educator have to be successful in them? Are the responsibilities and institutional context of a camp director and a JCC educator so different as to make the notion of an "informal Jewish educational profession" meaningless? Would this notion conceal (important



There were actually three issues at play. First, is there enough commonalities among educators in the "informal" settings to make the concept of an "informal Jewish educational profession" a meaningful and powerful diagnostic and policy-oriented tool? Second, to what degree is the education in these settings totally or primarily "informal"? While most would consider the educational activities that occur within a camp to be primarily informal, the educational activities of a JCC are both informal (e.g., camp, youth group) and formal (e.g., adult education, pre-school). Thus, the role of the JCC educator contains both formal and informal elements. Third, are the responsibilities and activities of the "heads" of these institutions (e.g., camp director, JCC educator) substantially different as to warrant distinguishing between them and other educators within these institutional settings (e.g. unit director, family educator). Perhaps, only those educators who meet certain professional criteria will be included in the study.

While these questions were raised, the staff did not reach any definitive conclusions with one exception. The staff concluded that it was not fruitful to view our efforts in this endeavor within the concept of "informal education". Rather, given the nature of the profession(s) as a continuum (running from formal to informal), we are engaging in expanding our study of Jewish

educators from a focus on classrooms to other settings (such as camps, JCCs, and family education programs). Afterward, educational professionals working in other areas will also be considered.

Summary

- The staff of the CIJE concluded that it would be fruitful to expand our study of educators from the classrooms into other settings, such as camps, JCCs, and family education programs.
- Afterward, educational professionals working in other settings would be considered.
- 2. The staff of the CIJE will explore in greater depth the issue of staff quality. What would count as evidence of staff knowledge or ability? What would count as adequate professional training? Two general areas were suggested: (1) Jewish content and (2) the ability to transmit the institution's culture and be critically reflective about this process. This issue of staff quality falls within the larger question, "what makes a difference in creating a successful institution/program". Thus, other areas beyond professional training may be considered, such as the educator's continuity of membership in the program (or like programs).
- 3. The staff of the CIJE will consider the question as to which educators within these institutions/programs will be included within the study. Certain criteria for "being a professional educator" will need to be discerned (e.g., compensation, frequency of activity, age). In addition, those educators at the "top" of the institution/program (e.g., camp director) may be considered differently from all others (e.g., unit director).
- 4. The underlying assumption of the study is that the transformative Jewish experiences found in these institutions/programs would be enhanced if their educators (and, especially, their educational leaders) had stronger Jewish backgrounds, as well as other qualities.
- 5. During the development of this project, the staff of the CIJE will consult with persons having expertise in these institutions/programs (expertise gained either through practice or

academic study). In the meantime, Adam Gamoran will consult with Aaron Brauer, Professor of Social Work at the University of Wisconsin, who has expertise in this area.



MINUTES:

DATE OF MEETING:

DATE MINUTES ISSUED:

PARTICIPANTS:

MEF TELECON

JULY 6, 1995, 1:30 pm EST

Gail Dorph, Annette Hochstein, Alan Hoffmann, Adam

Gamoran, Ellen Goldring, Nessa Rapaport, Bill Robinson

COPY TO:

Debra Perrin

I. Research Papers

ADH mentioned that he had sent out the letters confirming arrangements for Julie Tammivaara and Roberta Goodman to write the two research papers on in-service and teacher power.

II. MEF Advisory Committee Meeting

ARH will discuss with Seymour Fox and ADH the possibility of having an MEF Advisory Committee Meeting in August.

It was suggested that this August meeting could plan the envisioned Winter Israeli meeting on "Taking Stock of the CIJE in the Lead Communities". It was also noted that during the August meeting we may have to revisit our 1995 workplans, as well as begin planning for 1996.

III. Evaluation of the Teacher-Educator Institute

It was noted that if evaluation involves gathering data in August, then we need to talk about it very soon - next week's telecon.

IV. Educational Leaders Discussion Paper

A. GENERAL DISCUSSION

ARH provided some comments that Seymour Fox, Mike Inbar, and her had about the paper.

- 1. Overall, they agree with Gail's and Nessa's general comments regarding the story, audience, and purpose of the report.
- 2. Their primary suggestion was that the lack of Jewish content training on the part of the educational leaders be the primary focus of the report. If educational leaders are going to train the teachers, then they need Jewish content knowledge.

In response, it was noted while teachers require content knowledge in the area that they are teaching, this is not necessarily so for principals. A principal (in public schools) has content experience in some area, but not in every area. Perhaps in a Jewish school, the director should have expertise in some Jewish content area (as opposed to, say, mathematics) ... but this is still controversial.

Some more discussion ensued on this topic. For instance, how much Jewish content knowledge does an educational leader need to have in order to facilitate a school's deliberation about its vision? It was noted that we could spend 6 months deciding this one issue.

B. PURPOSE OF DISCUSSION PAPER

It was mentioned that this Discussion Paper was written primarily as an internal document for the CLE and perhaps for some experts who are concerned (professionally and academically) with the issues contained therein. The purpose of the report is to stimulate discussion, to raise questions more so than answer them (yet), and to provide a text which would assist the CIJE in focusing on specific policy issues. This paper is academic in nature, and not policy-focused.

While it was thought that a paper which lays out the field and provokes questions is a good idea, concern was expressed as to whether the paper should be distributed to anyone outside the CIJE (or, at least, not beyond anyone who receives it while sitting down with us first to discuss it). It was affirmed that there is a need for the CIJE to consult with other experts in the field in order for the CIJE to be able to clearly spell out its assumptions and policy recommendations regarding educational leadership. With whom and how was left undetermined.

C. NEXT STEPS

It was decided that the next step would be to revise this draft. The next (more focused) draft will be the basis for a policy discussion within the CIJE and with some outside experts. This discussion should happen in time to present the report with a set of policy recommendations to the November Board Meeting. A possible date to discuss the new draft is August 24th. The MEF will also circulate a draft individual city report among the staff of the CIJE, shortly.

Assignment

3

D. OTHER QUESTIONS

In addition to the above focus of discussion, other questions were raised about the data. Is it generalizable? If one removed the Orthodox (in Baltimore), how would the data look? Similarly, if one removed those with an HUC background, how would the data change? Any benefit to comparing educational leaders to teachers? In answer to the first question: Yes, the data is generalizable (as much as the teacher data was). One caveat: Given the size of the three Lead Communities, it may be that the data would not be representative of much smaller and much larger communities. (But, the educational leaders from each of the three Lead Communities are more similar than different.) Concerning the other questions that were raised, we would need to do the analyses and see what we find.

Assignment

08/04/1995 13:35

ARH also noted that the distinction between interpretation (of findings) and speculation was at times unclear in the report. ARH will send EG specific comments on where they found the distinction to be unclear.

V. Manual for The CIJE Study of Educators

NR requested a paragraph defining some terms related to the Manual, as well as the Assignments revised draft of the Manual as soon as possible. BR will provide both.

MINUTES:

MEF TELECON JULY 12, 1995

DATE OF MEETING:

DATE MINUTES ISSUED:

PARTICIPANTS:

Gail Dorph, Alan Hoffmann, Adam Gamoran, Ellen

Goldring, Bill Robinson

COPY TO:

Annette Hochstein, Debra Perrin

I. Presentation of AG's Research Paper, Background and Training of Teachers in Jewish Schools: Current Status and Levers for Change, at the Annual Research Network in Jewish Education Conference

A. PERCEPTIONS OF THE PAPER AND ITS RECEPTION

It was felt that, following the presentation and the discussants' comments, many participants at the conference lost the focus of the paper (i.e., on levers for raising the standards for in-service education). Instead, they become caught up in more general and political issues, such as how do you define workshops and whether the CIJE should even be focusing on workshops. This was largely due to the tenor of the comments of the first respondent. Dr. Leora Isaacs, which we perceived to be particularly hostile.

B. PROPOSED RESPONSES

After considerable discussion, it was affirmed that the paper was of a solid quality, though we still didn't appreciate the negative response of some participants. ADH approved AG to publish the paper once AG receives approval from the MEF Advisory Board. Also, ADH encouraged the MEF team to do more of this kind of work. In accord with this, EG mentioned that she is submitting a proposal to the AERA group on Research in Private Schools.

Assignment

It was decided that the CIJE will not respond specifically to any comments raised at the conference. Rather, AG will simply submit a revised abstract of the paper to the Research Network newsletter, that even more clearly states the focus of the paper but also outlines its context within the broader Study of Educators. In light of this year's conference, the CIJE will consider what type of presentation to make at next year's Research Network conference in Jerusalem. It may be a good idea for the MEF team to put together an entire session which sets the methodological framework together with the policy thinking of the Study of Educators. In concert with next year's conference, it was suggested that a session or more of the Evaluation Institute be held in Jerusalem.

2

II. Other Business

A. MEF CALENDAR

Assignment

AG will e-mail ADH an updated MEF calendar of products and the dates they will be available.

B. STAFF AND MEF ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Assignment

A meeting on August the 24th in NY - to discuss the educational leaders report(s) and have an MEF Advisory meeting - will try to be convened. AG or EG will contact ARH ASAP as Alan thinks she has a conflict on that date.

C. EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION

ADH is looking for a person to hold the CIJE early childhood education portfolio.

D. TAKING STOCK OF THE CUE IN THE LEAD COMMUNITIES

Assignment

ADH recommended that AG and EG find an appropriate time and airport to meet with ARH to plan the dates, agenda and relevant materials to be developed for a first week of January meeting in Jerusalem.

FROM: Bill Robinson, 74104,3335 TO: Gail Dorph, 73321,1217

Adam Gamoran, INTERNET:gamoran@ssc.wisc.edu Ellen Goldring, INTERNET:goldrieb@ctrvax.vanderbilt.edu

Alan Hoffmann, 73321,1220

myself, 74104,3335

Debra Perrin, 76322,2406

DATE: 7/16/95 7:59 PM

Re: Minutes of July 12th telecon

To: CIJE Staff

From: Bill Robinson

Re: Minutes of MEF Conference Call on July 12, 1995

(Present: Alan Hoffmann, Gail Dorph, Adam Gamoran, Ellen Goldring, and Bill

Robinson)

A

Most of the telecon focused on Adam's presentation of the research paper, "Background and Training of Teachers in Jewish Schools: Current Status and Levers for Change", at the annual Research Network in Jewish Education conference.

