



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

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

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

Subseries 5: Communication, Publications, and Research Papers, 1991–2003.

---

Box  
42

Folder  
7

Gamoran, Adam, et al. The Teachers Report. Correspondence  
and drafts, 1996.

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

---

FROM: INTERNET:GAMORAN@ssc.wisc.edu, INTERNET:GAMORAN@ssc.wisc.edu  
TO: Nessa Rapoport, 74671,3370  
DATE: 6/10/96 11:40 PM

Re: Re: Your report

Sender: gamoran@ssc.wisc.edu  
Received: from eagle.ssc.wisc.edu (eagle.ssc.wisc.edu [144.92.187.201]) by  
arl-img-7.compuserve.com (8.6.10/5.950515)  
id XAA02982; Mon, 10 Jun 1996 23:37:58 -0400  
From: <GAMORAN@ssc.wisc.edu>  
Received: from ssc.wisc.edu by ssc.wisc.edu (PMDF V5.0-6 #12975)  
id <01I5RDF2CUV891VSAR@ssc.wisc.edu> for 74671.3370@CompuServe.COM; Mon,  
10 Jun 1996 22:37:57 -0600 (CST)  
Date: Mon, 10 Jun 1996 22:37:57 -0600 (CST)  
Subject: Re: Your report  
To: 74671.3370@CompuServe.COM  
Message-id: <01I5RDF2D4IE91VSAR@ssc.wisc.edu>  
X-VMS-To: IN%"74671.3370@CompuServe.COM"  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: TEXT/PLAIN; CHARSET=US-ASCII  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

I just prepared a package to send you including a disk with the paper in  
Word Perfect 5.1. I'd be happy to have someone there enter the changes.

Adam




# COUNCIL FOR INITIATIVES IN JEWISH EDUCATION

## MEMORANDUM

**TO:** Colleagues  
**FROM:** Adam Gamoran  
**DATE:** June 20, 1996  
**RE:** Teachers' Paper

---


This is the final version of the paper on teachers in three communities, pending copy-editing.



Council for Initiatives in Jewish Education  
Monitoring, Evaluation, and Feedback Project

TEACHERS IN JEWISH SCHOOLS: A STUDY OF THREE COMMUNITIES

Adam Gamoran  
Ellen Goldring  
Bill Robinson  
Julie Tammivaara  
Roberta Goodman



June 1, 1996



Council for Initiatives in Jewish Education  
Monitoring, Evaluation, and Feedback Project

TEACHERS IN JEWISH SCHOOLS: A STUDY OF THREE COMMUNITIES

The need for well-trained teachers in Jewish education has been recognized since the beginning of the modern American Jewish community. In a 1907 lecture on the problems of Jewish education, Solomon Schechter (1915, p. 110) explained,

The first difficulty under which we labor is the great dearth of trained teachers....The American teacher, with his knowledge of the English language and his familiarity with the best educational methods, will thus in the end prove to be the only fit person to instruct also in religion, but unfortunately he is not always sufficiently equipped with a knowledge of Hebrew things in general and Hebrew language in particular to enable him to accomplish his duties in a satisfactory manner.

Schechter recognized the need for modern educational methods in the Jewish classroom and, simultaneously, the need for educators to be well versed in Jewish studies. In a similar vein, Emanuel Gamoran commented in his (1924, p.2) manual for teacher training for the Reform movement,

[T]he crux of the problem of Jewish education centers about the question of the Jewish teacher.... It is therefore of the utmost importance that our teachers be adequately trained, thoroughly imbued with Jewish spirit, possessed of Jewish knowledge and pedagogically qualified.

For Gamoran, the essential components in the background of a Jewish educator were commitment to Judaism, knowledge of Judaica, and pedagogical training. Yet one or more of these were usually missing. Gamoran explained that teachers lacked adequate training (p.5):

Training is absolutely essential for the development of adequate Jewish teachers. Very few people today would think of entrusting their legal affairs to anyone but a lawyer who had received special training entitling him to engage in his professional

activities. Still less would people permit anyone who had not received a long and arduous course of training followed by a period of practice in medicine to minister to their physical ailments. Yet those who are entrusted with the responsibility of molding the character of the young -- of developing the Jews of tomorrow -- are too often people who present no other qualification for their task than that of availability.

The concerns of Schechter and Gamoran are still echoed today. According to A Time to Act, the 1990 report of the Commission on Jewish Education in North America, developing the profession of Jewish education is an essential building block in the effort to improve Jewish education in North America. The Council for Initiatives in Jewish Education (CIJE) was established to implement the Commission's conclusions. To begin the task of enhancing the profession of Jewish education, one must ask: What is the character of the teaching profession in today's Jewish schools? In response, the CIJE carried out a study of teachers in Jewish schools in collaboration with its three "Lead Communities," Atlanta, Baltimore, and Milwaukee. The findings of this study have led to a number of plans and programs for improving the personnel for Jewish education in these communities. The purpose of this report is to share these findings with the wider Jewish community, in hopes of bringing continental attention to the problems and prospects of enhancing the profession of Jewish education.

### **Questions for Research and Policy**

One of the central questions of the CIJE study was to learn about the professional backgrounds of teachers who work in Jewish schools. How adequate is their training in the field of education? How extensive are their backgrounds in Judaica? Do they engage in activities that continually enhance their preparation for teaching? Answers to these questions are essential for developing policies for change.



If professional preparation and growth for teachers are important, providing professional conditions for work may be closely related. How adequate are the earnings and benefits for teachers in Jewish schools? How many hours do they work? Are teachers commonly employed in more than one school? What are the prospects for full-time work as a Jewish teacher?

A third set of issues concerns Jewish education as a career. How are teachers recruited to Jewish education? How experienced are they? Do they view their work as a career? What are their future plans? Addressing these questions may provide guidance about the worth of investing in our current teaching force.

#### About the Study and Its Participants

This study was carried out by the Council for Initiatives in Jewish Education, in collaboration with the three Lead Communities of Atlanta, Baltimore, and Milwaukee. Data sources included surveys of nearly 1000 teachers and interviews with over 100 educators. Further information on the data and methodology of the study may be found in the appendix.

The survey indicated that teachers in the three communities are predominantly female (84%) and married (80%). A large majority are American born (86%), while 7% percent were born in Israel. Surveys from other cities have indicated much higher proportions of Israeli-born teachers: 17% in Boston (Frank, Margolis, and Weisner, 1992); 25% in Los Angeles (Aron and Phillips, 1988); and in Miami, 15% of synagogue school teachers and 29% of Judaic day school teachers (Sheskin, 1988).

Our respondents represent a variety of religious affiliations. Thirty-two percent are Orthodox and 8% are Traditional. Thirty-one percent identify with the Reform movement and 25% see themselves as Conservative. (The remaining 4% list other preferences, including 1% Reconstructionist.) Sixty-three percent of the teachers have visited Israel, and 51% of those have lived in Israel for three months or more. Twenty-one percent of the teachers in our survey described themselves as fluent Hebrew speakers.

#### Background and Training of Teachers in Jewish Schools

To what extent are teachers in Jewish schools trained as educators? Are they prepared in areas of Jewish content? What standards are maintained for their ongoing

professional development? Our first task is to examine the background and training of teachers in Jewish schools.

### Educational Backgrounds

Teachers in the Jewish schools of Atlanta, Baltimore, and Milwaukee are highly educated. Table 1 shows that 74% have college degrees, and more than a quarter have graduate or professional degrees. Compared to the national Jewish population, the teachers are more likely to have college degrees, and about equally likely to have post-collegiate degrees. According to the 1990 National Jewish Population Survey, around 50% of both men and women who identify as Jews have college degrees, and 24% of women and 32% of men have graduate degrees (Kosmin et al., 1993).

Table 1. General Educational Backgrounds of Teachers in Jewish Schools					
SETTING	College Degree	Grad/Prof. Degree	Degree in Education		Worked in General Educ.
			From University	From Teacher's Institute	
Day Schools	76%	40%	43%	17%	48%
<i>Orthodox</i>	69%	42%	32%	26%	36%
<i>Other</i>	86%	38%	58%	5%	64%
Supplementary Schools	80%	33%	41%	5%	55%
Pre-Schools	63%	13%	46%	15%	50%
<i>Orthodox</i>	38%	8%	28%	31%	32%
<i>Other</i>	66%	14%	48%	12%	53%
TOTAL	74%	29%	43%	11%	51%

More important for our interests is the finding that 43% of the teachers in the Jewish schools of the three communities have university degrees in education, and another 11% have

education degrees from teacher's institutes. Just over half the teachers have worked in general education. Whereas day, supplementary, and pre-school teachers are about equally likely to have degrees and experience in general education, these comparisons mask important differences within settings: Teachers in day and pre-schools under Orthodox sponsorship have less formal training and experience in general education, compared to those in day and pre-schools under other sponsorships.

Table 2. Collegiate and Professional Jewish Educational Backgrounds of Teachers in Jewish Schools		
SETTING	Certification in Jewish education	Degree in Jewish Studies
Day Schools	40%	37%
<i>Orthodox</i>	47%	49%
<i>Other</i>	30%	24%
Supplementary Schools	18%	12%
Pre-Schools	10%	4%
<i>Orthodox</i>	24%	16%
<i>Other</i>	8%	3%
TOTAL	22%	17%

Thirty-seven percent of the day school teachers reported a college major or seminary degree in Jewish studies, and slightly more are certified in Jewish education (see Table 2). Again, these figures differed within the day school setting, with those in Orthodox institutions substantially more likely to have training or certification in Jewish education or studies. Teachers in other settings have far less formal preparation in Jewish studies. Table 2 indicates that only 12% of supplementary school teachers, 16% of teachers in Orthodox



pre-schools, and 3% of teachers in other pre-schools majored in Jewish studies; the percentages are moderately higher but follow the same pattern for certification in Jewish education. Similar contrasts in Judaic training between day school and other teachers were reported in Miami (Sheskin, 1988).

Teachers in supplementary schools and pre-schools have relatively little formal preparation to be Jewish educators. Even in day schools, where formal preparation is most extensive, only half the teachers are trained in education, and half are prepared in Jewish studies at the collegiate or professional level (this includes both Jewish studies majors and Jewish education certification).

Overall, 19% of the teachers we surveyed may be considered well trained, with professional or collegiate training in both Judaica and education (this includes teacher's institutes). Another 47% had formal training in one field or the other, but not both, including 35% with backgrounds in education and 12% certified in Jewish subjects (including Jewish education). This leaves about 34% of teachers in Jewish schools in the three communities who lack collegiate or professional degrees in both areas. Figure 1 provides a graphic display of this pattern for all teachers. The pattern differs somewhat across settings: among day school teachers, only 10% in Orthodox schools and 23% in non-Orthodox schools lack degrees in both areas, whereas the figure is 38% for pre-school teachers and 44% for supplementary school teachers.

This analysis views teachers who are certified in Jewish education but who lack a degree in general education as partially trained, because certification in Jewish education typically does not require the same level of training in education as a secular degree.




Figure 1: Extent of Professional Training in General Education and Jewish Studies

Counting those with certificates in Jewish education as well trained would lead to the conclusion that about 25% instead of 19% are well trained -- still only one quarter of all teachers in Jewish settings.

An important qualification to these findings is that they emphasize formal schooling. However, Jewish content is learned not only in school, but in informal settings such as the home, the synagogue, summer camp, Israel experiences, and through living a Jewish life. Focusing only on formal education thus underestimates the extent of Jewish knowledge among teachers in Jewish schools. Still, to the extent that modern conceptions of teaching include formal training in one's subject matter (as well as in pedagogy), the lack of formal training in Jewish studies among many of the teachers must draw our attention.