It was felt that following the presentation and the discussants' comments many participants at the conference lost the focus of the paper (i.e., on levers for raising the standards for in-service education). Instead, they become caught up in more general and political issues, such as how do you define workshops and whether the CIJE should even be focusing on workshops.

After considerable discussion, it was affirmed that the paper was of a solid quality, though we still didn't appreciate the negative response of some participants. Alan approved Adam to publish the paper once Adam receives approval from the MEF Advisory Board. Also, Alan encouraged the MEF team to do more of this kind of work. In accord with this, Ellen mentioned that she is submitting a proposal to the AERA group on Research in Private Schools.

It was decided that the CIJE will not respond specifically to any comments raised at the conference. Rather, Adam will simply submit a revised abstract of the paper to the Research Network newsletter, that even more clearly states the focus of the paper. In light of this year's conference, the CIJE will consider what type of presentation to make at next year's Research Network conference in Jerusalem. In concert with next year's conference, it was suggested that a session or more on the Evaluation Institute be held.

B.

Concerning other business:

- Adam will e-mail Alan an updated MEF calendar.

- A meeting on August the 24th in NY - to discuss the educational leaders report(s) and have an MEF Advisory meeting - will try to be convened.

Alan is looking for a person to hold the CIJE early childhood education portfolio.

BARRY TELLS ME THAT I NEGLECTED TO SEND THE ASSIGNMENT. SO HERE IT IS: Think about 3 or 4 key features or characteristics of good teaching in one specific subject matter area: Bible, Holidays, Hebrew Language, History or Jewish Values.

Think of specific "real live examples" of each feature so that you can vividly describe it to others. For example, what as the teacher doing and saying? What were students doing? Be as concrete as possible because people often use the same phrases and think they are agreeing, when they actually have quite different pictures of the practices that they are actually describing.

Be sure to write down the features that you think are crucial to good teaching of that you can share them on Monday morning. Please, choose examples from either early childhood or supplementary school education (until age 13).

To: S. Nemser

CC: ADH From: GZD

To: CIJE Staff

From: Bill Robinson

Re: Minutes of MEF Conference Call on July 12, 1995

(Present: Alan Hoffmann, Gail Dorph, Adam Gamoran, Ellen Goldring, and Bill Robinson)

A.

Most of the telecon focused on Adam's presentation of the research paper, "Background and Training of Teachers in Jewish Schools: Current Status and Levers for Change", at the annual Research Network in Jewish Education conference.

It was felt that following the presentation and the discussants' comments many participants at the conference lost the focus of the paper (i.e., on levers for raising the standards for in-service education). Instead, they become caught up in more general and political issues, such as how do you define workshops and whether the CIJE should even be focusing on workshops. This was largely due to the tenor of the comments of the first respondent, Dr. Leora Isaacs, which we perceived to be particularly hostile.

After considerable discussion, it was affirmed that the paper was of a solid quality, though we still didn't appreciate the negative response of some participants. Alan approved Adam to publish the paper once Adam receives approval from the MEF Advisory Board. Also, Alan encouraged the MEF team to do more of this kind of work. In accord with this, Ellen mentioned that she is submitting a proposal to the AERA group on Research in Private Schools.

It was decided that the CIJE will not respond specifically to any comments raised at the conference. Rather, Adam will simply submit a revised abstract of the paper to the Research Network newsletter, that even more clearly states the focus of the paper but also outlines its context within the broader Study of Educators.. In light of this year's conference, the CIJE will consider what type of presentation to make at next year's Research Network conference in Jerusalem. It may be a good idea for the MEF team to put together an entire session which sets the methodological framework together with the policy thinking of the Study of Educators. In concert with next year's conference, it was suggested that a session or more of the Evaluation Institute be held in Jerusalem.

B.

Concerning other business:

- Adam will e-mail Alan an updated MEF calendar of products and the dates they will be available.
- A meeting on August the 24th in NY to discuss the educational leaders report(s) and have an MEF Advisory meeting - will try to be convened. Adam or Ellen will contact Annette ASAP as Alan thinks she has a conflict on that date.
- Alan is looking for a person to hold the CIJE early childhood education portfolio.
- Alan recommended that Adam and Ellen find an appropriate time and airport to meet with Annette to plan the dates, agenda and relevant materials to be developed for a first week of January meeting in Jerusalem.

To: CIJE Staff

From: Bill Robinson

Re: MEF Conference Call of July 18, 1995

(Present: Gail Dorph, Adam Gamoran, Ellen Goldring, Bill Robinson)

The conference call was devoted to the evaluation of the CIJE Teacher-Educator Institute (referred to below as "the project").

In determining the nature of the evaluation, we focused on what the evaluators (MEF) can contribute to CIJE's goals beyond what the instructors (Barry and Gail) will learn through the curriculum of the Institute. We also affirmed that we want to learn the why, as well as the what, of change. In addition, given limited resources for the evaluation, we thought it would be best to target a small sample (of communities) for in-depth study, and supplement this with any data obtained during the Institute itself. Finally, it was decided that the MEF team will produce three products for the CIJE:

- 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 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. 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. This document will draw on interviews with participants and others from the focal communities, as well as on observations of in-service activities in the communities.

The MEF team will write up a brief abstract of this plan, delineating in more detail these three documents and how the MEF team plans to obtain the data required to write them.

Gail will inform the communities that Bill (beyond the physical confines of the Institute) may be conducting interviews with them and observing their in-service offerings, as part of the CIJE evaluation of this project.

A conference call was scheduled for Wednesday, July 26th at 3:30 EST, to review and affirm the plan for evaluating the CIJE Teacher-Educator Institute.

That date was one of days I had suggested to ELR for my visit to Milwaukee. I also have to see Annette in Ann Arbor before the end of the week. I have copied Debra with this issue and

will do my best to try and get to the meeting with Gail. Please give DSP the times of the meeting and the place and I will call her or she should put it on the staff telecon agenda for next week.

a.

Alan Please explain - this e-mail
doesn't make sense to me.

Thank you,

Debra

draw

on interviews with participants and others from the focal communities, as well as on observations of

in-service activities in the communities.

The MEF team will write up a brief abstract of this plan, defineating in more detail these three documents and how the MEF team plans to obtain the data required to write them.

Gail will inform the communities that Bill (beyond the physical confines of the Institute) may be conducting interviews with them and observing their in-service offerings, as part of the CIJE evaluation of this project.

A conference call was scheduled for Wednesday, July 26th at 3:30 EST, to review and affirm the plan

for evaluating the CIJE Teacher-Educator Institute.



MINUTES: DATE OF MEETING: DATE MINUTES ISSUED: PARTICIPANTS:

MEF TELECON JULY 18, 1995, 3:30 pm EST

Gail Dorph, Adam Gamoran, Ellen Goldring, Bill Robinson

COPY TO:

Annette Hochstein, Alan Hoffmann, Debra Perrin

I. Evaluation of the CIJE Teacher-Educator Institute

A. DISCUSSION OF MEF EVALUATION

In determining the nature of the evaluation, we focused on what the evaluators (MEF) can contribute to CIJE's goals beyond what the instructors (BWH and GZD) will learn through the curriculum of the Institute. We also affirmed that we want to learn the why, as well as the what, of change. In addition, given limited resources for the evaluation, we thought it would be best to target a small sample (of communities) for in-depth study, and supplement this with any data obtained during the Institute itself.

B. OUTLINE OF EVALUATION PLAN

It was decided that the MEF team will produce three products for the CIJE:

- 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 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. 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. This document will draw on interviews with participants and others from the focal communities, as well as on observations of in-service activities in the communities.

Assignment

The MEF team will write up a brief abstract of this plan, delineating in more detail these three documents and how the MEF team plans to obtain the data required to write them.

C. INFORMING COMMUNITIES OF MEF ROLE

Assignment

GZD will inform the communities that BR (beyond the physical confines of the Institute) may be conducting interviews with them and observing their in-service offerings, as part of the CIJE evaluation of this project.

II. Next Scheduled MEF Telecon

A conference call was scheduled for Wednesday, July 26th at 3:30 EST, to review and affirm the plan for evaluating the CIJE Teacher-Educator Institute.

CIJE-MEF ASSIGNMENTS

Summary of Past MEF Telecons

NO.	DESCRIPTION	ASSIGNED TO	DATE ASSIGNED	DUE DATE
1.	Write draft an individual city report on educational leaders.	MEF	July 6, 1995	August 15, 1995*
2.	Provide comments on the educational leaders discussion paper.	ARH	July 6, 1995	COMPLETED
3.	Write paragraph defining certain terms used in the Manual.	MEF	July 6, 1995	COMPLETED
4.	Finish revised draft of the Manual and send to NR.	MEF	July 6, 1995	COMPLETED
5.	Revise Abstract of the paper presented at the Research Network in Jewish Education conference.	AG	July 12, 1995	COMPLETED
6.	Provide updated MEF calendar of products and the dates they will be available.	AG	July 12, 1995	COMPLETED
7.	Contact ARH to check availability of ARH for an August 24th MEF Advisory Committee Meeting.	AG and EG	July 12, 1995	COMPLETED
8.	Schedule meeting with ARH to discuss January meeting to review three years of the CIJE's work in the Lead Communities.	AG and EG	July 12, 1995	ASAP*
9.	Write plan for the MEF Evaluation of the CIJE Teacher-Educator Institute.	MEF	July 18, 1995	COMPLETED
10.	Inform communities participating in the Teacher-Educator Institute about BR's role in evaluating the project.	GZD	July 18, 1995	COMPLETED

updated July 16, 1995

^{*} Items #1 and #8 are listed in the current table of assignments (updated July 26, 1995) as items #3 and #2, respectively.

file-MEF

FROM: Alan Hoffmann, 73321,1220 TO: Bill Robinson, 74104,3335

CC: Adam Gamoran, INTERNET:GAMORAN@ssc.wisc.edu

Virginia Levi, 73321,1223

DATE: 7/21/95 8:27 AM

Re: Minutes of July 12th telecon

BILL,

THIS SHLD. GO TO ANNETTE AT BOTH HER INTERNET AND HER COMPUSERVE ADDRESSES. LOOK THROUGH THE TEXT AT THE FEW PLACES WHERE I HAVE MADE

COMMENTS.