#### Pre-Collegiate Jewish Educational Backgrounds

What sort of Jewish education did the teachers receive when they were children? On the whole, teachers in Jewish schools are much better educated Jewishly than the typical American Jew. For example, according to the 1990 National Jewish Population Survey (Kosmin et al., 1993), 22% of males and 38% of females who identify as Jews received no Jewish education as children; the comparable figure is only 8% for the teachers in our survey when childhood education both before and after age 13 are considered.

Table 3 indicates that among teachers in Orthodox day schools and pre-schools, a majority attended day schools (or schools in Israel), and nearly all teachers in Orthodox day schools and over two-thirds of those in Orthodox pre-schools attended at least two days per week both before and after age 13. Among teachers in other day schools, about two-thirds attended at least twice per week before age 13, and over half attended at least that often after



Table 3. Pre-Collegiate Jewish Educational Backgrounds of Teachers in Jewish Schools

SETTING	BEFORE AGE 13			school in Israel or day school
	None	1 day per week only	2 days or more supplementary	
Day Schools	6%	11%	21%	62%
<i>Orthodox</i>	2%	2%	16%	79%
<i>Other</i>	11%	24%	28%	37%
Supplementary Schools	11%	25%	40%	24%
Pre-Schools	22%	40%	23%	15%
<i>Orthodox</i>	20%	3%	23%	54%
<i>Other</i>	22%	45%	23%	9%
TOTAL	12%	25%	29%	33%
SETTING	AFTER AGE 13			school in Israel, yeshiva, or day school
	None	1 day per week only	2 days or more supplementary	
Day Schools	14%	8%	11%	67%
<i>Orthodox</i>	7%	1%	7%	86%
<i>Other</i>	25%	20%	17%	38%
Supplementary Schools	29%	25%	17%	29%
Pre-Schools	55%	23%	8%	14%
<i>Orthodox</i>	22%	3%	11%	64%
<i>Other</i>	60%	27%	8%	5%
TOTAL	32%	20%	13%	36%

Note: Figures omit a small number of responses marked "other." Rows may not sum to 100% due to rounding.

age 13. Supplementary school teachers participated less, but still much more than the average American Jew: Before age 13, 24% attended day schools, and another 40% attended a supplementary school of two days or more per week, while 25% attended only once per week, and 11% did not attend at all. After age 13, 29% attended day school, 17% attended twice per week, and the proportion that reported "none" rises to 29%.

Teachers in non-Orthodox pre-schools stand out as having received substantially less Jewish schooling as children. Less than one-third before age 13 and less than one-seventh after age 13 attended a Jewish school twice or more each week. One reason for these low figures is that 11% of teachers in non-Orthodox pre-schools are not Jewish. (A survey in Miami also reported that 7% of early childhood teachers in Jewish schools were not Jewish; see Sheskin, 1988). Even excluding the non-Jewish teachers, however, over half of teachers in non-Orthodox pre-schools received no Jewish schooling after the age of Bat Mitzvah.

### Professional Development

Nearly all pre-school teachers reported that they were required to attend in-service workshops. In our interviews, we learned that most pre-schools were licensed by the states in which they were located, and state accreditation requirements demanded staff development. One pre-school director explained:

They [the teachers] are required by licensing to do 18 hours of continued education. And I would hope that three-quarters of that would be Judaic. They have to have 15 hours of in-servicing, which [another pre-school director] and I have to prepare for them. A consultation is part of that. That's probably a little more of the secular background that we give them. We'll bring in experts on language, on special needs development, that type of area. But it makes a nice package all in all.

On the surveys, pre-school teachers reported they were required to attend an average of 6.2 in-service workshops over a two-year period. While these workshops generally satisfied state

requirements, they may not have been sufficient to compensate for the limited Judaic backgrounds of most pre-school teachers.

Day school teachers attend substantially fewer workshops. Although almost 80% said workshops were required, on average only 3.8 workshops were required over a two year period (see Figure 2). This level of staff development is far below normal standards in public education. For example, teachers in Wisconsin are required to complete 180 hours of workshops over a five-year period in order to maintain their teaching license. Assuming a typical workshop lasts 3 hours, day school teachers in our study averaged about 29 hours of workshops over a five-year period, less than one-sixth of what is required for state-licensed teachers in Wisconsin.

Wisconsin teachers can also maintain their licenses by earning 6 college or university credits over a five-year period. About 32% of the day school teachers reported taking a course in Judaica or Hebrew at a university, community center, or synagogue during the previous 12 months. Unfortunately, we did not ask more specific questions about these courses, but it is clear that attendance at workshops does not capture the full extent of continuing education obtained by day school teachers. Furthermore, the survey did not ask about university courses in education. Taking these courses into account, day school teachers come closer to the levels of professional development required in public education, but they do not attain it, nor are they not required to do so, even though they are less well prepared in the first place.

Supplementary school teachers reported slightly more in-service training than day school teachers, although not as much as pre-school teachers (see Figure 2). Also, 44% of






Figure 2: Average Number of Required Workshops Over a Two-Year Period  
(For Those Who Were Required to Attend at Least One Workshop and Excluding First-Year Educators)

the supplementary teachers reported taking a Judaica or Hebrew course at a university, community center, or synagogue. These likely consisted mainly of synagogue courses of limited hours. As with day school teachers, professional development for supplementary teachers falls well short of common professional standards for public school teachers. Staff development activities were even less frequent in a Miami survey (Sheskin, 1988), where day school teachers averaged 3.7 Judaica workshops over a three-year period, supplementary school teachers average 3.2 Judaica workshops, and pre-school teachers averaged 3.4 such workshops. During the same three-year period, day school and pre-school teachers reported having taken 0.8 courses in teaching methods on average, and supplementary school teachers averaged 1.1 courses.

Consistent with their diverse backgrounds, the teachers varied substantially in the areas in which they would like to improve (see Table 4); among the most popular were skills in motivating children to learn and creating materials, and content knowledge in Hebrew and history. Variation across settings followed predictable patterns. For example, pre-school teachers were more concerned with child development, and teachers in non-Orthodox pre-schools were especially interested in learning about Jewish customs and ceremonies. Interest in rabbinic literature was largely confined to day and supplementary school teachers. Teachers in Orthodox day schools were most concerned with learning more history, while teachers in non-Orthodox day schools more often perceived a need for improved Bible knowledge. It is noteworthy that interests in creating materials, motivating students, and learning Hebrew were uniformly strong across settings.



Table 4. Areas in Which Teachers Would Like to Improve and Have Attended Workshops

Percent Desiring Improvement: Teaching Skills		Percent Desiring Improvement: Jewish Content	
Classroom management	46%	Hebrew language	57%
Child development	37%	Customs and ceremonies	45%
Lesson planning	31%	Israel and Zionism	29%
Curriculum development	42%	Jewish history	54%
Creating materials	58%	Bible	46%
Communication skills	32%	Synagogue skills/prayer	32%
Parental involvement	37%	Rabbinic literature	32%
Motivating children to learn	67%		

Percent who attended workshops on the following topics in the last two years:

Judaic subject matter	62%
Hebrew language	30%
Teaching methods	76%
Classroom management	61%
Curriculum development	49%
Art/drama/music	41%

In-service training is not only infrequent but, especially in day and supplementary schools, it tends to be sporadic and not geared to teachers' specific needs. On the survey, teachers indicated they typically find the workshops "somewhat helpful." Aside from Hebrew language, many teachers had in fact attended a workshop in an area in which they desired to improve. Yet our interviews indicated several concerns about the workshops. Particularly in day and supplementary schools, there is rarely any overall coordination or program of in-service training. Also, teachers feel that a workshop is an event unto itself, without any apparent connection to previous staff development activities, nor follow-up afterwards. Teachers who learn something practical and concrete see the workshop as useful; otherwise, it is seen as largely a waste of time. One pre-school teacher commented about workshops:

[S]ome of them are wonderful and really do address just the issues you need to hear about, very practical things. . . . I went to a wonderful one that covered several of

the major Jewish holidays. She showed us some very useful things we could take back to our classroom. That is very useful and I enjoyed that.

Conversely, another teacher who found nothing of practical value dismissed the workshop experience as "dreadfully boring and non-helpful to me." Moreover, in-service training tends to be provided uniformly for all teachers, rather than offering different programs designed to meet the varied needs of teachers with diverse backgrounds in pedagogy and Jewish content. Given the wide range of training, experience, subject matters and grade levels, it is unlikely that a given workshop will be appropriate for many teachers, even within the same school. As one day school teacher remarked,

A lot of times, I guess because Jewish education is so small, you end up in a [workshop] class with a range of people teaching all the way from preschool to tenth grade. You can't teach a [workshop] class like that. The way you approach the material depends entirely on the age that the children are. Developmentally what works for an eighth grader does not work for a kindergartner and vice versa.

### Summary and Implications

Compared to other settings, day school teachers are relatively well prepared, both Jewishly and pedagogically. Still, fewer than half have undergone the level of professional preparation that is standard among public school teachers. Ironically, day schools generally require their teachers of secular subjects to meet the standard requirements. In addition, staff development demands for day school Judaica teachers are minimal, and are less than the requirements for day school teachers of secular subjects, who typically meet state requirements for ongoing certification to maintain their teaching licenses. Both for pre-service preparation and in-service development, Jewish day schools in Atlanta, Baltimore, and Milwaukee typically hold teachers of secular subjects to higher standards than teachers of Jewish subjects.



Among supplementary and pre-school teachers, few are fully prepared as professional Jewish educators. That is, only small proportions of teachers in those settings have extensive training in both education and Judaica. In particular, only 46% of supplementary school teachers are trained in education, and most teachers in non-Orthodox pre-schools received minimal formal Jewish education as children, let alone at the college level. Professional growth opportunities are needed to advance their levels of professional knowledge and skills.

Professional development for Jewish educators is not only a matter of remediation, of making up for deficiencies. It is also a means of renewal and growth, something that is imperative for all teachers. Even those who are well prepared for their positions must have opportunities to keep abreast of the field, to learn exciting new ideas, and to be invigorated by contact with other educators. (For a concise review of current directions in professional development, see Dilworth and Imig, 1995.)

What must teachers know in order to teach? Beyond pedagogic and content knowledge is the notion of "pedagogic content knowledge," that is, the knowledge of what it is about the content that is most essential for teaching (Shulman, 1986). This is the knowledge of how to create bridges between student and subject matter. Teachers need a rich and deep knowledge of the subject matter to place it in a meaningful context for their students. Although students do not always respond to instruction in predictable ways, a teacher who possesses pedagogic content knowledge has the power to find new ways of enabling students to learn the material at hand. In thinking about professional development for Jewish teachers, then, we must consider not only pedagogy, and not only Judaica, but the education of Jewish subject matter.



### Conditions of Work

Having identified a need for professional preparation and development of teachers, we must also consider whether work conditions for teachers in Jewish schools make it reasonable to think about a profession of Jewish education. How many hours do teachers work each week? How many are full time? What are their earnings and benefits? What incentives might stimulate more teachers to work full time, if positions were available?

#### Settings and Hours of Work

Most of the teachers we surveyed reported that they work in one school. Specifically, 80% teach in one school, 17% teach in two schools, and 3% teach in more than two schools. Thirty-one percent of the respondents teach in day schools as their primary setting (the setting in which they work the most hours), including 18% under Orthodox sponsorship and 13% under other sponsorships. Forty percent work in supplementary schools. The remaining 29% teach in pre-schools, including 4% under Orthodox sponsorship and 25% under other sponsorships. Whereas 20% of teachers work in more than one school, approximately 35% of positions are held by teachers who teach in more than one school.

There is no agreed-upon definition of full-time work in the field of Jewish education. When we define full-time teaching as more than 25 hours per week, we find that 28% work full time in one school, and 32% work full time when all their positions in Jewish education are taken into account. When asked on the survey, 31% of the teachers described themselves as a "full-time Jewish educator". Thus, alternative definitions give similar results, on average.