----- Forwarded Message ------

From: Bill Robinson, 74104,3335 TO: Gail Dorph, 73321,1217

> Adam Gamoran, INTERNET:gamoran@ssc.wisc.edu Ellen Goldring, INTERNET:goldrieb@ctrvax.vanderbilt.edu

Alan Hoffmann, 73321,1220

myself, 74104,3335

Debra Perrin, 76322,2406

DATE: 7/16/95 7:59 PM

RE: Minutes of July 12th telecon

To: CIJE Staff

From: Bill Robinson

Re: Minutes of MEF Conference Call on July 12, 1995

(Present: Alan Hoffmann, Gail Dorph, Adam Gamoran, Ellen Goldring, and Bill

Robinson)

A.

Most of the telecon focused on Adam's presentation of the research paper, "Background and Training of Teachers in Jewish Schools: Current Status and Levers for Change", at the annual Research Network in Jewish Education conference.

It was felt that following the presentation and the discussants' comments many participants at the conference lost the focus of the paper (i.e., on levers for raising the standards for in-service education). Instead, they become caught up in more general and political issues, such as how do you define workshops and whether the CIJE should even be focusing on workshops. THIS WAS LARGELY

DUE TO THE TENOR OF THE COMMENTS OF THE FIRST RESPONDENT, DR. LEORA ISAACS.

WHICH WE PERCEIVED TO BE PARTICULARLY HOSTILE.

After considerable discussion, it was affirmed that the paper was of a solid quality, though we still didn't appreciate the negative response of some participants. Alan approved Adam to publish the paper once Adam receives approval from the MEF Advisory Board. Also, Alan

encouraged the MEF team to do more of this kind of work. In accord with this, Ellen mentioned that she is submitting a proposal to the AERA group on Research in Private Schools.

It was decided that the CIJE will not respond specifically to any comments raised at the conference. Rather, Adam will simply submit a revised abstract of the paper to the Research Network newsletter, that even more clearly states the focus of the paper BUT ALSO OUTLINES ITS CONTEXT WITHIN THE BROADER STUDY OF EDUCATORS.. In light of this year's conference, the CIJE will consider what type of presentation to make at next year's Research Network conference in Jerusalem. IT MAY BE A GOOD IDEA OF THE MEF TEAM TO PUT TOGETHER AN ENTIRE SESSION WHICH SETS THE METHODOLICAL FRAMEWORK TOGETHER WITH THE POLICY THINKING OF THE STUDY OF EDUCATORS.In concert with next year's conference, it was suggested that a session or more OF THE on the Evaluation Institute be held IN JERUSALEM.

B.

Concerning other business:

- Adam will e-mail Alan an updated MEF calendar OF PRODUCTS AND THE DATES THEY WILL

BE AVAILABLE.

 A meeting on August the 24th in NY - to discuss the educational leaders report(s) and have an MEF Advisory meeting - will try to be convened. ADAM OR ELLEN WILL CONTACT ANNETTE ASAP AS

ALAN THINKS SHE HAS A CONFLICT ON THAT DATE.

- Alan is looking for a person to hold the CIJE early childhood education portfolio.
- ALAN RECOMMENDED THAT ADAM AND ELLEN FIND AN APPROPRIATE TIME AND AIRPORT TO

MEET WITH ANNETTE TO PLAN THE DATES, AGENDA AND RELEVANT MATERIALS TO BE

DEVELOPED FOR A FIRST WEEK OF JANUARY MEETING IN JERUSALEM.

[BILL:

I THINK YOU NEED TO TAKE A LITTLE MORE CAREFUL NOTES. CIJE MINUTES ARE IMPORTANT DOCUMENTS AND I SUGGEST THAT YOU CALL GINNY AND LET HER EXPLAIN

TO YOU HOW WE WRITE MINUTES AND HOW WE ACCOMPANY THEM WITH ASSIGNMENT

SHEETS.

IN FUTURE I WANT TO OPEN EACH MEETING BY GOING OVER THE ASSIGNMENTS AND

THE MINUTES. THE ASSIGNMENTS ARE CUMULATIVE UNTIL COMPLETED]

MINUTES:

MEF TELECON

DATE OF MEETING:

JULY 26, 1995, 3:30 pm EST

DATE MINUTES ISSUED:

AUGUST 4, 1995

PARTICIPANTS:

Gail Dorph, Annette Hochstein (Israel), Alan Hoffmann (Israel), Adam Gamoran, Ellen Goldring, Bill Robinson

(NY)

COPY TO:

Debra Perrin

I. MEF Plan for Evaluation of the CIJE Teacher-Educator Institute

A. ANNETTE HOCHSTEIN

ARH joined the telecon as a representative of the MEF Advisory Committee.

B. RESPONSES TO EVALUATION PLAN

ARH suggested that we inform the participants as to the evaluation process, as their conscious participation in the evaluation may have a positive impact on the project.

It was also suggested that the evaluation derive its hypotheses from the CIJE's goals regarding the project. Adam mentioned that the first document to be produced by the MEF team, in regard to its evaluation of the project, will delineate such hypotheses. To produce this first document Bill will interview the NY staff.

C. MEF ADVISORY COMMITTEE

ARH recommended that the MEF team should proceed with the evaluation of the project as outlined in the MEF Plan for Evaluation of the CIJE Teacher-Educator Institute. The role of the MEF Advisory Committee should be decided after the first document is produced.

D. COMMUNITY SELECTION

As outlined in the evaluation plan, the evaluation process will focus on a subsample of communities. ARH suggested that we consider including Cleveland in the subsample (along with Atlanta, Baltimore, Hartford, and Milwaukee). AG will take this under advisement

Assignment

II. Other Business

A. TAKING STOCK OF THE CUE IN THE LEAD COMMUNITIES

Assignment

AG and EG will schedule a meeting with ARH in Detroit on August 8th or 9th to discuss the possibility of a meeting in Israel during the first week of January to review three years of the CIJE's work in the Lead Communities.

B. EDUCATIONAL LEADERS REPORTS

A meeting of the CIJE staff will take place on August 24th in NY to discuss the educational leaders reports. In preparation for this meeting, the MEF team will complete a revised draft of a Discussion Paper on educational leaders and a draft of Atlanta's community report on educational leaders.

Assignment

C. THE MANUAL FOR THE CUE STUDY OF EDUCATORS

ADH thought that overall the Manual for The CIJE Study of Educators was very clear. However, he felt that the section, entitled Guide to the CIJE Educators Survey, was too prescriptive. The introduction needs to explain in more explicit language why communities should proceed in the manner outlined in the Guide.

Assignment

Assignment BR should send ARH a copy of the draft Manual.

CIJE-MEF ASSIGNMENTS

MEF Telecon

NO.	DESCRIPTION	ASSIGNED TO	DATE ASSIGNED	DUE DATE
1.	Decide upon inclusion of Cleveland in the subsample.	AG	July 26,1995	September, 1995
2.	Schedule meeting with ARH to discuss January meeting to review three years of the CIJE's work in the Lead Communities.	AG and EG	July 26, 1995	First week of August, 1995
3.	Write draft of discussion paper and Atlanta's community report on educational leaders.	MEF	July 26, 1995	August 15, 1995
4.	Revise language of the Guide to the CIJE Educators Survey,	MEF	July 26, 1995	September, 1995
5.	Send ARH copy of the draft Manual for The CIJE Study of Educators.	BR	July 26, 1995	ASAP

updated July 26,1995

prie

Enclosure 5 6 e quealonal Le adernus

MINUTES:

CIJE - MEF STAFF MEETING ON EDUCATIONAL

LEADERSHIP

mer

DATE OF MEETING: DATE MINUTES ISSUED: AUGUST 24, 1995, 9:30 a.m. EST

PARTICIPANTS:

Gail Dorph, Alan Hoffmann, Barry Holtz, Adam Gamoran, Ellen Goldring, Dan Pekarsky, Nessa Rapoport, Bill

Robinson

COPY TO:

Annette Hochstein, Ginny Levi, Debra Perrin

I. Examination of Pre-service and In-service Standards and Programs for Educational Leaders

EG presented information on the pre-service and in-service standards for educational leaders in public and private schools, and on the programs available in general education for educational leaders to meet these standards.

In summary: Widely accepted standards in general education throughout the United States hold that educational leaders should have credentials in three areas: education/pedagogy, a subject matter, and administration/supervision. Preparation in education/pedagogy consists usually of a license or certification in general education, and "x" number of years of teaching. In Jewish schools, the appropriate subject matter knowledge would be in a content area, such as Hebrew, Jewish history, Jewish literature, or a related field.

The group reviewed a selection of materials on professional standards in both general and Jewish education:

- 1. 'The Landscape of Leadership Preparation", Joseph Murphy,
- 2. 'The Licensure of School Administrator: Policy and Practice", by Carl R. Ashbaugh and Katherine L. Kasten;
- 3. 'Performance Domains of the Principalship", from the National Committee for the Principalship;
- 4. The Return of the Mayflower: British Alternatives to American Practice", by Paul A. Pohland;
- Requirements for Certification of Teachers, Counselors, Librarians, Administrators for Elementary and Secondary School*, compiled by John Tryneski,
- "Guidelines and Requirements for Licenses" from the National Board of License for teachers and Principals of Jewish Schools in North America;
- 7. standards from The Solomon Schechter Day School Association;
- 8. the academic program of the Jewish Theological seminary; and
- 9. selected statistics from the Digest of Educational Statistics.

A brief discussion followed, comparing standards and programs in Jewish education with those existing in general education.

II. Possible CIJE Responses

A. FIVE MODELS OF ACTION

GZD and EG outlined five possible models that the CIJE could pursue:

- 1. Pre-service Programs
 - a impact what is currently occurring in education programs in institutions of Jewish higher learning
 - b. entice (other) universities to offer programs in Jewish educational leadership (such as the University of Wisconsin at Madison)
 - c recruit people with Jewish content and entice them to attend current leadership programs in non-Jewish universities
- 2. Institute Model (professional growth model)
 - a Harvard Model (subcontract out, but design content)
 - b. TEI Model (CIJE also does instruction)
 - c ongoing programs
- 3. Principal Center Model (grassroots, resource centers)
- 4. Leadership Academy Model (state/district approach to professional development, tied to standards analogue: BJEs?)
- 5. 'Training of Trainers" Model

B. DISCUSSION OF MODELS

The group engaged in a critical discussion on these five possible models. During the discussion, the following key issues, concerns, and ideas were raised:

- 1. Unlike teachers, the pool of educational leaders in Jewish schools is much smaller. Thus, it may be possible for the CIJE to have a direct impact upon all educational leaders. The CIJE may want to put forth a greater effort in impacting pre-service programs, rather than in-service activities.
- 2. At present the participation of educational leaders is voluntary. We need to move beyond encouragement, as we consider our approach to professional growth for educational leaders. Are there ways to learn from norms or standards, that exist both for pre-service and in-service programs for leaders in general education? The CIJE may need to begin a process, whereby standards for pre-service and inservice are articulated and widely distributed, and particular groups (e.g., The Solomon Schechter Day School Association) agree to begin implementing them.