Table 5. Weekly Hours of Work among Teachers in Jewish Schools (Primary Setting)

SETTING	HOURS			
	1-4	5-12	13-24	25+
Day Schools	5%	11%	37%	47%
Supplementary Schools	64%	32%	2%	2%
Pre-Schools	1%	19%	36%	43%
TOTAL	27%	22%	23%	28%

Note: Rows may not sum to 100% due to rounding.

Teaching in supplementary schools is overwhelmingly a part-time occupation; 96% teach 12 hours or less in their primary setting, and almost two-thirds teach less than 5 hours per week (see Table 5). By contrast, day school teachers are about evenly split between those who work 25 hours per week or more in their primary setting and those who work less. Among pre-school teachers, 43% work full time, 37% work 13 to 24 hours per week, and 20% work 12 hours per week or less. Similar differences appeared in Miami, where 55% of day school teachers and 50% of pre-school teachers reported working 25 hours per week or more, compared with 5% of supplementary school teachers (Sheskin, 1988). In Los Angeles, only 16% of teachers reported 25 hours of teaching per week or more (Aron and Phillips, 1988); this figure was not broken down by setting, but two-thirds of the respondents were supplementary school teachers, and one-third were day school teachers. (Pre-school teachers were not included in the Los Angeles survey.) In Atlanta, Baltimore, and

Milwaukee, about two-thirds of the teachers who work in more than one school teach in supplementary schools as their second school.

In our interviews with teachers, we discovered that teachers and principals work together to assemble "employment packages" to provide some teachers with more paid work. Rabbis in Orthodox day school settings are commonly recruited to take responsibility for tefillah and extracurricular activities to fill out their work week. Teachers in other settings assume responsibility for a variety of additional activities including working in the library, tutoring students at the school, engaging in family education, leading tefillah services, directing grant-related projects, and so forth. Even with these additional responsibilities, few are able to put together an employment package that is considered full time, although many find they devote more than 40 hours per week to their institutions.

One pre-school teacher who presently teaches part time exemplifies the struggle of putting together a full-time position. Looking ahead at her career plans, she expressed a desire to work full time as a Judaic pre-school teacher. But her school, like most others in her community, offers Judaic programs only in the morning. She could become full time only by teaching non-Judaic subjects in the afternoon, by working with older students in a day school in the afternoon, or by the school's reorganization of the timing of curricular offerings. Typically, the Jewish educational "marketplace" does not provide an opportunity for a teacher like this one to specialize (teaching a particular subject to a specific age group) and to work full time.



## Salary

Earnings from Jewish education must be viewed in the context of the part-time nature of Jewish education. Table 2 shows that 58% of the teachers we surveyed reported earning less than \$10,000 from their work in Jewish education in one school, while 43% reported earning less than \$5,000. (In Los Angeles, 69% of teachers earned less than \$10,000 per year, according to Aron and Phillips, 1988, but their sample was two-thirds supplementary

Table 6. Teachers' Earnings from One School

EARNINGS	PERCENT
Less than \$1000	3%
\$1000-\$4999	40%
\$5000-\$9999	15%
\$10000-\$14999	15%
\$15000-\$19999	9%
\$20000-\$24999	5%
\$25000-\$30000	4%
Over \$30000	9%

teachers.) Fifteen percent of the teachers in our survey said they receive between \$10,000 and \$15,000, 18% reported wages between \$15,000 and \$30,000, while 9% reported earnings of over \$30,000 annually. As one educational director of a day school lamented, "We certainly lose the best teachers to principalships, assistant principalships, administrative roles, because that is what day schools are willing to pay for. They are not willing to pay the same thing for teachers." This is a problem with which all education systems (not only Jewish education) must contend: Because of education's flat hierarchy, often a teacher must move out of teaching in order to advance professionally.

Teaching at more than one school provides modest gains to teachers' incomes; the gains are limited because teachers rarely work more than ten hours per week at the second

school. Seventy-four percent of those who teach in more than one school reported they receive less than \$5000 for the additional work, while 18% receive between \$5000-\$10,000.

We asked the teachers, "How important to your household is the income you receive from Jewish education?" Only 20% of teachers surveyed reported that their income from Jewish education is the main source of income for their household. Fifty-one percent indicated that their income from Jewish education is an important source of additional income, while 29% say their wages from teaching are insignificant to their household income. Responses to a similar question in Los Angeles were more evenly distributed: 32% said their income from Jewish education is the main source of household income, 34% called it an important supplement, and 32% said it was unimportant (Aron and Phillips, 1988). In Miami, 57% of day school teachers reported that more than half their household income comes from Jewish teaching, but only 24% of pre-school teachers and 18% of supplementary school teachers reported that level of importance (Sheskin, 1988).

An exception to the general pattern in Atlanta, Baltimore, and Milwaukee, and more consistent with Miami, is that for teachers in Orthodox day schools, income from teaching is typically not just an important source of additional pay, but their main source of income. Fifty-nine percent of teachers in Orthodox day schools reported that their wages from Jewish education are the main source of income, compared to 35% who indicated their wages are an important source of additional income, and only 6% who reported their income from Jewish education is insignificant. Moreover, among those who work full time in Orthodox day schools (that is, those who work 25 hours per week or more, or about four-fifths of teachers

in Orthodox day schools), 80% said their wages from Jewish education are their main source of income.

For many teachers the additional income, however small, is extremely meaningful. As one educator stated, "The salary is extremely important. That's how I pay for my kid's education. I have to be working. I want to be working, but also that salary is essential."

SETTING	VERY SATISFIED	SOMEWHAT SATISFIED	SOMEWHAT DISSATISFIED	VERY DISSATISFIED
Day Schools	14%	35%	28%	23%
Supplementary Schools	33%	42%	19%	7%
Pre-Schools	7%	30%	30%	32%
TOTAL	20%	36%	25%	19%

Note: Rows may not sum to 100% due to rounding.

Overall, teachers were more satisfied than dissatisfied with their salaries, but this varied substantially by setting. As Table 7 illustrates, a substantial majority of supplementary school teachers were somewhat or very satisfied with their salaries. However, just under half the day school teachers and only 37% of pre-school teachers reported satisfaction with their salaries. Comparing full-time and part-time teachers revealed somewhat less satisfaction among full-time teachers, but the main differences in satisfaction occurred across the three settings as exhibited in Table 7. Our interviews confirmed a general pattern of greater satisfaction with salaries among supplementary school teachers, and the most dissatisfaction among pre-school teachers. Teachers acknowledged, however, that it



is not the money that keeps them in the profession, citing intrinsic rewards such as working with children and teaching Judaism as more salient.

### Benefits

Few fringe benefits are available to teachers in Jewish schools. Given the part-time nature of teaching, the scarcity of benefits may not be surprising. However, most full-time Jewish educators (those teaching more than 25 hours per week) reported that they are not offered many benefits (see Table 8). Full-time teachers are most likely to be offered tuition subsidies (75%) (i.e., reduced tuition for their children at their school) and money to attend conferences (66%). Of those who teach full time, only 23% are offered disability benefits, 48% are offered health benefits, and 45% have pension plans.

BENEFIT	FULL-TIME TEACHERS	PART-TIME TEACHERS	ALL TEACHERS
Tuition Subsidies	75%	42%	52%
Day Care	28%	15%	19%
Membership Subsidies	46%	33%	37%
Synagogue Privileges	17%	19%	19%
Conferences	66%	55%	58%
Sabbaticals	14%	6%	9%
Disability	28%	9%	15%
Health	48%	15%	26%
Pension	45%	16%	25%

When teachers put together "job packages" that include part-time positions in a number of settings, they are not eligible for health, pension, or disability benefits from any one institution. Even when fringe benefits are offered, the size of the benefits may be negligible. One day school principal indicated:

Today a health plan for a family is about \$5500 a year. A full-time teacher may get \$900 from the school, the rest they have to pay for. They get a small allocation. It's a token, but it's not that much. The same thing with pension plans. The pension plan until now was a fair plan. It was little, but it was fair. That's been suspended because of the financial crisis, so there is none at all. That's all the benefits there are.

Benefits differ somewhat across settings, mainly as a function of the percent of teachers in that setting who work full-time. Forty-seven percent of teachers in day schools reported that health benefits are available to them. Only 29% of those in pre-schools and a mere 7% of supplementary school teachers are offered health benefits. About 46% of teachers in day schools, and 27% of those in pre-schools, are offered pensions, as compared with just 7% of supplementary school teachers.

### Summary and Implications

Most educators work part-time, have few tangible fringe benefits, and receive salaries that they consider to be an important, supplementary part of their household income. For some educators, this situation is compatible with their goals and family situations. For others, the current situation does not meet their needs, and they are not pleased with their salaries and benefits. When part-time teachers were asked what possible incentives would encourage them to work full-time in Jewish education, salary, benefits, and job security/tenure were the most important incentives (see Table 9). Since we did not question persons who chose not to enter Jewish education, we cannot say whether these work conditions discourage people from entering the field at all, but these results are consistent with that speculation.

Those who have chosen the field of Jewish education typically find their greatest rewards in the intangibles. As one supplementary school teacher commented:



Table 9. Most Important Incentives for Full-Time Work

INCENTIVE	FIRST	SECOND	THIRD
Salary	33%	18%	7%
Benefits	3%	22%	13%
Job security/tenure	4%	6%	14%
Better Judaica Background	6%	4%	5%
Better Education Background	3%	3%	2%
Career Development	6%	6%	9%
More Job Opportunities	4%	3%	4%
Training Opportunities	1%	1%	2%
Change in Family Status	9%	3%	5%
Work Resources	-	1%	2%
Presence of Colleagues	1%	2%	4%

[F]inancially, no, this is not the best job in the world. The reward is watching children grow. I don't think any of the synagogues really pay that well. We have no benefits. I've worked 26 years without any benefits whatsoever. Nothing. When I retire, it is 'Good-bye. It was nice knowing you.' You really have to love what you are doing, let's face it.

What do these findings imply for the notion of building a profession of Jewish education? The working conditions of teachers in Jewish schools, particularly the part-time nature of work, the modest significance of earnings, and the absence of benefits for many teachers, are not typical for professional occupations. Moreover, we found that many teachers chose their positions because of the availability of part-time work. On the one hand, these conditions may make it difficult to build a profession. The scarcity of full-time positions with substantial salary and benefits packages may make it difficult to recruit teachers who are willing to conform to high standards of professional preparation and

development. On the other hand, just because someone chooses to work part time does not mean he or she would necessarily resist efforts to raise standards. A part-time teacher may be experienced and committed to Jewish teaching, and therefore welcome opportunities for professional development. To resolve these issues, we need to examine the career orientation and experiences of full-time and part-time teachers.

### **Career Patterns**

To enhance the profession of Jewish education, it is essential to learn about the career patterns of today's teachers. How were they recruited into Jewish education? How experienced are they? Do they view Jewish education as a career? What are their plans for the future? Answering these questions will tell us whether investing in our current teachers is a sound strategy for improving the personnel of Jewish schools.

#### **Recruitment into Jewish Education**

Jewish education provides relatively easy access to prospective members, although pre-schools are more highly regulated by the state than other settings. In interviews, we learned that teachers in Jewish schools enter the field as early as high school and as late as retirement. This wide range, combined with the part-time nature of teaching in Jewish settings, allows educators to teach while they are pursuing other endeavors, such as post-secondary schooling.

Since educators typically enter the field in an unregulated manner, without complete formal preparation or certification, there is a common perception that "anybody can do it". Some educators make casual decisions to enter the field and expect on-the-job training to prepare them as they teach. Interviews with supplementary school teachers suggest that an

overwhelming number entered the field without much planning. They became Jewish educators because someone, usually a friend, told them about an opening at the synagogue.