- 3. We need to consider denominational differences in standards and the role of denominational institutions in setting such standards.
- 4. Recruiting people with Jewish content and enticing them to attend current leadership programs in non-Jewish universities (option #1c) may only be successful if a critical number -- e.g., cohort -- of Jewish educational leaders attend the program Otherwise, they will find themselves isolated. In addition, such programs would not necessarily offer them the opportunities:
 - a. to reflect on matters of Judaic content, and their connection to leadership issues;
 - b to deal with the specifics of the contexts in which they work, and their impact on leadership issues.
- 5. The CIJE could work with one of these leadership programs in a non-Jewish university, developing a Jewish component to help the students apply what they are learning to Jewish schools.
- 6. How can we influence an established institution to provide a more substantial pre-service program. Several possibilities were suggested:
 - a set up a consultation on educational leadership with experts in the field, geared toward ourselves and faculties of AIHJLE;
 - b encourage the development of substantial educational leadership programs, perhaps using funding as leverage;
 - c assist them in recruiting more students;
 - d train a faculty in Jewish educational leadership;
 - e. educate relevant constituencies ("seeding the culture").

These possibilities are not mutually exclusive. For instance, after the consultation(s), the CIJE could work with interested institutions to develop a proposal for funding.

- 7. In general education, change occurred in the content of leadership programs, because professionals in the field began to demand greater emphasis be placed on leadership issues in these programs. This would support the argument to focus efforts toward "seeding the culture" (see issue #5e). The Institute Model (option #2), in concert with the creation of Principal Centers (option #3), could assist in this effort.
- 8. If we create an Institute Model (option #2), we could require that teams be sent (i.e., president of schools, key community lay people, and the principal).

- 9. The Institute Model (option #2), alone, is insufficient. There needs to be a vehicle for translating what is learned in the Institutes into the realities of institutional and communal life. The Principal Center Model can provide this linkage between the Institute Model and the classroom.
- 10. Following the Harvard Principals' Seminar, many educational leaders began meeting with their colleagues in their community to share what they learned and continue learning together. This spontaneous development can be capitalized upon to create the Principals Center Model (option #3). The CIJE could provide support for enhancing the effectiveness of community efforts in this area.
- 11. If we focus our efforts on "seeding the culture", we should proceed along three avenues:
 - a conduct institutes for educational leaders, complemented with follow-up support for back-home work;
 - b bring together leadership of the major institutions as a study group (using a CIJE Policy Brief as a primary text);
 - c bring the heads of major foundations together.
- 12. What will lead people to buying into our visions of what educational leadership should be? Perhaps, you could achieve buy-in by creating one institution that would be a living model of what excellence could be. This could be a new institution (i.e., The National Institute for Jewish Educational Leadership) or one already in existence.
- 13. If we create our own institution, we need to consider whether or not there will be a sufficient number of students and enough qualified faculty, as well as its impact on already existing institutions.
- 14 The Reform movement currently combines a Pre-service Program with an the Institute Model (option #2) in the form of the denominational colleges and NATE (where professional development experiences occur). Given encouragement and money, the Reform movement may be interested in setting up a Leadership Academy (option #5).
- 15. The Leadership Academy Model (option #4) is unlikely to be effective because of the limited capacity which currently exists within BJEs and the denominational movements.
- 16. Engaging in the "Training of Trainers" model (option #5) is a necessary basis for undertaking any of the other models.

C. CONSIDERING A DECISION

The group was divided about which models to pursue. Some preferred focusing on preservice (option #1). There was disagreement, however, over whether our efforts should initially focus on enhancing the quality of current pre-service programs or increasing the number of persons attending these programs: quality versus quantity. Others preferred focusing on in-service: create continental Institutes (option #2) and support the development of local Principal Centers (option #3) following participation in the Institutes. There was limited support for the Leadership Academy Model. On the other hand, some felt that we need to engage in all five models in order to impact substantially upon the system. It was pointed out that since the CIJE does not have the capacity to engage in all of them (or even some of them) simultaneously, we would still need to prioritize among them. Most felt that, no matter upon which of the first four models we focus, we need to decide how to train the trainers who would (eventually) run the programs (option #5).

In making a decision about which models to pursue, the group raised several questions that would need to be considered:

- 1. What precise steps will be necessary to achieve each of our goals?
- 2. What type of role will the CIJE have in each process (e.g., mediator versus service deliverer)?
- 3. What is our own capacity (staff) for engaging in any one model or a combination of models?
- 4. From where will funding come?

Given our limited capacity and funding, if we decide that we should pursue a combination of models, how do we prioritize among them? One way to decide would be to consider which pieces have to be done no matter what else we did. Or, what things are so big and complex that we can't do them now? Another way to decide, which was suggested, concerned the venue under which we would consider the issue: Do we conceive of our initial efforts as primarily community mobilization ("seeding the culture") or as building the profession? If the former, we may want to do as many short-term Principal Institutes (option #2) as possible, which could lead to grassroots spin-offs (i.e., Principal Centers - option #3).

Finally, the importance of writing a design document, which details our desired outcomes (once the CIJE has determined what they are) and the actions we need to take in order to reach those outcomes, was noted.

III. Next Steps

A. LOCAL COMMUNITY REPORTS

We briefly discussed the individual community reports. In particular, the group thought that we should consider in more depth the issue of how best to use the reports (or some version of them) with the key lay persons and Federation professionals in each community. The staff was requested to have all comments on the Atlanta report sent to the MEF team by Tuesday. GZD affirmed the need to have all three community reports completed in time for the Lead Community consultation on October 1st and 2nd.

Assignment

B. DISCUSSION PAPER AND POLICY BRIEF

We discussed the purpose and audience for the Discussion Paper on educational leaders, which presents a broad view of the data collected by the MEF team in the three Lead Communities. The following purposes/audiences were suggested for the Discussion Paper or some version of it:

- 1. a seminar with foundations and experts on leadership in general education;
- the Research Network in Jewish Education;
- faculties at institutions of higher Jewish learning and academic departments of Jewish studies;
- 4. other CIJE bodies (such as the Steering Committee);
- 5. local communities that are pursuing studies of their educational leaders (such as Cleveland).

Consultations with these groups of people (i.e., key faculty members at institutions of higher Jewish learning and academic departments of Jewish studies, along with experts on leadership in general education), using the Discussion Paper as the primary text, could assist the CLIE in reaching a decision on which models to pursue, and help "seed the culture" in preparation for change.

ADH requested that the MEF team have this Discussion Paper and the integrated report on teachers in the three Lead Communities available in October.

The group decided that the next CIJE Policy Brief will be on educational leaders.

C. THE MANUAL FOR THE CIJE STUDY OF EDUCATORS

ADH noted that a letter is being sent out to key professional and lay leadership across North America informing them, among other things, of the availability of the Manual for The CIJE Study of Educators. Final revisions on the Manual need to be done as soon as possible.

Assignment

The importance of having local communities maintain the anchor items in their versions of the survey was re-affirmed. We briefly discussed ways that this could be accomplished. The implementation of the planned Evaluation Institute, as a means of accomplishing this goal, was re-affirmed. In addition, ADH requested that AG and EG compose a short letter that will be sent to communities who have requested and received the Manual, which will make the case for anchor items on a sophisticated level in language geared toward lay persons. The letter also should mention that the CIJE will be holding a conference or seminar on the anchor items or how to use the CIJE Educators Survey.

Assignment

CIJE-MEF ASSIGNMENTS

CIJE-MEF Staff Meeting

NO.	DESCRIPTION	ASSIGNED TO	DATE ASSIGNED	DUE DATE
1.	Decide upon inclusion of Cleveland in the subsample.	AG	July 26,1995	COMPLETED
2.	Schedule meeting with ARH to discuss January meeting to review three years of the CIJE's work in the Lead Communities.	AG and EG	July 26, 1995	COMPLETED
3.	Write draft of discussion paper and Atlanta's community report on educational leaders.	MEF	July 26, 1995	COMPLETED
4.	Make final revisions to the Manual for The CIJE Study of Educators,	MEF	July 26, 1995	September, 1995 (ASAP)
5.	Send ARH copy of the draft Manual for The CIJE Study of Educators.	BR	July 26, 1995	COMPLETED
6.	Send comments on Atlanta's community report on educational leaders to MEF.	Staff	August 24, 1995	August 30, 1995
7.	Compose letter to lay leaders that will follow delivery of the Munual to local communities.	AG and EG	August 24, 1995	September, 1995

updated August 24, 1995

MINUTES:

MEF TELECON

DATE OF MEETING:

NOVEMBER 13, 1995, 9:30 p.m. EST

DATE MINUTES ISSUED:

NOVEMBER 28, 1995

PARTICIPANTS:

Gail Dorph, Alan Hoffmann, Adam Gamoran, Ellen

Goldring, Bill Robinson

COPY TO:

Annette Hochstein, Ginny Levi, Josie Mowlem, Debra

Perrin

I. January Consultation on the Manual for The CIJE Study of Educators

The group suggested Sunday, January 21, 1995, for the date of the January consultation to communities on using the Manual for The CIJE Study of Educators.

The primary purpose of this meeting will be to provide participants with an understanding of the "big picture" (i.e., building the profession and community mobilization), the importance of collecting data, and the benefits of using the instruments developed by the CIJE. In particular, the participants will learn how they can use the information obtained from specific questionnaire items to create a report that provides vital information for building the profession and mobilizing the community.

Assignment

The MEF Research Team, in cooperation with the CIJE staff, will design a curriculum for the consultation.