As one supplementary teacher recounted:

Well, basically, I got recruited through a friend. I have a friend who was teaching here and she said it was fun and great and a good thing to do. She thought I might like doing that. My first reaction, of course, was, "Who am I to be teaching?" I have no formal education as a teacher and certainly not of Judaica or Hebrew. And she just said from what she knew that I knew, I had all the qualifications. I had no experience in Jewish education, but my friend persuaded me. And so just indirectly, and luckily, I became involved in Jewish education.

Teachers most commonly obtained their current positions by approaching the school directly (29%), through a friend or mentor (30%) or by being recruited by the school (24%). Our interviews indicated that it is rare for teachers to be recruited for their positions from outside their current community.

Most educators are attracted to Jewish education for intrinsic rewards, such as transmitting the joy and enthusiasm for Judaism to children. Some teachers also emphasized the warmth of the Jewish community. One explained:

I think the reason I am in Jewish education is the community. . . . I feel very comfortable. When I first came to the Center, it was almost a sense of family. I just always enjoyed coming to work, enjoyed the people that I was working with.

Factors influencing the decision to work at a particular schools coincide with the part-time nature of teaching. On the survey, 87% of teachers said the hours and days available for work was an important reason for choosing to work at a particular school. This was the most prevalent reason mentioned. As one teacher explained,

I had my third child, and I was feeling like I needed to get out and do something, but I couldn't do something on a full-time basis. [Working as a Jewish educator] seemed to coincide with what I needed at the time.



Location was also an important factor, cited by 75% of the teachers, and the reputation of the school was listed as important by 66% of the teachers. Religious affiliation was indicated as important by 62% of the teachers -- 56% percent of supplementary school teachers teach in synagogues where they are also members -- and 51% of the teachers mentioned salary as an important factor in choosing to work at a particular school.

The most important reason for choosing a specific second school was the same as that for the first, namely scheduling. In addition, 64% percent of those teaching in a second school reported that location was a significant factor in their decision to teach in a particular school, and 56% listed salary as an important factor.

### Experience

There is considerable stability in the field of Jewish teaching. The top panel of Table 10 indicates that 14% of teachers have been in the field for more than 20 years, 24% for between 10 and 20, and 29% for 6 to 10 years. Another 27% have worked in Jewish education for 2 to 5 years, and only 6% were in their first year at the time of our survey.

At the same time, teachers' tenure at their current schools is less extensive than their experience in the field. The majority of teachers, 59%, have been teaching in their current institutions for five years or less, and 18% were teaching in their current settings for the first time. Others, totalling just 18%, have been teaching in their current institutions for more than 10 years, and 23% have been teaching 6 to 10 years in their current schools.

Supplementary schools have the highest proportion of novice teachers. Whereas only 9% of supplementary school teachers were new to Jewish education, 27% were new to their current schools. Twelve percent of day school teachers and 13% of pre-school teachers were

new to their current schools. Figures for new teachers reflect new faculty positions as well as movement across schools.

### Career Opportunities

There are limited career advancement opportunities in the three communities. Teachers can make horizontal moves from one setting to another, although one's denominational or philosophical orientation constrains this movement to a certain degree. Many educators feel comfortable in specific settings, and they would not be considered for other settings due to qualities that go beyond credentials (e.g., denominational preferences).

There are two ways teachers move out from their regular positions. Some apply for non-teaching positions when they become vacant, while others are tapped by administrators who see promising qualities in them. The fact that teachers are recruited without benefit of a position's being advertised narrows the perceived range of opportunities. Our interviews indicated that many positions are filled before it is generally known that they

Table 10. Stability and Continuity of Teachers

#### TOTAL YEARS OF EXPERIENCE IN JEWISH EDUCATION

1 or less	6%
2 to 5	27%
6 to 10	29%
11 to 20	24%
20 or more	14%

#### TOTAL YEARS OF TEACHING EXPERIENCE IN THE CURRENT COMMUNITY

1 or less	11%
2 to 5	34%
6 to 10	27%
11 to 20	19%
20 or more	10%

#### TOTAL YEARS OF TEACHING EXPERIENCE IN THE PRESENT SETTING

1 or less	18%
2 to 5	41%
6 to 10	23%
11 to 20	13%
20 or more	5%

Note: Columns may not sum to 100% due to rounding.

are vacant. Vertical movement is constrained by the small number of positions, and top-level administrative positions are sometimes filled by recruits from outside the community.

### Career Perceptions

Interestingly, although only a minority of teachers work full-time in Jewish education (32%), most, 59% of teachers, describe themselves as having a career in Jewish education (see Table 11). In fact, 54% of those who work part-time in Jewish education (those who teach less than 25 hours per week) indicate that they have careers in Jewish education. At the same

time, 31% of the full-time Jewish educators say Jewish education is not their career. For a majority of educators, part-time or not, Jewish education is their career.

Teachers in day schools and pre-schools under Orthodox sponsorship are the most likely to indicate they have a career in Jewish education. In these settings close to 90% describe themselves as having a career in Jewish education. Almost two-thirds of teachers in other day schools also describe Jewish education as their career, as do 56% of teachers in other pre-schools and 44% of supplementary school teachers.

### Retention

The majority of teachers we surveyed plan to continue working in their present positions (see Table 12). Across all settings, 64% of the teachers reported that they plan to

Table 11. Teachers' Career Perceptions

SETTING	REPORTED HAVING A CAREER IN JEWISH EDUCATION
Day Schools	79%
Orthodox	88%
Other	66%
Supplementary Schools	44%
Pre-Schools	60%
Orthodox	89%
Other	56%
TOTAL	59%



stay in their present positions over the next three years, and only 6% planned to seek a position outside Jewish education. In day schools, as many as 76% reported that they expected to stay in their current jobs. (Teachers in Orthodox and other day schools were similar in responding to this question.)

Table 12. Future Plans of Teachers in Jewish Schools

FUTURE PLANS	SETTINGS			TOTAL
	Day	Sup	Pre	
Continue Same Position	76%	56%	63%	64%
Change Schools	6%	4%	3%	4%
Change Positions	3%	2%	2%	2%
Seek a Position outside of Jewish Education	3%	9%	6%	6%
Other (e.g., going back to school)	2%	7%	5%	5%
Undecided	10%	22%	21%	18%

Note: Columns may not sum to 100% due to rounding.

Day school teachers who do not plan to stay in their current positions are most likely to be changing to a different school (6%) or do not know their plans (10%). Among supplementary and pre-school teachers who anticipate a change, the vast majority are uncertain about their plans for the next three years: 22% of supplementary and 21% of pre-school teachers are undecided.

#### Teacher Professional Involvement

Our interviews with teachers indicated that they play little role in developing school policies for curriculum and instruction. In general, the teacher's role is not to participate in developing the curriculum, but to implement it. Teachers generally feel autonomous in their

classrooms, but this freedom is constrained by curriculum and resources. Teachers seldom participate in networks beyond their own schools. Moreover, teachers have few opportunities to collaborate with other teachers even within their own schools. While the phenomenon of teacher isolation is not unknown in general education, it is exacerbated in Jewish education due to the part-time nature of most teachers' work.

By and large, teachers are at their institutions to meet their classes and to attend infrequent faculty meetings. This is true across all settings. Since their agreements with their institutions call for a certain amount of pay for a certain number of contact hours with students, principals are often reluctant to ask them to be present for professional discussions and teachers have accepted the "drop in" structure laid out for them. The framing of their work agreements and the structure of their work settings conspire to discourage teachers from collaborating together either in curricular areas or on professional matters that extend beyond the classroom walls. There are some exceptions, but, in general, teachers lead isolated professional lives that are separated from the conversations that affect their professional futures.

### Summary and Implications

Most teachers in Jewish schools have substantial experience in Jewish education, but many teachers are new to their current schools. Most plan to continue teaching in their current positions. In addition, a majority of teachers indicate that they have made Jewish education their careers. Even among part-time teachers, more than half describe themselves as having a career in Jewish education. Most strikingly, 44% of supplementary school teachers view their work in this way.



The commitment and stability reflected in these findings suggest that the notion of a profession of Jewish education is not as far-fetched as its part-time nature might indicate. If teachers plan to stay in Jewish education, and view it as a career, they may respond positively to increased opportunities for professional growth. Through professional growth, the weaknesses in pre-service training may be addressed. Moreover, the commitment and stability of teachers in Jewish education suggests that investment in their professional growth would have a long-term payoff.

### Conclusions

The findings in this report shed light on the characteristics of teachers in Jewish schools in North America. Although the study was restricted to three cities, the findings are similar to data available from other cities, and most likely reflect patterns that are common to many communities. The results show substantial diversity among teachers, both within and across settings, but on the whole one can say that although the field of Jewish teaching is not highly professionalized, the potential exists for enhancing the professional standards and conditions of teaching in Jewish schools.

A number of key findings contribute to this conclusion:

- (1) Roughly half the teachers have completed formal training in the field of education. Far fewer have degrees or certification in Jewish content areas; outside of Orthodox day schools, such training is especially rare.
- (2) Overall, 19% of teachers are formally trained in both education and Jewish content, 47% are trained in one area or the other, and 34% are not formally trained in either field.
- (3) Pre-collegiate Jewish education does not make up for teachers' limited backgrounds in Jewish content. Almost one-third of the teachers received no pre-collegiate Jewish education after age 13; this included 29% of supplementary school

teachers and 55% of pre-school teachers. Eleven percent of teachers in non-Orthodox pre-schools are not Jewish.

(4) In-service education also fails to compensate for limited formal training. Required workshops averaged 3.8 over two years for day school teachers, 4.4 for supplementary school teachers, and 6.2 among pre-school teachers. Particularly in day and supplementary schools, the amount of required in-service training was far below common standards for public school teachers.

(5) Interviews raised questions about the quality of in-service education, highlighting the isolated and fragmented character of workshops. In-service education is not targeted to meet teachers' diverse needs, and it is not part of a coherent plan for professional growth, particularly in day and supplementary schools.

(6) Coupled with limited formal training is the finding that work conditions are not professionalized. The teaching force is largely part-time. Even in day and pre-schools, around half the teachers work part time. Only 20% of teachers say their earnings from Jewish education are the main source of family income. Supplementary teachers are generally satisfied with their salaries, but day school teachers are less so and pre-school teachers are largely dissatisfied.

(7) Benefits are scarce, even for full-time teachers. Among full-time teachers in all settings, just 48% reported that they are offered health benefits, 45% have access to pensions, and 28% are offered disability coverage.

(8) Despite these conditions, most teachers in Jewish schools describe their work in Jewish education as a career. Even among supplementary school teachers, almost all of whom work part time, 44% say they have a career in Jewish education. Most teachers have six or more years of experience, and most plan to stay in the field.

What should we make of these findings? Taken as a whole, they suggest that improving the quantity and quality of professional growth for teachers, along with enhancing the conditions of employment, is the strategy most likely to improve the quality of the teaching force in Jewish schools.

#### Improving Opportunities for Professional Growth

Why should professional growth be the focus of reform efforts? First, obviously, many teachers are limited in their formal training, and improved and extended in-service



education may compensate for the lack of pre-service training. Second, the field of Jewish education is largely part-time, and many teachers choose it precisely because of that characteristic. Hence, while we do not mean to dismiss intensified recruitment efforts, the part-time nature of the work means it is unlikely that the field will be transformed through recruitment of a large cadre of teachers who are formally trained as Jewish educators.

Third, and most strikingly, enhancement of professional growth is a powerful strategy for reform because teachers are committed, stable, and career-oriented. Even among part-time teachers who lack formal training as Jewish educators, many view their work in Jewish education as a career, and plan to stay in their positions for some time to come. These teachers are a ripe target for higher standards for professional growth. While it is not realistic to expect Jewish schools to hire only trained teachers -- because the candidates are simply not available -- our data suggest that it is realistic to ask teachers to participate in some degree of high-quality on-going professional training.