The Manual for The CIJE Study of Educators, along with the Coding Instructions for the CIJE Educators Survey, will serve as the primary text for the consultation.

II. Manual for The CIJE Study of Educators

Assignment

After NR approves the final version of the Manual for The CIJE Study of Educators and ADH reviews and approves the title page (containing the acknowledgement), BR will produce the Manual. The group decided that the Manual should be bound in a soft-covered, ring binder with a plastic shield on the outside into which a cover can be placed. The different sections of the Manual will be printed in different colors, except for the CIJE Educators Survey which will remain white. The Manual will be printed on single-sided sheets.

III. Next Steps on the Evaluation Institute

Assignment

EG and GZD will meet with Leora Isaacs of JESNA during the GA to debrief the evaluation consultation and to think about appropriate next steps. EG and GZD also will discuss the same during the GA with ADH.

CIJE-MEF ASSIGNMENTS

MEF Telecon

NO.	DESCRIPTION	ASSIGNED TO	DATE ASSIGNED	DUE DATE
1.	Develop curriculum for January consultation.	MEF, in cooperation with CIJE staff	November 13, 1995	January, 1995
2.	Review and approve Manual for The CIJE Study of Educators.	NR	November 13, 1995	December, 1995
3.	Review and approve title page of the Manual for The CIJE Study of Educators.	ADH	November 13, 1995	December, 1995
4.	Produce Manual for The CIJE Study of Educators.	BR	November 13, 1995	January, 1995
5.	Produce Coding Instructions for the CIJE Educators Survey.	BR AN JEW	November 13, 1995	January, 1995
6.	Discuss the next steps in creating the Evaluation Institute.	EG, GZD, ADH	November 13, 1995	November 17, 1995

Mtg. W/AH + AG
Next week

FROM: INTERNET:GAMORAN@ssc.wisc.edu, INTERNET:GAMORAN@ssc.wisc.edu

TO: (unknown), INTERNET:ANNETTE@VMS.HUJI.AC.IL

CC: (unknown), INTERNET:GOLDRIEB@CTRVAX.VANDERBILT.EDU

Robin Mencher, 73321,1220

DATE: 12/19/95 3:13 PM

Re: meeting in Jerusalem

Sender: gamoran@ssc.wisc.edu

Received: from robin.ssc.wisc.edu (robin.ssc.wisc.edu [144.92.187.200]) by

arl-img-4.compuserve.com (8.6.10/5.950515)

id OAA22535; Tue, 19 Dec 1995 14:52:05 -0500

From: <GAMORAN@ssc.wisc.edu>

Received: from ssc.wisc.edu by ssc.wisc.edu (PMDF V5.0-5 #12975)

id <01HYZS77P28WD8Z4R9@ssc.wisc.edu>; Tue, 19 Dec 1995 13:53:11 -0600 (CST)

Date: Tue, 19 Dec 1995 13:53:11 -0600 (CST)

Subject: meeting in Jerusalem To: Annette@vms.huji.ac.il

Cc: GOLDRIEB@ctrvax.Vanderbilt.Edu, 73321.1220@compuserve.com

Message-id: <01HYZS77QI1ED8Z4R9@ssc.wisc.edu>

X-VMS-To: ANNETTE

X-VMS-Cc: ELLEN, ALAN, GAMORAN

MIME-version: 1.0

Content-type: TEXT/PLAIN; CHARSET=US-ASCII

Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

Annette,

Since our meeting will be brief, I'd like to think about it as the start of a conversation, which we will resume on January 15 in Detroit when we are joined by Alan and Ellen.

I'd like to bring two topics to your attention, both of which are included on our Jan 15 agenda, and both of which really have us stumped right now. One is the question of what to do with our Ed Leaders report now. We have written a long, comprehensive report, which we had intended to circulate as a discussion paper to other academics. In reviewing the paper for us, Nessa has raised many questions about the assumptions, arguments, and audience of the paper. The points she raises are mostly good ones, but we aren't sure about responding in this context. I would like to share the comments with you -- I'll send them in the next e-mail -- and would appreciate your guidance.

Another topic which we've long discussed but not resolved is the MEF role in CIJE's work on informal education. At one point we had virtually decided to carry out a survey of informal educators in camps, JCCs, and synagogues, but we pulled back from that because the purpose isn't fully clear. We'd be grateful for your counsel on this issue.

There are many other issues we'll get into on Jan 15 which we won't have a chance to start on Jan 27. But if you want to substitute another topic for the two I've raised, that's ok with me.

FROM: Alan, 73321,1220

TO: Debra abcPerrin, 76322,2406

DATE: 1/11/96 10:20 PM

Re: Re: proposed agenda for January 15, based on meeting with Alan Dec 26

DSP: PLS. DOWNLOAD AND PUT IN MY MEF MEETING FOLDER.

COPY FOR MEF FILE.

----- Forwarded Message -----

From: INTERNET:GAMORAN@ssc.wisc.edu, INTERNET:GAMORAN@ssc.wisc.edu

TO: (unknown), INTERNET:ANNETTE@VMS.HUJI.AC.IL

CC: (unknown), INTERNET:GOLDRIEB@CTRVAX.VANDERBILT.EDU

Alan, 73321,1220

DATE: 1/7/96 10:31 PM

RE: Re: proposed agenda for January 15, based on meeting with Alan Dec 26

Sender: gamoran@ssc.wisc.edu

Received: from robin.ssc.wisc.edu (robin.ssc.wisc.edu [144.92.187.200]) by

arl-img-2.compuserve.com (8.6.10/5.950515)

id WAA16116; Sun, 7 Jan 1996 22:21:26 -0500

From: <GAMORAN@ssc.wisc.edu>

Received: from ssc.wisc.edu by ssc.wisc.edu (PMDF V5.0-5 #12975)

id <01HZQRIW5CQ0HXITD2@ssc.wisc.edu>; Sun, 07 Jan 1996 21:21:14 -0600 (CST)

Date: Sun, 07 Jan 1996 21:21:14 -0600 (CST)

Subject: Re: proposed agenda for January 15, based on meeting with Alan Dec 26

To: ANNETTE@vms.huji.ac.il

Cc: GOLDRIEB@ctrvax.Vanderbilt.Edu, 73321.1220@compuserve.com

Message-id: <01HZQRIW5CQ2HXITD2@ssc.wisc.edu>

X-VMS-To: IN%"ANNETTE@vms.huji.ac.il" X-VMS-Cc: ELLEN, ALAN, GAMORAN

MIME-version: 1.0

Content-type: TEXT/PLAIN; CHARSET=US-ASCII

Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

Right, ok, I will come with a list of what's already in the pipeline, and we can discuss what to add. But it seems to me most essential on Jan 15 to address the specific issues we want to cover -- e.g. the possibility of a leaders brief, the idea of the review, CIJE's strategic direction -- and then see how it all comes together as a work plan.

FROM: Alan, 73321,1220

TO: Debra abcPerrin, 76322,2406 CC: Josie abMowlem, 102467,616

Gail Dorph, 73321,1217 Barry Holtz, 73321,1221 Nessa Rapoport, 74671,3370

DATE: 1/11/96 10:19 PM

Re: alan, please look this over and offer any comments, before I send it off to Anne

DOWNLOAD FOR MY MEF MEETING IN AA ON MONDAY.

FILE IN MEF FILE.

STAFF: ANY COMMENTS BEFORE MONDAY WOULD BE WELCOME.

A.

AMERICAN JEWISH ARCHIVES

----- Forwarded Message -----

From: INTERNET:GAMORAN@ssc.wisc.edu, INTERNET:GAMORAN@ssc.wisc.edu

TO: Alan, 73321,1220

CC: (unknown), INTERNET:GOLDRIEB@CTRVAX.VANDERBILT.EDU

DATE: 1/4/96 1:15 AM

RE: alan, please look this over and offer any comments, before I send it off to Annette

Sender: gamoran@ssc.wisc.edu

Received: from robin.ssc.wisc.edu (robin.ssc.wisc.edu [144.92.187.200]) by

dub-img-1.compuserve.com (8.6.10/5.950515)

id RAA28544; Wed, 3 Jan 1996 17:08:37 -0500

From: <GAMORAN@ssc.wisc.edu>

Received: from ssc.wisc.edu by ssc.wisc.edu (PMDF V5.0-5 #12975)

id <01HZKVIKOO5CHXIRR8@ssc.wisc.edu>; Wed, 03 Jan 1996 16:08:33 -0600 (CST)

Date: Wed, 03 Jan 1996 16:08:33 -0600 (CST)

Subject: alan, please look this over and offer any comments,

before I send it off to Annette

To: 73321.1220@compuserve.com Cc: GOLDRIEB@ctrvax.Vanderbilt.Edu

Message-id: <01HZKVIKOXSIHXIRR8@ssc.wisc.edu>

X-VMS-To: ALAN X-VMS-Cc: ELLEN MIME-version: 1.0

Content-type: TEXT/PLAIN; CHARSET=US-ASCII

Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

In my meeting with Alan on 12/26/95, we discussed the possible agenda

for our meeting with Annette on 1/15/95. We came up with the following list of topics:

1. How do we structure a process of "What have we learned from 4 years of MEF?" (Or, what did we learn from 3 years of MEF in lead communities?) Not sure exactly what the question is, but the basic idea is to take a look back at what we've learned over the past several years. This could occur in conjunction with hiring a new director. This process could take up a substantial part of Ellen's and Adam's work time during 1996, if we want to take a close look. It is important, however, that it not consume ALL the CIJE staff members' time.

At the meeting Jan 15, we should consider, what is the question? and how should we structure the process of answering it?

- 2. Publications in the pipeline -- including discussion of possible educational leaders policy brief.
- 3. Evaluation Institute: Update and discussion (ADH)
- 4. Preliminary discussion: CIJE's strategic thrust, and implications for MEF. That is, we would discuss current and expected directions for CIJE, and how MEF can best contribute. One example may be a strong early childhood initiative.
- Meeting of MEF advisory committee (tentatively scheduled with Annette for February 18). Possible topics include "what have we learned..."; informal education; educational leaders policy brief.

FROM: Alan, 73321,1220

TO: Debra abcPerrin, 76322,2406

DATE: 1/11/96 10:20 PM

Re:

fyi -- see my response in next message

DEBRA,

PLEASE DOWNLOAD AND PUT IN MY MEF MEETING FILE AND ALSO IN THE MAIN MEF FILE.

THANKS.

A

----- Forwarded Message -----

From: INTERNET:GAMORAN@ssc.wisc.edu, INTERNET:GAMORAN@ssc.wisc.edu

TO: Alan, 73321,1220

CC: (unknown), INTERNET:GOLDRIEB@CTRVAX.VANDERBILT.EDU

DATE: 1/7/96 10:22 PM

Hi Adam,

regarding the agenda for the 15th, the topics are fine. However it seems to me that the 1996 workplan may be a useful point of departure - I trust the MEF advisory group will expect an overview of 1995 + a discussion of 1996 as the basis for any specific topic.

Regarding item 2 - this includes discussion of the leaders' publication/s?

I am signing off my Jerusalem address tomorrow - temporarily the address is:

"annetteh@umich.edu"

Have a good week,

Annette

Date: Fri, 05 Jan 1996 07:44:17 -0600 (CST)

From: GAMORAN@ssc.wisc.edu

Subject: proposed agenda for January 15, based on meeting with Alan Dec 26

To: Annette@vms.huji.ac.il

In my meeting with Alan on 12/26/95, we discussed the possible agenda for our meeting with Annette on 1/15/95. We came up with the following list of topics:

1. How do we structure a process of "What have we learned from 4 years of MEF?" (Or, what did we learn from 3 years of MEF in lead communities?) Not sure exactly what the question is, but the basic idea is to take a look

back at what we've learned over the past several years. This could occur in conjunction with hiring a new director. This process could take up a substantial part of Ellen's and Adam's work time during 1996, if we want to take a close look. It is important, however, that it not consume ALL the CIJE staff members' time.

At the meeting Jan 15, we should consider, what is the question? and how should we structure the process of answering it?

- 2. Publications in the pipeline -- including discussion of possible educational leaders policy brief.
- 3. Evaluation Institute: Update and discussion (ADH)
- 4. Preliminary discussion: CIJE's strategic thrust, and implications for MEF. That is, we would discuss current and expected directions for CIJE, and how MEF can best contribute. One example may be a strong early childhood initiative.
- Meeting of MEF advisory committee (tentatively scheduled with Annette for February 18). Possible topics include "what have we learned..."; informal education; educational leaders policy brief.

	msf his
	MET meeting, Ann Rubson, Michigan 1.15.96
	ADAM _
l.	Should be propram evaluation of the CIFE's own work
	(Februales Wind)
2.	Baseline dale: poriay openino D Rosophett. Say leading
7	
۶.	Denelopment of swateric mission of CIT's Eg. 101 Starty discussion of January 1986
	I (ii) Early CHICHOOS]
	Q. Annelle: Does mot re-enter come of hie original invention.
	H. HIRSCHHORN
A	A 2 M T I I M T I
At the	Dissue 3 pours I. MET Advisory
B	4-40 Raview {New Divertor } Recease Network
	Dissue 3 pour I. MET Advisor 4-ye Review { New Divertor } J. Revenue Network CITE Guarge Thrust.
C	CITE Grange That.
Ь.	Evaluation (ushbull.
E	Prhiralioni
E	teh. 18 4.
	Kereben Aflende
6-	mor worlegstan

Line de la constante de la con	
	EDUCATION, foricy, infrimentation
KENT OF	
	ed. Apan R. Odden
	HOUSE AND
	Settle - C.
Har Top 2 1	ANTENICAN LEWIST BOOK OF THE PARTY OF THE PA
English A	
100	
7 7 4	
	The state of the s
	The state of the s
190 mg	

- J-1

MEF

FROM: INTERNET:GAMORAN@ssc.wisc.edu, INTERNET:GAMORAN@ssc.wisc.edu

TO: (unknown), INTERNET:ANNETTEH@UMICH.EDU

(unknown), INTERNET:GOLDRIEB@CTRVAX.VANDERBILT.EDU

Alan Hoffmann, 73321,1220

DATE: 1/16/96 2:00 PM

Re: minutes from yesterday -- comments welcome

Sender: gamoran@ssc.wisc.edu

Received: from robin.ssc.wisc.edu (robin.ssc.wisc.edu [144.92.187.200]) by

dub-img-5.compuserve.com (8.6.10/5.950515)

id NAA01617; Tue, 16 Jan 1996 13:55:57 -0500

From: <GAMORAN@ssc.wisc.edu>

Received: from ssc.wisc.edu by ssc.wisc.edu (PMDF V5.0-5 #12975)

id <01I02UJR73DSHXIY6X@ssc.wisc.edu>; Tue, 16 Jan 1996 12:54:36 -0600 (CST)

Date: Tue, 16 Jan 1996 12:54:36 -0600 (CST)

Subject: minutes from yesterday -- comments welcome

To: annetteh@umich.edu, GOLDRIEB@ctrvax.Vanderbilt.Edu,

73321.1220@compuserve.com

Message-id: <01I02UJR7MOIHXIY6X@ssc.wisc.edu> X-VMS-To: IN%"annetteh@umich.edu", ELLEN, ALAN

MIME-version: 1.0

Content-type: TEXT/PLAIN; CHARSET=US-ASCII

Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

Minutes of meeting in Ann Arbor, MI, 1/15/95 Adam Gamoran, Ellen Goldring, Annette Hochstein, Alan Hoffmann Minutes prepared by Adam Gamoran

I. In the first part of the meeting, we discussed an overall strategy for MEF which consists of three "prongs": evaluation of CIJE programs, policy-oriented research, and influencing CIJE's strategic agenda.

A. Evaluation of CIJE programs

Our current activity in this area is the evaluation of TEI. We described our approach briefly but did not debate the content of the evaluation. Alan noted that standards of evidence is an important question. For example, how will we know that changes reported after TEI are real changes? There was consensus about evaluating change in communities as the approach to evaluating CIJE initiatives (as contrasted with evaluating changes in individuals or evaluating CIJE itself).

B. Policy-oriented research

Annette reminded us that this came about because originally we had no programs to evaluate, and our mobilization reports were of limited usefulness. As it turned out, our analyses of educators have had a major impact on CIJE's activities. Annette recommended a new project that could have similar impact, namely a study of content in Jewish education. Alan pointed out that

calling for this research assumes that richer content leads to more learning, and Adam and Ellen indicated that substantial research in general education supports this assumption. Ellen observed that there could be political difficulties in analyzing content because of variation across the movements, e.g. Orthodox vs. reform. Adam suggested using indicators of depth, higher order thinking, and substantive conversation to indicate the quality of content, without valuing one specific Jewish content over another. Ellen noted that many Jews do not care about content in Jewish education because they are seeking affective outcomes. In response, Annette suggested we need to convince people that better content leads to better affect.

Adam noted that a study of content could include informal as well as formal settings. He argued that to be meaningful, it would have to include observations of interactions between educators and learners, and this would make it a very large undertaking.

No decision was reached on Annette's suggestion, but we will discuss it with the CIJE NY staff.

C. Influencing CIJE's strategic agenda
We discussed various modes of operation, and reached consensus
that it is appropriate for MEF to describe and analyze the
changes through which CIJE has gone, for consideration by the
director, the advisory board, and the steering committee.

**Note from Adam: In light of our subsequent discussion, I do not think there is a mandate for MEF to evaluate CIJE's operation and changes over the past four years.

MEF can also influence CIJE's strategic agenda by making a case for particular interpretations of data, for new data collections, or for addressing particular policy issues.

II. In the second part of the meeting, we discussed how we might structure a process of reviewing what we have learned about CIJE and its work. The more we discussed the idea, the less convinced we became that this would be a fruitful exercise. We postponed a final decision for a conference call scheduled for Wednesday, Jan. 31, at 3:00pm Eastern Time, but we left the meeting leaning against this idea. For the record, I will summarize our discussion.

A. Audience and schedule

The audience would be an internal one consisting of the CIJE staff, including the new director, and the MEF advisory committee including possible new members.

The best date seemed to be July 3, 1996. Other possibilities were August 21, 1996 or some time in November, 1996.

B. Content

Alan initiated a list of nine topics that could be examined in a review process:

- the idea of CIJE
- 2. Lead Communities
- 3. content and goals
- 4. community mobilization and lay leadership
- 5. building the profession
- 6. the role of MEF
- 7. the intersection of 3, 4, 5, and 6
- why informal education (and other topics) have been left out so far
- 9. the challenges ahead

After some discussion of difficulties in examining this list, including its vast scope and the need to avoid a simplistic chronological approach, Alan suggested a more thematic approach:

- Does the model of federation as convener, developing a coalition of lay leadership, and focusing on professional development work?
- 2. Is it possible to think about systemic change without visions of educational outcomes?
- Is working at the national and local levels simultaneously an effective strategy?
- 4. How has the problem of limited human capacity affected CIJE's endeavors?
- 5. How has the role of the synagogue and rabbi figured in what has occurred in the communities in which CIJE has worked?

The idea here would be to take three or four seminal questions and subject them to intense examination, possibly along with a cross-community mobilization report. Ellen suggested that such questions could be addressed through different lenses that represent different approaches to studying change. Annette expressed concern that this procedure, while interesting, may not lead to concrete policy decisions.

After further discussion it became apparent that MEF did not have enough information to examine questions with this broad scope. Alan then suggested a more modest approach, where the questions would be: "What have we learned from MEF?" "What has MEF taught us about CIJE's work in communities?" While this approach is feasible in that we have plenty of evidence to answer the questions, it's not clear how much we would learn, and whether it would contribute substantially to CIJE's strategic thrust.

The idea of the review will be discussed at the staff meeting on Jan 21, and in a conference call of Annette, Alan, Ellen, and Adam on Jan 31, when a final decision will be reached.

**Note from Adam: If we decided against the review, Adam and Ellen will still prepare a substantial briefing for the new director, addressing the question of what we have learned from MEF. Thus, this important function of the review would not be lost, even if we decide not to hold the review.

III. Next, Alan provided an update on the Evaluation Institute. He discussed its aims, how it fits into CIJE's mission, and the steps we are taking to bring it about. We listed elements of a possible curriculum for the Institute, including:

- -- The CIJE Study of Educators
- -- CIJE's experiences in community mobilization
- -- Ilana' Shohamy's assessment of Hebrew in day schools
- -- the Nativ study of the Israel Experience
- -- a manual for program evaluation in Jewish education

This last item, a nuts-and-bolts manual for program evaluation, must be produced by CIJE by August 1996. Alan will hire someone to write this manual.