Our findings about in-service education point to two directions for reform. First, the quantity must be increased. At present, the extent of in-service is far too meager, especially in day and supplementary schools, to compensate for background deficiencies. Second, the quality must be improved. Our interviews indicated that in-service experiences are isolated, fragmented, not targeted to meet diverse needs, and generally not part of a coherent program. These problems should be remedied.

Other analyses of our data suggest ways of addressing these problems. Gamoran et al. (1995) noted that supplementary teachers in a community that provided financial incentives to teachers and schools for attending workshops reported significantly higher levels



of required in-service. Also, teachers in pre-schools that are certified by the state reported more required workshops on average. These findings indicate that raising standards is possible, that the community as a whole can be a source of standards, and that financial inducements may help maintain adherence to standards.

Raising standards for quantity will be of little avail, however, if the quality of professional growth is not improved simultaneously. Staff development should emphasize the diverse needs of teachers, corresponding to their varied training, experience, subject matters, and grade levels. In-service reforms should also emphasize the need for a coherent, on-going program for teachers, instead of one-shot, isolated workshops. In light of teachers' commitment to their work, we anticipate that they would be eager to participate in high-quality, targeted programs.

#### Improving the Conditions of Work

Coupled with raising standards for professional growth of teachers, conditions of work must also be shifted towards higher standards. This is important for three reasons. First, it may encourage more people to train professionally as Jewish educators. Our data do not address this possibility, but it is plausible. Second, improving the conditions of work may encourage more teachers to work full time. Our data do address this notion: part-time teachers indicated that salary, benefits, and job security could make them consider full-time work. Standards for professional growth can be higher for full-time teachers, so the two reforms (more professional growth and more professional working conditions) could build upon one another. Third, improving work conditions for teachers is a moral imperative. In

this day, it is not appropriate that many teachers in Jewish schools work full time in Jewish education but are not offered health benefits.

Indeed, perhaps the most important reform of working conditions would be to extend benefit packages to teachers who work full time in Jewish education. Community agencies could create programs to provide benefits to teachers who create full-time work by teaching at more than one institution. Such programs could serve as incentives to increase the proportion of full-time teachers, and could include demands for intensive professional development.

Salaries for pre-school teachers pose a more difficult problem. Earnings are low and teachers are dissatisfied, but this is a characteristic of the field of early childhood education, and is not specific to Jewish schools. However, if Jewish schools could be on the forefront of increasing pay standards for early childhood education, they could also demand professional growth in the area of Jewish content as well as in child development, and this would address the most serious shortcoming among teachers in Jewish pre-schools.

#### Towards A Comprehensive Plan

To some extent, these problems can be addressed on a community by community basis, as each community studies its educators and devises a comprehensive plan in response. The need for community-wide planning in education is clear. Opportunities for full-time work and career advancement ultimately rest with the community as a whole. For example, the position of "community educator" provides an opportunity to create full-time work, with appropriate salary and benefits, by teaching at more than one school. In addition, these

educators may take on leadership responsibilities within the community, such as mentoring new teachers or peer coaching.

Questions about standards and accountability for educational personnel might also be addressed at the community level. Communities may design systems for professional development, which include standards for in-service training coupled with increased salaries and benefits for qualifying teachers. Although communities cannot set binding rules for individual schools, community guidelines might provide a moral force which would upgrade the quality of personnel. In addition to moral suasion, community standards might be backed up with community incentives, such as providing salary and benefit supplements to create "community educator" positions.

To succeed, a comprehensive plan would have to incorporate the full spectrum of the community, address the critical needs identified in this report, and be adequately funded to do so. At the same time, national Jewish organizations can play an important role in supporting these reform efforts, through setting standards, developing programs of in-service education, and providing intellectual resources and normative support for change. The task may be daunting, but the stakes are high, and now is the time to act.



### Appendix: Data and Methods

This study draws on two sources of data: a survey of teachers in Jewish schools; and a series of interviews with Jewish teachers, principals, and other educational leaders, in Atlanta, Baltimore, and Milwaukee. (Educational leaders were also surveyed; those results were reported by Goldring, Gamoran, and Robinson, 1995.) The surveys were administered in spring and fall of 1993 to all Judaica teachers at all Jewish day schools, supplementary schools, and pre-school programs in the three communities. General studies teachers in day schools were not included. Non-Jewish pre-school teachers who teach Judaica were included. Lead Community project directors in each community coordinated the survey administration. Teachers completed the questionnaires and returned them at their schools. (Some teachers who did not receive a survey form at school were mailed a form and a self-addressed envelope, and returned their forms by mail.) An updated version of the survey and the interview protocols is available from the CIJE (Gamoran et al., 1996).

Over 80% of the teachers in each community filled out and returned the questionnaire, for a total of 983 teachers out of 1192 who were surveyed. In analyzing the results, we avoided sampling inferences (e.g., t-tests) because we are analyzing population figures, not samples. Respondents include 302 day school teachers, 392 supplementary school teachers, and 289 pre-school teachers. Teachers who work at more than one type of setting were categorized according to the setting (day school, supplementary school, or pre-school) at which they teach the most hours (or at the setting they listed first if hours were the same for two types of settings). Each teacher is counted only once. If teachers were counted in all the settings in which they teach, the results would look about the same, except

that supplementary school teachers would look more like day school teachers, because 61 day school teachers also work in supplementary schools. In most cases, we report results separately by setting (day, supplementary, and pre-school); in some cases where differences were salient we further separate day schools and pre-schools under Orthodox sponsorship from other day and pre-schools.

Despite differences in the Jewish populations of the three communities, results were generally comparable across communities for schools of a given type, and we do not provide separate results by community in this report. The broad comparability of results from the three communities in this study suggests that the profile of teachers presented here is likely to resemble that of many other communities. Where possible, we provide results from other surveys carried out in Boston, Miami, and Los Angeles, which shed light on the generalizability of our results. We also compare findings to the 1990 National Jewish Population Survey, to see how teachers differ from other Jewish adults on some indicators.

Missing responses were excluded from calculations of percentages. Generally, less than 5% of responses were missing for any one item. An exception was the question about certification in Jewish education (see below). In two communities, many teachers left this blank, apparently because they were not sure what it meant. On the assumption that teachers who did not know what certification meant were not themselves certified, for this item only we calculated percentages based on the total who returned the survey forms, instead of the total who responded to the question.

The interviews for our study were designed and carried out by Julie Tammivaara, Roberta Goodman, and Claire Rottenberg, CIJE field researchers. Interviews were

conducted with teachers in pre-schools, supplementary schools, and day schools, as well as educational directors and educators at central agencies and institutions of Jewish higher learning. In total, 125 educators were interviewed, generally for one to two hours. All quotes in this report derive from those interviews.





## References

- Aron, Isa, and Bruce Phillips. (1988). Findings of the Los Angeles BJE Teacher Census. Paper presented at the Conference of the Research Network on Jewish Education, New York.
- Commission on Jewish Education in North America. (1990). A Time to Act. Lanham, MD: University Press of America.
- Dilworth, Mary E., and David G. Imig. (1995). "Professional Teacher Development." ERIC Review, 3 (3), 5-11.
- Frank, Naava, Daniel J. Margolis, and Alan Weisner. (1992). The Jewish School Teacher: Preliminary Report of a Study. Boston: Bureau of Jewish Education of Greater Boston.
- Gamoran, Adam, Ellen B. Goldring, Bill Robinson, Roberta Louis Goodman, and Julie Tammivaara. (1995). Background and Training of Teachers in Jewish Schools: Current Status and Levers for Change. New York: Council for Initiatives in Jewish Education.
- Gamoran, Adam, Ellen B. Goldring, Roberta Louis Goodman, Bill Robinson, and Julie Tammivaara. (1996). Manual for the CIJE Study of Educators. Version 2.0. New York: Council for Initiatives in Jewish Education.
- Gamoran, Emanuel. (1924). Teacher Training for Jewish Schools. Cincinnati: Union of American Hebrew Congregations.
- Goldring, Ellen, Adam Gamoran, and Bill Robinson. (1995). Educational Leaders in Jewish Schools: A Study of Three Communities. New York: Council for Initiatives in Jewish Education.
- Kosmin, Barry A., Sidney Goldstein, Joseph Waksberg, Nava Lerer, Ariella Keysar, and Jeffrey Scheckner. (1993). Highlights of the CJF National Jewish Population Survey. New York: Council of Jewish Federations.
- Schechter, Solomon. (1915). "The Problem of Religious Education." In Solomon Schechter, Seminary Addresses and Other Papers, pp. 105-117. Cincinnati: Ark Publishing Co.

Sheskin, Ira. (1988). The Miami Jewish Educator Study: Final Report. Miami: The Central Agency for Jewish Education.

Shulman, Lee S. (1986). "Those Who Understand: Knowledge Growth in Teaching." Educational Researcher, 15 (2), 4-14.



TO: Adam, internet:gamoran@ssc.wisc.edu  
Ellen, INTERNET:GOLDRIEB@ctrvax.Vanderbilt.Edu

Re: Integrated Teachers Report

Although this publication was affected by our summer schedule, I have not forgotten it. What I need from you two is some consensus on recommended language for the cover, compared to what appears currently on the cover of the paper you have completed. If you can e-mail the components of the cover: title; subtitle; calling it a "CIJE Research Report" or not; and any other issues as you think about for the audience of both researchers and communities, I'll give you feedback if I have any; get signoff; and come back to you with a new cover design. Although I have a couple of unexpected things in the pipeline, I would still like to publish this in 1996 and get it to several audiences.

Don't worry about being able to change your minds. I just want to move us one step closer to a final design.

What we already agreed on: MEF will be on the inside cover rather than the outside. You're not sure you want: "A Study of Three Communities" (although I think it's enticing); you may want "A Research Report" rather than "A CIJE Research Report" (although, note, we have on Sarna "CIJE Essay Series," even though our logo appears on the cover); and you want to list all five authors in equal typeface, with the two of you first.

In addition, please consider the following issues which you raised with me:

1. Do we want an executive summary or overview?
2. We'll need a table of contents.
3. Please send me language for crediting Blaustein. Inside front cover?
4. You said to me: "sample sizes; standard deviations; t-test should be put at the bottom of each table." I don't know what exactly you meant, but you should tell me what to do about it. (You may have been responding to my reiterated comment that we should allay in advance any criticism about the rigor of the research.)
5. I also wrote down: Contemporary Jewry; Jewish Social Science; Jewish Journal of Sociology: Were those meant to receive review copies? Let me know why you gave me that list.

I hope to be doing the final editorial work in the second half of October. The more we can work out re the above, the faster we can publish!

Thanks in advance and Shanah Tovah.

Nessa

9/18/96



FROM: INTERNET:GAMORAN@ssc.wisc.edu, INTERNET:GAMORAN@ssc.wisc.edu  
TO: Nessa Rapoport, 74671,3370  
CC: Ellen, INTERNET:GOLDRIEB@CTRVAX.VANDERBILT.EDU  
DATE: 9/19/96 2:30 PM

Re: teachers report

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 OAA11650; Thu, 19 Sep 1996 14:28:34 -0400  
From: <GAMORAN@ssc.wisc.edu>  
Received: from ssc.wisc.edu by ssc.wisc.edu (PMDF V5.0-6 #17630)  
id <01I9NXJJJ4D0AEKWBN@ssc.wisc.edu>; Thu, 19 Sep 1996 13:25:32 -0600 (CST)  
Date: Thu, 19 Sep 1996 13:25:32 -0600 (CST)  
Subject: teachers report  
To: 74671.3370@compuserve.com  
Cc: GOLDRIEB@ctrvax.Vanderbilt.Edu  
Message-id: <01I9NXJJJ5AUAEKWBN@ssc.wisc.edu>  
X-VMS-To: NESSA  
X-VMS-Cc: ELLEN  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: TEXT/PLAIN; CHARSET=US-ASCII  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

Nessa,

As you've seen, Ellen and I are discussing the questions you raised. On no. 3 (crediting Blaustein), please use the language from the Manual for the CIJE Study of Educators. On no. 5, I'm not sure what that list of journals was for, but it wasn't for this paper. On no. 2, sure, I'll make a table of contents.

Adam

FROM: INTERNET:GAMORAN@ssc.wisc.edu, INTERNET:GAMORAN@ssc.wisc.edu  
TO: Ellen, INTERNET:GOLDRIEB@CTRVAX.VANDERBILT.EDU  
CC: Nessa Rapoport, 74671,3370  
DATE: 9/19/96 2:38 PM

Re: teachers report

Sender: gamoran@ssc.wisc.edu  
Received: from robin.ssc.wisc.edu (robin.ssc.wisc.edu [144.92.187.200]) by  
hil-img-3.compuserve.com (8.6.10/5.950515)  
id OAA05318; Thu, 19 Sep 1996 14:19:43 -0400  
From: <GAMORAN@ssc.wisc.edu>  
Received: from ssc.wisc.edu by ssc.wisc.edu (PMDF V5.0-6 #17630)  
id <01I9NWYVVLASAEKWBN@ssc.wisc.edu>; Thu, 19 Sep 1996 13:16:21 -0600 (CST)  
Date: Thu, 19 Sep 1996 13:16:21 -0600 (CST)  
Subject: teachers report  
To: GOLDRIEB@ctrvax.Vanderbilt.Edu  
Cc: 74671.3370@compuserve.com  
Message-id: <01I9NWYVVM8MAEKWBN@ssc.wisc.edu>  
X-VMS-To: ELLEN  
X-VMS-Cc: NESSA, GAMORAN  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: TEXT/PLAIN; CHARSET=US-ASCII  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

ellen,

We need to decide if we want to include any more statistics in our teachers report. In particular, do we want to report sample sizes for each table? (At present we have reported the number of respondents, and noted that generally fewer than 5% of cases are missing data on any given item.)

I've looked at a number of different reports in our genre, from research institutes, the US government, and even a few Jewish population reports. Sometimes sample sizes are given for each table, sometimes not. The more "user friendly" the report is intended to be, the less likely are sample sizes to be reported.

If we were to report sample sizes, in most cases that could mean reporting a sample size for each column (or sometimes a row) in a crosstab. For example, in the table showing % with various degrees, we could report a sample N for each row (table 1).

My thinking is that this would unnecessarily complicate and clutter up the paper. We've tried to make it readable and informative, somewhat less dry and stuffy than one might find in a journal. The overall sample size is reasonably close for all the tables -- we wouldn't be hiding any important information by failing to report specific sample sizes for each table.

What do you think?


Adam

FROM: INTERNET:GAMORAN@ssc.wisc.edu, INTERNET:GAMORAN@ssc.wisc.edu  
TO: Ellen, INTERNET:GOLDRIEB@CTRVAX.VANDERBILT.EDU  
CC: Nessa Rapoport, 74671,3370  
DATE: 9/19/96 2:43 PM

Re: teachers report, part 3

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 OAA10711; Thu, 19 Sep 1996 14:22:44 -0400  
From: <GAMORAN@ssc.wisc.edu>  
Received: from ssc.wisc.edu by ssc.wisc.edu (PMDf V5.0-6 #17630)  
id <01I9NXD45X1CAEKWBN@ssc.wisc.edu>; Thu, 19 Sep 1996 13:19:45 -0600 (CST)  
Date: Thu, 19 Sep 1996 13:19:45 -0600 (CST)  
Subject: teachers report, part 3  
To: GOLDRIEB@ctrvax.Vanderbilt.Edu  
Cc: 74671.3370@compuserve.com  
Message-id: <01I9NXD47RWYAEKWBN@ssc.wisc.edu>  
X-VMS-To: ELLEN  
X-VMS-Cc: NESSA  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: TEXT/PLAIN; CHARSET=US-ASCII  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

However, I think an executive summary or an abstract would be nice. I am willing to write one if you agree.





FROM: INTERNET:GAMORAN@ssc.wisc.edu, INTERNET:GAMORAN@ssc.wisc.edu  
TO: Ellen, INTERNET:GOLDRIEB@CTRVAX.VANDERBILT.EDU  
CC: Nessa Rapoport, 74671,3370  
DATE: 9/19/96 2:50 PM


Re: more on teachers report

Sender: gamoran@ssc.wisc.edu  
Received: from robin.ssc.wisc.edu (robin.ssc.wisc.edu [144.92.187.200]) by  
arl-img-1.compuserve.com (8.6.10/5.950515)  
id OAA11335; Thu, 19 Sep 1996 14:21:10 -0400  
From: <GAMORAN@ssc.wisc.edu>  
Received: from ssc.wisc.edu by ssc.wisc.edu (PMDF V5.0-6 #17630)  
id <01I9NXBJSBS0AEKWBN@ssc.wisc.edu>; Thu, 19 Sep 1996 13:18:13 -0600 (CST)  
Date: Thu, 19 Sep 1996 13:18:13 -0600 (CST)  
Subject: more on teachers report  
To: GOLDRIEB@ctrvax.Vanderbilt.Edu  
Cc: 74671.3370@compuserve.com  
Message-id: <01I9NXBJSELUAEKWBN@ssc.wisc.edu>  
X-VMS-To: ELLEN  
X-VMS-Cc: NESSA  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: TEXT/PLAIN; CHARSET=US-ASCII  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

Ellen,

I do not think there is any need to report standard deviations or other  
sample statistics. Do you?

Adam



FROM: INTERNET:GAMORAN@ssc.wisc.edu, INTERNET:GAMORAN@ssc.wisc.edu  
TO: Nessa Rapoport, 74671,3370  
DATE: 9/19/96 3:40 PM

Re: ellen's response

Sender: gamoran@ssc.wisc.edu  
Received: from robin.ssc.wisc.edu (robin.ssc.wisc.edu [144.92.187.200]) by  
hil-img-5.compuserve.com (8.6.10/5.950515)  
id PAA12279; Thu, 19 Sep 1996 15:22:36 -0400  
From: <GAMORAN@ssc.wisc.edu>  
Received: from ssc.wisc.edu by ssc.wisc.edu (PMDF V5.0-6 #17630)  
id <01I9NZHR6LKGAEKWBN@ssc.wisc.edu> for 74671.3370@compuserve.com; Thu,  
19 Sep 1996 14:19:54 -0600 (CST)  
Date: Thu, 19 Sep 1996 14:19:54 -0600 (CST)  
Subject: ellen's response  
To: 74671.3370@compuserve.com  
Message-id: <01I9NZHR8M36AEKWBN@ssc.wisc.edu>  
X-VMS-To: NESSA  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: TEXT/PLAIN; CHARSET=US-ASCII  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

From: IN%"GOLDRIEB@ctrvax.Vanderbilt.Edu" 19-SEP-1996 14:14:09.59  
To: IN%"GAMORAN@ssc.wisc.edu"  
CC:  
Subj: RE: teachers report

I agree that we should not put overall sample sizes for each table. Second, we do not need t-tests, and other statistics, but we need to make sure we indicate why in a footnote ( I cannot remember if we did in the paper), and great if you would write the abstract. If this is a research paper and not a policy paper, then an abstract would be more appropriate than an executive summary. In addition, the paper isn't so long that it needs a long summary.

I didn't think we needed a study of three communities on the cover. Nessa thinks it adds to the appeal, but it seems strange to me to put that on the title.

FROM: INTERNET:GAMORAN@ssc.wisc.edu, INTERNET:GAMORAN@ssc.wisc.edu  
TO: Ellen, INTERNET:GOLDRIEB@CTRVAX.VANDERBILT.EDU  
CC: Nessa Rapoport, 74671,3370  
DATE: 9/19/96 3:44 PM

Re: Re: teachers report

Sender: gamoran@ssc.wisc.edu  
Received: from robin.ssc.wisc.edu (robin.ssc.wisc.edu [144.92.187.200]) by  
hil-img-6.compuserve.com (8.6.10/5.950515)  
id PAA29359; Thu, 19 Sep 1996 15:26:26 -0400  
From: <GAMORAN@ssc.wisc.edu>  
Received: from ssc.wisc.edu by ssc.wisc.edu (PMDF V5.0-6 #17630)  
id <01I9NZI4XLG6AEKWBN@ssc.wisc.edu>; Thu, 19 Sep 1996 14:23:19 -0600 (CST)  
Date: Thu, 19 Sep 1996 14:23:19 -0600 (CST)  
Subject: Re: teachers report  
To: GOLDRIEB@ctrvax.Vanderbilt.Edu  
Cc: 74671.3370@compuserve.com  
Message-id: <01I9NZI4XNC8AEKWBN@ssc.wisc.edu>  
X-VMS-To: IN%"GOLDRIEB@ctrvax.Vanderbilt.Edu"  
X-VMS-Cc: NESSA  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: TEXT/PLAIN; CHARSET=US-ASCII  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

As a title, "Teachers in Jewish Schools" is not sufficiently informative.  
I like "Teachers in Jewish Schools: A Study of Three Communities," but  
I'm not wedded to it -- do you have another suggestion? I can't come up  
with anything else that is both informative and catchy.

Nessa -- Ellen's previous message means we have decided not to add any  
more statistics to the paper. So, the only things left are to decide on  
the title, and for me to prepare a table of contents and abstract/summary/  
overview.



TO: Adam, internet:gamoran@ssc.wisc.edu  
Ellen, INTERNET:GOLDRIEB@ctrvax.Vanderbilt.Edu

Re: Award-winning correspondents

You two get the award for both quantity and promptness!

I abide by whatever decisions re statistics you come to, but please do add the footnotes you need to alleviate the critiques of the Leora and Susans of this world.

Re cover: The only element that occurs to me is that we may want to indicate that this is "Data and analysis from "The CIJE Study of Educators." Or some such language. Somewhere.

I do think that "Teachers in Jewish Schools" is a little flat and doesn't really tell you what the report is about. Can we do "Who are our teachers?" Aren't there reports in general education that ask questions in the title or use a metaphor ("A Nation at Risk"). Give this a trifle more thought, because we do have some time.

Nessa



FROM: INTERNET:GAMORAN@ssc.wisc.edu, INTERNET:GAMORAN@ssc.wisc.edu  
TO: Nessa Rapoport, 74671,3370  
CC: Ellen, INTERNET:GOLDRIEB@CTRVAX.VANDERBILT.EDU  
DATE: 9/19/96 4:55 PM

Re: titles

Sender: gamoran@ssc.wisc.edu  
Received: from robin.ssc.wisc.edu (robin.ssc.wisc.edu [144.92.187.200]) by  
hil-img-5.compuserve.com (8.6.10/5.950515)  
id QAA09218; Thu, 19 Sep 1996 16:48:27 -0400  
From: <GAMORAN@ssc.wisc.edu>  
Received: from ssc.wisc.edu by ssc.wisc.edu (PMDF V5.0-6 #17630)  
id <01I9O2GGVLMIAEKWBN@ssc.wisc.edu>; Thu, 19 Sep 1996 15:45:25 -0600 (CST)  
Date: Thu, 19 Sep 1996 15:45:25 -0600 (CST)  
Subject: titles  
To: 74671.3370@compuserve.com  
Cc: GOLDRIEB@ctrvax.Vanderbilt.Edu  
Message-id: <01I9O2GGVMKCAEKWBN@ssc.wisc.edu>  
X-VMS-To: NESSA  
X-VMS-Cc: ELLEN  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: TEXT/PLAIN; CHARSET=US-ASCII  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

How about "Teachers in Jewish Schools: Portrait of a Semi-Profession"

From: IN%"GOLDRIEB@ctrvax.Vanderbilt.Edu" 19-SEP-1996 14:50:37.40  
To: IN%"GAMORAN@ssc.wisc.edu"  
CC:  
Subj: RE: teachers report

How about something like, "Teachers in Jewish Schools: Toward Building a Profession"

TO: Adam, internet:gamoran@ssc.wisc.edu  
Alan, 73321,1220  
Barry, 73321,1221  
Danny, INTERNET:PEKARSKY@mail.soemadison.wisc.edu  
Ellen, INTERNET:GOLDRIEB@ctrvax.Vanderbilt.Edu  
Gail, 73321,1217  
Josie, 102467,616  
Karen, 104440,2474

Re: Teachers' Report: Title

I am now meeting with the designer to work seriously on the Teachers' Report, which would be CIJE's first formal research report.