IV. Adam gave an update on publications in the pipeline, including:

- -- 3-city ed leaders report (on hold)
- -- 3-city teachers report (will be distributed shortly)
- -- memos on TEI (doc #1 to be discussed at Jan 22 staff mtg)
- -- teacher power and teacher in-service (due Jan 31)
- -- "levers" paper (revision pending new analysis)
- -- leaders paper for AERA (will be completed by April)

We then discussed possible ideas for new policy briefs. Alan expressed the concern that policy briefs must be accompanied by plans for action, including CIJE's own plans. Annette noted that it is important to keep the debate alive, and producing policy briefs helps us do that. Alan proposed, therefore, that we write a policy brief on early childhood, using leaders and teachers data, for release at the 1996 GA. He gave the following reasons for the importance of this topic:

- -- early childhood education is growing
 - -- it is therefore an opportunity to attract more children to Jewish education
 - -- moreover, good early childhood education involves parents, so it is an opportunity to increase the Jewish learning and involvement of families
- -- early Jewish education leads to later Jewish education
- -- early childhood education crosses denominations and

settings (including JCCs), so it is of broad interest

This idea will be discussed at the staff meeting on Jan 22 to see how it fits into the rest of CIJE's agenda.

Possibly by November of 1997 we will be ready to produce a policy brief on leaders.

V. Finally, we decided that we will not be able to hold a meeting of the MEF advisory committee on Feb 18, because the planning committee for the "professors in Israel" program has greater urgency. Instead, we will decide about the most pressing issue - whether or not to carry out a review procedure -- in a conference call on Jan 31.



cc: Staff

----- Forwarded Message -----

From:

INTERNET: GAMORAN

TO:

Alan, 73321,1220

INTERNET: GOLDRIEB

DATE:

2/29/96 5:56 PM

RE:

summary of today's call

Conference call summary

Date: 2/29/96

Participants: Adam Gamoran, Ellen Goldring, Alan Hoffmann

We discussed two possible models for writing a proposal to the Blaustein Foundation for continued funding. In one model, the proposed funding would support Research and Evaluation (R&E) within CIJE, with the Evaluation Institute (EI) as the centerpiece of that work. In the second model, the proposed funding would support the EI, and other CIJE R&E work would be included as supplementary to the EI. After discussion, we decided to focus on the first model.

The proposal should note that this work is leading towards a National Center for Evaluation in Jewish Education. It should explain how the work builds on the accomplishments to date of previous Blaustein funding. In particular, previous work has shown us the importantce of building capacity, and that is why we are starting the EI.

ASSIGNMENT:

AG and EG will prepare a proposal of about 8-10 pages for ADH, who will polish it for submission to the Blaustein Foundation. AG and EG will try to finish their version by mid-April, so ADH can get something to Hirschhorn by the May Board meeting if his schedule permits. ADH will discuss our plans with Seymour to get his advice about working with Hirschhorn and the Blaustein Foundation.

ASSIGNMENT:

EG will talk to Barbara Neufeld about the possibility of writing the "Manual for Program Evaluation in Jewish Education." If Barbara is unable to do it herself, she may have someone else to recommend.

We discussed the R&E Work Plan for 1996 briefly. ADH is concerned about the high proportion of our work time devoted to studying TEI, and asked us to consider the question, "What will we learn from TEI (and the study of TEI) that is important for CIJE?" There is also some concern that we do not have a sufficiently deep understanding of the intended changes among TEI participants. The R&E team is working to rectify this weakness.

EG noted that data collected through the TEI evaluation could lead to a new Policy Brief on the state of professional development for teachers in Jewish supplementary schools.

ASSIGNMENT:

We still have not made a final decision about a Policy Brief for 1996, but time is slipping away. To help us reach a decision about 1996 and plan for 1997, AG and EG will prepare a list of what we could say in a policy brief based on the data we already have. ADH and GZD will respond to this list by indicating what else would need to be covered in a policy brief to make it serve CIJE's agenda.



FROM: Alan, 73321,1220 TO: Alan, 73321,1220 DATE: 4/17/96 2:48 PM

Re: summary of MEF section of the staff meeting

----- Forwarded Message -----

From: INTERNET:GAMORAN@ssc.wisc.edu, INTERNET:GAMORAN@ssc.wisc.edu

TO: (unknown), INTERNET: ANNETTE@VMS.HUJI.AC.IL

CC: Alan, 73321,1220

(unknown), INTERNET:GOLDRIEB@CTRVAX.VANDERBILT.EDU

(unknown), 74104,3335 (unknown), 74671,3370 (unknown), 73321,1217 (unknown), 74043,423

DATE: 1/26/96 9:40 AM

RE: summary of MEF section of the staff meeting

Sender: gamoran@ssc.wisc.edu

Received: from robin.ssc.wisc.edu (robin.ssc.wisc.edu [144.92.187.200]) by

arl-img-7.compuserve.com (8.6.10/5.950515)

id JAA17942; Fri, 26 Jan 1996 09:19:00 -0500

From: <GAMORAN@ssc.wisc.edu>

Received: from ssc.wisc.edu by ssc.wisc.edu (PMDF V5.0-5 #12975)

id <01I0GJRIE25IQT5TWV@ssc.wisc.edu>; Fri, 26 Jan 1996 08:18:37 -0600 (CST)

Date: Fri, 26 Jan 1996 08:18:37 -0600 (CST)

Subject: summary of MEF section of the staff meeting

To: Annette@vms.huji.ac.il

Cc: 73321.1220@compuserve.com, GOLDRIEB@ctrvax.Vanderbilt.Edu, 74104.3335@compuserve.com, 74671.3370@compuserve.com, 73321.1217@compuserve.com, 74043.423@compuserve.com

Message-id: <01I0GJRIEBSOQT5TWV@ssc.wisc.edu>

X-VMS-To: ANNETTE

X-VMS-Cc: ALAN, ELLEN, BILL, BARRY, NESSA, GAIL, ROBIN

MIME-version: 1.0

Content-type: TEXT/PLAIN; CHARSET=US-ASCII

Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

To: Annette From: Adam

CC: Ellen, Bill, Alan, Barry, Gail, Nessa, Dan P.

Annette, I'm writing to give you a report on the MEF section of the CIJE staff meeting on Jan 22. The MEF topics were: TEI evaluation, review of CIJE, data collection on content, the Research Network conference, and policy brief of early childhood.

(Really I should be saying "Research and Evaluation" instead of MEF, since we aren't doing MEF in Lead Communities any more, and

since that's what the CIJE domain is called. But MEF is shorter.)

A. TEI evaluation

The staff regards the evaluation plan as acceptable as far as it goes, but pointed out four limitations that should be addressed if possible:

- 1. The evaluation plan as stated does not address participants' thinking about professional growth, but that is a chief mechanism through which change is expected to occur. In response, we need to incorporate this issue into the interviews with targeted participants that we have scheduled for this spring.
- 2. We plan to assess change in professional growth opportunities with survey questions administered before and after. A weakness in this plan is that we will not have observations to confirm that reported changes have actually occurred. In response, we hope to use follow-up surveys of lead community educators to triangulate, so that we will have evidence from beyond the TEI participants themselves.
- 3. The TEI evaluation does not assess change in teacher-student interactions in classrooms, nor does it assess change in student outcomes. In response, near the end of the three-year TEI program, we may ask participants to collect baseline data in areas in which positive results of their professional development offerings are most likely to occur. (Adam's note: This is a good idea, but it may not be practical because it puts a heavy burden on TEI participants.
- 4. The issue of funding for professional development is absent from our evaluation. (Adam's note: This is a separate topic and cannot be incorporated in our TEI evaluation.)

B. Review of CIJE or MEF

We reported on our meeting of Jan 15, concluding with the recommendation that we not put the review on MEF's work plan. Staff members found the decision understandable, but had some regrets. Both Nessa and Barry were particularly concerned that we have not done enough with what we have learned, and that we did not have advice to offer other communities or change agents.

The staff decided to hold a 1-day staff meeting on "what have we learned," for which each staff member would prepare a 2-page memo about their own insights and conclusions. This would help satisfy our need for self-reflection without draining staff energies more than is warranted. Possibly, after going through this process, we may decide to work on a document for an external audience.

C. Data collection on content

The staff found your idea about a new data collection on content to be intriguing and provocative. There was some concern that the response to such a study would be "so what," unlike the response to the study of educators. Most staff members think the American Jewish audience would not be particularly concerned about weak content.

One idea that resulted from this discussion is that we could begin work in this area by examining content in a setting that is working with the Goals Project. In a subsequent discussion with Dan Pekarsky (who was unable to attend the staff meeting), he was very interested in the idea of examining content in a pilot site before and after working with him. This could constitue evaluation of a Goals Project pilot project. We plan to explore this idea further.

D. The Research Network conference

The conference is scheduled for July 29-August 1, 1996, in Israel. It does not fit my schedule or Ellen's, but Alan is very eager for us to make a major presentation that would inform this audience -- which, this year, will include many Israeli academics -- about the whole CIJE Study of Educators. (This is particularly important because last year's presentation, unfortunately, failed to show CIJE in its best light.)

Barry Holtz will approach the conference organizers about the possibility of devoting a session to a CIJE symposium on our study. The session would include 5 papers:

- (1) Background to the CIJE Study of Educators: Theory and Policy Context
- (2) Instruments for the CIJE Study of Educators
- (3) Research findings: Commitment in a non-professional context
- (4) Policy implications: Building the personnel of Jewish education
- (5) Implementation of policy: Improving opportunities for professional growth

In addition, Dan P. is submitting a paper on goals and Barry is submitting a paper on best practices for presentation at the conference.

D. Policy brief on early childhood

We decided to hold off on the policy brief on early childhood for now, possibly waiting until 1997. The reason for this decision is that we do not yet know what CIJE's policy response will be, and we do not yet know whether new data may be required to support that policy response.

I think we could tell a good story about Jewish early childhood education, using the data we already have. But is it a story that would further CIJE's policy efforts? That's what is not yet clear.

Should we return to the idea of a policy brief on leaders? There, too, CIJE's policy response is not yet determined. But I am concerned about Annette's point about maintaining momentum and keeping the attention of the North American audience.