The current title is:

"Teachers in Jewish Schools: A Study in Three Communities."

Ellen, Adam and I have been in e-mail conversation about my suggestion that we find a title that is more policy-oriented and more evocative rather than simply descriptive. (Closer to "A Nation Prepared: Teaching for the Twenty-first Century," "A Nation at Risk," etc.)

Adam has suggested:

"Teachers in Jewish Schools: Toward Building a Profession"

How do people who are going to use this document and mail it to colleagues feel about that? It may be a good bridge between something overly inflammatory ("Who is teaching our children?") and something too flat. But I am also imagining that this will be an important "foundational" document in making the case for JEWEL, so that perhaps we need something a little more metaphorical. Also, we need to imagine that we'll be doing the leaders' report in 1997, and the titles have to be compatible. (It, too, could be subtitled "Toward Building a Profession," which means it's not the right subtitle for either volume.) On the other hand, we could have "Building a Profession: Teachers in Jewish Schools" and "Building a Profession: Leaders in Jewish Schools," which suddenly puts a positive spin on both documents!

(The cover would also include the phrase: "A CIJE Research Report.")

Your thoughts? Please scan your bookshelves for models and your memory banks for influential documents of this sort. In my mind they have metaphorical titles and descriptive subtitles.

Nessa



FROM: INTERNET:GOLDRIEB@ctrvax.Vanderbilt.Edu,  
INTERNET:GOLDRIEB@ctrvax.Vanderbilt.Edu  
TO: Nessa Rapoport, 74671,3370  
CC: Adam, INTERNET:GAMORAN@SSC.WISC.EDU  
DATE: 10/1/96 9:33 AM

Re: Re: Teachers' Report: Title

Sender: goldrieb@ctrvax.vanderbilt.edu  
Received: from ctrvx1.Vanderbilt.Edu (ctrvx1.Vanderbilt.Edu [129.59.1.21]) by  
hil-img-4.compuserve.com (8.6.10/5.950515)  
id JAA13853; Tue, 1 Oct 1996 09:28:36 -0400  
From: <GOLDRIEB@ctrvax.Vanderbilt.Edu>  
Received: from PATHWORKS-MAIL by ctrvax.Vanderbilt.Edu (PMDf V5.0-7 #11488)  
id <01IA4EPTSYG08XX2Q6@ctrvax.Vanderbilt.Edu>; Tue,  
01 Oct 1996 08:27:56 -0500 (CDT)  
Date: Tue, 01 Oct 1996 08:27:56 -0500 (CDT)  
Subject: Re: Teachers' Report: Title  
To: 74671.3370@CompuServe.COM  
Cc: gamoran@ssc.wisc.edu  
Message-id: <01IA4EPTT83M8XX2Q6@ctrvax.Vanderbilt.Edu>  
X-VMS-To: IN%"74671.3370@CompuServe.COM"  
X-VMS-Cc: in%"gamoran@ssc.wisc.edu"  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

Nessa, I just received the Art Green essay. I really like the look and the cover.

As for the title of the Teachers' Report, I like your suggestion: Toward Building a Profession: Teachers in Jewish Schools, and then having the option of using the same idea for both teachers and leaders.

I definitely agree we need something inviting, not just Teachers in Jewish Schools.

Ellen

FROM: Barry, 73321,1221  
TO: Nessa Rapoport, 74671,3370  
DATE: 10/1/96 8:07 AM

Re: Teachers' Report: Title

I favor "Teachers in Jewish Schools: Toward Building a Profession" and the leaders could be parallel. Putting "Building a profession" as the main title is not a good idea since it could easily lead to confusing which is the teachers report, which the leaders.b



FROM: Gail Dorph, 73321,1217  
TO: Nessa Rapoport, 74671,3370  
DATE: 10/4/96 12:54 PM

Re: Teachers' Report: Title

nessa, I'm not sure about title. current title is certainly accurate. although not scintillating. I guess I wonder about toward building a profession. does the study make recommendations that come under that rubric or is publishing it alone a step in that direction (is this what we're saying by giving it that name?) gail





FROM: INTERNET:GAMORAN@ssc.wisc.edu, INTERNET:GAMORAN@ssc.wisc.edu  
TO: Nessa Rapoport, 74671,3370  
DATE: 10/14/96 1:02 PM

Re: Re: Integrated Teachers Report

Sender: gamoran@ssc.wisc.edu  
Received: from robin.ssc.wisc.edu (robin.ssc.wisc.edu [144.92.187.200]) by  
hil-img-6.compuserve.com (8.6.10/5.950515)  
id MAA01050; Mon, 14 Oct 1996 12:38:54 -0400  
From: <GAMORAN@ssc.wisc.edu>  
Received: from ssc.wisc.edu by ssc.wisc.edu (PMDF V5.0-6 #17630)  
id <01IAMQSI1NHC9N418Z@ssc.wisc.edu> for 74671.3370@compuserve.com; Mon,  
14 Oct 1996 11:30:29 -0600 (CST)  
Date: Mon, 14 Oct 1996 11:30:29 -0600 (CST)  
Subject: Re: Integrated Teachers Report  
To: 74671.3370@compuserve.com  
Message-id: <01IAMQSI3ZAQ9N418Z@ssc.wisc.edu>  
X-VMS-To: IN%"74671.3370@compuserve.com"  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: TEXT/PLAIN; CHARSET=US-ASCII  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

I am bringing a new hard copy of Teachers in Jewish Schools. It has an overview and a table of contents, as well as a new title. I have it on disk in Word Perfect 5.1, so I'll bring a disk copy also.

I plan to ask the office staff to xerox copies of this version for you and the co-authors when I am at the CIJE office on Wed.

Adam

Council for Initiatives in Jewish Education  
Monitoring, Evaluation, and Feedback Project

TOWARD BUILDING THE PROFESSION: TEACHERS IN JEWISH SCHOOLS

Adam Gamoran  
Ellen Goldring  
Bill Robinson  
Julie Tammivaara  
Roberta Goodman



October 1996

## CONTENTS

### **Overview**

### **Introduction**

### **Questions for Research and Policy**

### **About the Study and its Participants**

### **Background and Training of Teachers in Jewish Schools**

Educational Backgrounds

Pre-Collegiate Jewish Educational Backgrounds

Professional Development

Summary and Implications

### **Conditions of Work**

Settings and Hours of Work

Salary

Benefits

Summary and Implications

### **Career Patterns**

Experience

Career Opportunities

Career Perceptions

Teacher Professional Involvement

Summary and Implications



## Conclusions

Improving Opportunities for Professional Growth

Improving the Conditions of Work

Towards a Comprehensive Plan

## Appendix: Data and Methods

## References



## OVERVIEW

Many observers have seen the need for well-trained teachers as central to the improvement of Jewish education. To embark on this task, we need to first ask, what are the characteristics of teachers in Jewish schools? The Council for Initiatives in Jewish Education (CIJE), a non-profit organization dedicated to the improvement of Jewish education in North America, carried out a study of Jewish educators in collaboration with its three "Lead Communities," Atlanta, Baltimore, and Milwaukee. This paper reports the results of surveys and interviews with teachers in Jewish day schools, supplementary schools, and pre-schools in the three communities. All teachers in these settings were surveyed, with a response rate of 82%, and 125 teachers and other educators were interviewed in depth. Where possible, results from this study are compared to those of earlier surveys from Boston, Los Angeles, and Miami.

The results point to limited formal training and infrequent professional development among teachers in Jewish schools. About half the teachers have completed formal training in the field of education, but far fewer have degrees or certification in Jewish content areas. Jewish education during childhood does little to compensate for the lack of later training in Judaica: almost one-third of the teachers received no pre-collegiate Jewish education after age 13. Similarly, in-service education fails to make up for limited formal training. Most teachers attended around two workshops per year, or fewer. The quality of workshops is also problematic: In-service education is not only infrequent, but it is not aimed at teachers' specific needs, and in most schools it is not part of a coherent plan for professional growth.

Generally, work conditions are not professionalized. Most teachers work part-time in Jewish education. Only 20% of teachers say their earnings from Jewish education are their main source of family income, although this figure is much higher in Orthodox day schools. Benefits are scarce, even for full-time teachers. For example, among full-time teachers in all three settings, only 48% reported that they are offered health benefits.

Despite these conditions, the teachers are strongly committed to their work in Jewish education. Close to 60% describe their work in Jewish education as a career. Even among part-time teachers, over half described their work in Jewish education as a career.

In light of teachers limited training but strong commitment, the authors argue that improving the quality and quantity of professional development should be the primary focus of reform efforts. Improving working conditions, including increasing the availability of benefits and opportunities for full-time work, should also be part of a comprehensive plan for reform.

Council for Initiatives in Jewish Education  
Monitoring, Evaluation, and Feedback Project

TEACHERS IN JEWISH SCHOOLS: A STUDY OF THREE COMMUNITIES

**Introduction**

The need for well-trained teachers in Jewish education has been recognized since the beginning of the modern American Jewish community. In a 1907 lecture on the problems of Jewish education, Solomon Schechter (1915, p. 110) explained,

The first difficulty under which we labor is the great dearth of trained teachers....The American teacher, with his knowledge of the English language and his familiarity with the best educational methods, will thus in the end prove to be the only fit person to instruct also in religion, but unfortunately he is not always sufficiently equipped with a knowledge of Hebrew things in general and Hebrew language in particular to enable him to accomplish his duties in a satisfactory manner.

Schechter recognized the need for modern educational methods in the Jewish classroom and, simultaneously, the need for educators to be well versed in Jewish studies. In a similar vein, Emanuel Gamoran commented in his (1924, p.2) manual for teacher training for the Reform movement,

[T]he crux of the problem of Jewish education centers about the question of the Jewish teacher.... It is therefore of the utmost importance that our teachers be adequately trained, thoroughly imbued with Jewish spirit, possessed of Jewish knowledge and pedagogically qualified.

For Gamoran, the essential components in the background of a Jewish educator were commitment to Judaism, knowledge of Judaica, and pedagogical training. Yet one or more of these were usually missing. Gamoran explained that teachers lacked adequate training (p.5):

Training is absolutely essential for the development of adequate Jewish teachers. Very few people today would think of entrusting their legal affairs to anyone but a lawyer who had received special training entitling him to engage in his professional



activities. Still less would people permit anyone who had not received a long and arduous course of training followed by a period of practice in medicine to minister to their physical ailments. Yet those who are entrusted with the responsibility of molding the character of the young -- of developing the Jews of tomorrow -- are too often people who present no other qualification for their task than that of availability.

The concerns of Schechter and Gamoran are still echoed today. According to A Time to Act, the 1990 report of the Commission on Jewish Education in North America, developing the profession of Jewish education is an essential building block in the effort to improve Jewish education in North America. The Council for Initiatives in Jewish Education (CIJE) was established to implement the Commission's conclusions. To begin the task of enhancing the profession of Jewish education, one must ask: What is the character of the teaching profession in today's Jewish schools? In response, the CIJE carried out a study of teachers in Jewish schools in collaboration with its three "Lead Communities," Atlanta, Baltimore, and Milwaukee. The findings of this study have led to a number of plans and programs for improving the personnel for Jewish education in these communities. The purpose of this report is to share these findings with the wider Jewish community, in hopes of bringing continental attention to the problems and prospects of enhancing the profession of Jewish education.