FROM: Alan D. Hoffmann, [73321,1220]
TO: Debra abcPerrin, [76322,2406]
CC: Josie abcMowlem, [102467,616]

DATE: 4/28/96 4:44 PM

Re: Re: staff meetings

MEF FILE

----- Forwarded Message -----

From: INTERNET:GAMORAN@ssc.wisc.edu, INTERNET:GAMORAN@ssc.wisc.edu

TO: Alan D. Hoffmann, 73321,1220

DATE: 4/28/96 3:46 PM

RE: Re: staff meetings

Sender: gamoran@ssc.wisc.edu

Received: from robin.ssc.wisc.edu (robin.ssc.wisc.edu [144.92.187.200]) by

arl-img-3.compuserve.com (8.6.10/5.950515)

id PAA20578; Sun, 28 Apr 1996 15:38:24 -0400

From: <GAMORAN@ssc.wisc.edu>

Received: from ssc.wisc.edu by ssc.wisc.edu (PMDF V5.0-6 #12975)

id <01I42U136Q1CHXISEG@ssc.wisc.edu> for 73321.1220@CompuServe.COM; Sun,

28 Apr 1996 14:38:21 -0600 (CST)

Date: Sun, 28 Apr 1996 14:38:21 -0600 (CST)

Subject: Re: staff meetings

To: 73321.1220@CompuServe.COM

Message-id: <01I42U13829EHXISEG@ssc.wisc.edu> X-VMS-To: IN%"73321.1220@CompuServe.COM"

X-VMS-Cc: GAMORAN MIME-version: 1.0

Content-type: TEXT/PLAIN; CHARSET=US-ASCII

Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

On April 9, we had an excellent meeting of me, Ellen, Bill, Gail, Sharon, and Deborah. I think we ironed out all the issues relating to the TEI evaluation. If there are remaining concerns, someone should tell me about them. I thought Bill did a fine job of "shuttle diplomacy" in preparation for that meeting.

In general, I don't see the wisdom of excluding Bill from staff meetings. I can see that there may be times when something is discussed, e.g. personnel of the Research and Evaluation domain, where you might not want him present. But as a general rule, it is better to have him there. It is better for him and better for me and Ellen. We will, of course, abide by your decision, and make a specific request each time. Hence, please consider this my request to have Bill attend the June 25 staff meeting, for the reasons explained in my earlier message: So I won't have to repeat what I hear (spending extra time and possibly losing something in the translation), and so I'll have the opportunity to work with him in person.

FROM: Alan, 73321,1220

TO: Debra abcPerrin, 76322,2406

DATE: 3/4/96 6:21 PM

Re: DRAFT AGENDA

TEI FILE

MEF FILE

----- Forwarded Message -----

From: gail dorph, 73321,1217 TO: Alan, 73321,1220 DATE: 2/27/96 5:34 AM

RE: DRAFT AGENDA

ALAN, ARE YOU GOING TO BE ABLE TO BE PART OF THIS?
------ Forwarded Message -----

From: Bill Robinson, 74104,3335 TO: Gail Dorph, 73321,1217

> Adam Gamoran, INTERNET:gamoran@ssc.wisc.edu Ellen Goldring, INTERNET:goldrieb@ctrvax.vanderbilt.edu

DATE: 2/26/96 12:45 PM

RE: DRAFT AGENDA

To: Gail Dorph, Adam Gamoran, Ellen Goldring

From: Bill Robinson

Re: Conference Call

Wednesday, February 28, 1996

3:00 p.m. EST (2:00 p.m. Central Time)

DRAFT AGENDA

1. Plan for completion of TEI participant Surveys

- a. Dissemination of Surveys to participants who did NOT attend last seminar
- b. Who to call at the central agencies in Milwaukee, Boston, and Chicago?
- 2. Plan for completion of non-participant Surveys
 - a. Working with the other three communities (Boston, Chicago, and San Francisco)?
 - b. Pre-schools and day schools?
- 3. Interviews
 - a. Designing the protocol: With whom to consult?
 - b. Plan for conducting interviews
- 4. Consideration of other elements in the TEI Evaluation
 - a. Second cohort

- b. Investigating impact on teachers:

 - Educators Survey?
 Observation/interview of content-similar interventions?
 Other?
- 5. Review of Research and Evaluation Workplan for 1996
- 6. Date for next conference call



FROM: Alan, 73321,1220

TO: Debra abcPerrin, 76322,2406

DATE: 3/4/96 6:22 PM

Re: Minutes/assignments from 2/28 telecon

PLEASE DOWNLOAD AND CLEANUP FOR MY READING

TEI FILE

MEF FILE

----- Forwarded Message -----

From: Gail Dorph, 73321,1217

TO: Alan, 73321,1220 DATE: 3/4/96 11:02 AM

RE: Minutes/assignments from 2/28 telecon

I'M NOT SURE WHY HE DIDN'T SEND YOU A COPY. GAIL

----- Forwarded Message -----

From: Bill Robinson, 74104,3335 TO: Gail Dorph, 73321,1217

Adam Gamoran, INTERNET:gamoran@ssc.wisc.edu

Ellen Goldring, INTERNET:goldrieb@ctrvax.vanderbilt.edu

DATE: 3/4/96 9:37 AM

RE: Minutes/assignments from 2/28 telecon

Minutes: Telecon on TEI Evaluation

Date: February 28, 1996, 3:00 - 4:00 p.m., EST

Participants: Gail Dorph, Adam Gamoran, Ellen Goldring, Bill Robinson

Copy to: None

A. Plan for completion of TEI participant surveys

The Boston BJE will not be asked to complete a Professional Development Program Survey for every in-service offering they sponsor. Hassia (the only Boston TEI participant) will complete a Survey only for those in-service programs that she is personally responsible for.

BR will call the central agency people in the five communites that we are focusing the evaluation upon (i..e, Atlanta, Baltimore, Cleveland, Hartford, and Milwaukee).

B. Plan for completion of non-participant Surveys

When BR contacts the five central agency people (see above), he will make arrangements with them for the dissemination and completion of the Survey to all of the supplementary directors in their communities - recommeding that this be done during their monthly professional council meetings. BR wil be available to attend those meetings, if necessary.

BR will also talk with the five central agency people about the possibility of doing the same for the pre-school and day school principals. [This process will start with Atlanta.]

These meetings, at which the Survey will be completed, must be in April or May.

C. Interviews: Designing the protocol

We decided upon the following time line and assignments for developing the interview protocol.

March 7: BR to develop a suggestive list of questions for the interview protocol (incorporating comments for the January 22 CIJE staff meeting into the original design) and compile any other materials that will be sent to Sharon, Deborah, and an outside consultant (to be named**). Materials sent to AG, EG, and GZD for review.

March 11: AG, EG, and GZD to respond by March 11. Telecon scheduled for 3:00 p.m. EST (2:00 p.m. Central Time) to review the questions and other materials.

March 13: Revised list of interview questions and other materials sent to Sharon, Deborah, and outside consultant.

March 20-27: BR to meet with Sharon and Deborah and, then, with outside consultant (seperately) to develop interview protocol.

March 29: BR to develop draft of interview protocol. Sent to Sharon, Deborah, outside consultant, AG, EG, and GZD for their review.

April 8 or 9 (tentative): All comments on interview protocol to be received by BR. Meeting in NY with AG, EG, GZD, and possibly others to review draft of interview protocol. [BR to also meet again with outside consultant, preferably before this date.]

April 15: Make final revisions to interview protocol and begin conducting interviews.

** The outside consultant, with expertise in professional development, will be named later. Once a person who is qualified and interested is found, a memo will be written by EG or AG infomring ADH of our intention to employ this person on a temporary and limited basis for two consulations. FROM: Alan, 73321,1220

TO: Debra abcPerrin, 76322,2406 CC: Josie abMowlem, 102467,616

DATE: 3/5/96 9:29 PM

Re:

summary of today's call

MEF FILE

HIRSHHORN FILE

JOSIE -FYI

----- Forwarded Message ------

From: INTERNET:GAMORAN@ssc.wisc.edu, INTERNET:GAMORAN@ssc.wisc.edu

TO: Alan, 73321,1220

(unknown), INTERNET:GOLDRIEB@CTRVAX.VANDERBILT.EDU

DATE: 2/29/96 5:56 PM

RE: summary of today's call

Conference call summary

Date: 2/29/96

Participants: Adam Gamoran, Ellen Goldring, Alan Hoffmann

We discussed two possible models for writing a proposal to the Blaustein Foundation for continued funding. In one model, the proposed funding would support Research and Evaluation (R&E) within CIJE, with the Evaluation Institute (EI) as the centerpiece of that work. In the second model, the proposed funding would support the EI, and other CIJE R&E work would be included as supplementary to the EI. After discussion, we decided to focus on the first model.

The proposal should note that this work is leading towards a National Center for Evaluation in Jewish Education. It should explain how the work builds on the accomplishments to date of previous Blaustein funding. In particular, previous work has shown us the importantce of building capacity, and that is why we are starting the EI.

ASSIGNMENT:

AG and EG will prepare a proposal of about 8-10 pages for ADH, who will polish it for submission to the Blaustein Foundation. AG and EG will try to finish their version by mid-April, so ADH can get something to Hirschhorn by the May Board meeting if his schedule permits. ADH will discuss our plans with Seymour to get his advice about working with Hirschhorn and the Blaustein Foundation.

ASSIGNMENT:

EG will talk to Barbara Neufeld about the possibility of writing the "Manual for Program Evaluation in Jewish Education." If Barbara is unable to do it herself, she may have someone else to recommend.

We discussed the R&E Work Plan for 1996 briefly. ADH is concerned about the high proportion of our work time devoted to studying TEI, and asked us to consider the question, "What will we learn from TEI (and the study of TEI) that is important for CIJE?" There is also some concern that we do not have a sufficiently deep understanding of the intended changes among TEI participants. The R&E team is working to rectify this weakness.

EG noted that data collected through the TEI evaluation could lead to a new Policy Brief on the state of professional development for teachers in Jewish supplementary schools.

ASSIGNMENT:

We still have not made a final decision about a Policy Brief for 1996, but time is slipping away. To help us reach a decision about 1996 and plan for 1997, AG and EG will prepare a list of what we could say in a policy brief based on the data we already have. ADH and GZD will respond to this list by indicating what else would need to be covered in a policy brief to make it serve CIJE's agenda.