### **Questions for Research and Policy**

One of the central questions of the CIJE study was to learn about the professional backgrounds of teachers who work in Jewish schools. How adequate is their training in the field of education? How extensive are their backgrounds in Judaica? Do they engage in activities that continually enhance their preparation for teaching? Answers to these questions are essential for developing policies for change.

If professional preparation and growth for teachers are important, providing professional conditions for work may be closely related. How adequate are the earnings and benefits for teachers in Jewish schools? How many hours do they work? Are teachers commonly employed in more than one school? What are the prospects for full-time work as a Jewish teacher?

A third set of issues concerns Jewish education as a career. How are teachers recruited to Jewish education? How experienced are they? Do they view their work as a career? What are their future plans? Addressing these questions may provide guidance about the worth of investing in our current teaching force.

---

#### About the Study and Its Participants

This study was carried out by the Council for Initiatives in Jewish Education, in collaboration with the three Lead Communities of Atlanta, Baltimore, and Milwaukee. Data sources included surveys of nearly 1000 teachers and interviews with over 100 educators. Further information on the data and methodology of the study may be found in the appendix.

The survey indicated that teachers in the three communities are predominantly female (84%) and married (80%). A large majority are American born (86%), while 7% percent were born in Israel. Surveys from other cities have indicated much higher proportions of Israeli-born teachers: 17% in Boston (Frank, Margolis, and Weisner, 1992); 25% in Los Angeles (Aron and Phillips, 1988); and in Miami, 15% of synagogue school teachers and 29% of Judaic day school teachers (Sheskin, 1988).

Our respondents represent a variety of religious affiliations. Thirty-two percent are Orthodox and 8% are Traditional. Thirty-one percent identify with the Reform movement and 25% see themselves as Conservative. (The remaining 4% list other preferences, including 1% Reconstructionist.) Sixty-three percent of the teachers have visited Israel, and 51% of those have lived in Israel for three months or more. Twenty-one percent of the teachers in our survey described themselves as fluent Hebrew speakers.

---

#### Background and Training of Teachers in Jewish Schools

To what extent are teachers in Jewish schools trained as educators? Are they prepared in areas of Jewish content? What standards are maintained for their ongoing



professional development? Our first task is to examine the background and training of teachers in Jewish schools.

### Educational Backgrounds

Teachers in the Jewish schools of Atlanta, Baltimore, and Milwaukee are highly educated. Table 1 shows that 74% have college degrees, and more than a quarter have graduate or professional degrees. Compared to the national Jewish population, the teachers are more likely to have college degrees, and about equally likely to have post-collegiate degrees. According to the 1990 National Jewish Population Survey, around 50% of both men and women who identify as Jews have college degrees, and 24% of women and 32% of men have graduate degrees (Kosmin et al., 1993).

Table 1. General Educational Backgrounds of Teachers in Jewish Schools					
SETTING	College Degree	Grad/Prof. Degree	Degree in Education		Worked in General Educ.
			From University	From Teacher's Institute	
Day Schools	76%	40%	43%	17%	48%
<i>Orthodox</i>	69%	42%	32%	26%	36%
<i>Other</i>	86%	38%	58%	5%	64%
Supplementary Schools	80%	33%	41%	5%	55%
Pre-Schools	63%	13%	46%	15%	50%
<i>Orthodox</i>	38%	8%	28%	31%	32%
<i>Other</i>	66%	14%	48%	12%	53%
TOTAL	74%	29%	43%	11%	51%

More important for our interests is the finding that 43% of the teachers in the Jewish schools of the three communities have university degrees in education, and another 11% have



education degrees from teacher's institutes. Just over half the teachers have worked in general education. Whereas day, supplementary, and pre-school teachers are about equally likely to have degrees and experience in general education, these comparisons mask important differences within settings: Teachers in day and pre-schools under Orthodox sponsorship have less formal training and experience in general education, compared to those in day and pre-schools under other sponsorships.

Table 2. Collegiate and Professional Jewish Educational Backgrounds of Teachers in Jewish Schools		
SETTING	Certification in Jewish education	Degree in Jewish Studies
Day Schools	40%	37%
<i>Orthodox</i>	47%	49%
<i>Other</i>	30%	24%
Supplementary Schools	18%	12%
Pre-Schools	10%	4%
<i>Orthodox</i>	24%	16%
<i>Other</i>	8%	3%
TOTAL	22%	17%

Thirty-seven percent of the day school teachers reported a college major or seminary degree in Jewish studies, and slightly more are certified in Jewish education (see Table 2). Again, these figures differed within the day school setting, with those in Orthodox institutions substantially more likely to have training or certification in Jewish education or studies. Teachers in other settings have far less formal preparation in Jewish studies. Table 2 indicates that only 12% of supplementary school teachers, 16% of teachers in Orthodox

pre-schools, and 3% of teachers in other pre-schools majored in Jewish studies; the percentages are moderately higher but follow the same pattern for certification in Jewish education. Similar contrasts in Judaic training between day school and other teachers were reported in Miami (Sheskin, 1988).

Teachers in supplementary schools and pre-schools have relatively little formal preparation to be Jewish educators. Even in day schools, where formal preparation is most extensive, only half the teachers are trained in education, and half are prepared in Jewish studies at the collegiate or professional level (this includes both Jewish studies majors and Jewish education certification).

Overall, 19% of the teachers we surveyed may be considered well trained, with professional or collegiate training in both Judaica and education (this includes teacher's institutes). Another 47% had formal training in one field or the other, but not both, including 35% with backgrounds in education and 12% certified in Jewish subjects (including Jewish education). This leaves about 34% of teachers in Jewish schools in the three communities who lack collegiate or professional degrees in both areas. Figure 1 provides a graphic display of this pattern for all teachers. The pattern differs somewhat across settings: among day school teachers, only 10% in Orthodox schools and 23% in non-Orthodox schools lack degrees in both areas, whereas the figure is 38% for pre-school teachers and 44% for supplementary school teachers.

This analysis views teachers who are certified in Jewish education but who lack a degree in general education as partially trained, because certification in Jewish education typically does not require the same level of training in education as a secular degree.




Figure 1: Extent of Professional Training in General Education and Jewish Studies



Counting those with certificates in Jewish education as well trained would lead to the conclusion that about 25% instead of 19% are well trained -- still only one quarter of all teachers in Jewish settings.

An important qualification to these findings is that they emphasize formal schooling. However, Jewish content is learned not only in school, but in informal settings such as the home, the synagogue, summer camp, Israel experiences, and through living a Jewish life. Focusing only on formal education thus underestimates the extent of Jewish knowledge among teachers in Jewish schools. Still, to the extent that modern conceptions of teaching include formal training in one's subject matter (as well as in pedagogy), the lack of formal training in Jewish studies among many of the teachers must draw our attention.

#### Pre-Collegiate Jewish Educational Backgrounds

What sort of Jewish education did the teachers receive when they were children? On the whole, teachers in Jewish schools are much better educated Jewishly than the typical American Jew. For example, according to the 1990 National Jewish Population Survey (Kosmin et al., 1993), 22% of males and 38% of females who identify as Jews received no Jewish education as children; the comparable figure is only 8% for the teachers in our survey when childhood education both before and after age 13 are considered.

Table 3 indicates that among teachers in Orthodox day schools and pre-schools, a majority attended day schools (or schools in Israel), and nearly all teachers in Orthodox day schools and over two-thirds of those in Orthodox pre-schools attended at least two days per week both before and after age 13. Among teachers in other day schools, about two-thirds attended at least twice per week before age 13, and over half attended at least that often after

Table 3. Pre-Collegiate Jewish Educational Backgrounds of Teachers in Jewish Schools

SETTING	BEFORE AGE 13			
	None	1 day per week only	2 days or more supplementary	school in Israel or day school
Day Schools	6%	11%	21%	62%
<i>Orthodox</i>	2%	2%	16%	79%
<i>Other</i>	11%	24%	28%	37%
Supplementary Schools	11%	25%	40%	24%
Pre-Schools	22%	40%	23%	15%
<i>Orthodox</i>	20%	3%	23%	54%
<i>Other</i>	22%	45%	23%	9%
TOTAL	12%	25%	29%	33%
SETTING	AFTER AGE 13			
	None	1 day per week only	2 days or more supplementary	school in Israel, yeshiva, or day school
Day Schools	14%	8%	11%	67%
<i>Orthodox</i>	7%	1%	7%	86%
<i>Other</i>	25%	20%	17%	38%
Supplementary Schools	29%	25%	17%	29%
Pre-Schools	55%	23%	8%	14%
<i>Orthodox</i>	22%	3%	11%	64%
<i>Other</i>	60%	27%	8%	5%
TOTAL	32%	20%	13%	36%

Note: Figures omit a small number of responses marked "other." Rows may not sum to 100% due to rounding.

age 13. Supplementary school teachers participated less, but still much more than the average American Jew: Before age 13, 24% attended day schools, and another 40% attended a supplementary school of two days or more per week, while 25% attended only once per week, and 11% did not attend at all. After age 13, 29% attended day school, 17% attended twice per week, and the proportion that reported "none" rises to 29%.

Teachers in non-Orthodox pre-schools stand out as having received substantially less Jewish schooling as children. Less than one-third before age 13 and less than one-seventh after age 13 attended a Jewish school twice or more each week. One reason for these low figures is that 11% of teachers in non-Orthodox pre-schools are not Jewish. (A survey in Miami also reported that 7% of early childhood teachers in Jewish schools were not Jewish; see Sheskin, 1988). Even excluding the non-Jewish teachers, however, over half of teachers in non-Orthodox pre-schools received no Jewish schooling after the age of Bat Mitzvah.

### Professional Development

Nearly all pre-school teachers reported that they were required to attend in-service workshops. In our interviews, we learned that most pre-schools were licensed by the states in which they were located, and state accreditation requirements demanded staff development. One pre-school director explained:

They [the teachers] are required by licensing to do 18 hours of continued education. And I would hope that three-quarters of that would be Judaic. They have to have 15 hours of in-servicing, which [another pre-school director] and I have to prepare for them. A consultation is part of that. That's probably a little more of the secular background that we give them. We'll bring in experts on language, on special needs development, that type of area. But it makes a nice package all in all.

On the surveys, pre-school teachers reported they were required to attend an average of 6.2 in-service workshops over a two-year period. While these workshops generally satisfied state



requirements, they may not have been sufficient to compensate for the limited Judaic backgrounds of most pre-school teachers.

Day school teachers attend substantially fewer workshops. Although almost 80% said workshops were required, on average only 3.8 workshops were required over a two year period (see Figure 2). This level of staff development is far below normal standards in public education. For example, teachers in Wisconsin are required to complete 180 hours of workshops over a five-year period in order to maintain their teaching license. Assuming a typical workshop lasts 3 hours, day school teachers in our study averaged about 29 hours of workshops over a five-year period, less than one-sixth of what is required for state-licensed teachers in Wisconsin.

Wisconsin teachers can also maintain their licenses by earning 6 college or university credits over a five-year period. About 32% of the day school teachers reported taking a course in Judaica or Hebrew at a university, community center, or synagogue during the previous 12 months. Unfortunately, we did not ask more specific questions about these courses, but it is clear that attendance at workshops does not capture the full extent of continuing education obtained by day school teachers. Furthermore, the survey did not ask about university courses in education. Taking these courses into account, day school teachers come closer to the levels of professional development required in public education, but they do not attain it, nor are they not required to do so, even though they are less well prepared in the first place.

Supplementary school teachers reported slightly more in-service training than day school teachers, although not as much as pre-school teachers (see Figure 2). Also, 44% of




Figure 2: Average Number of Required Workshops Over a Two-Year Period  
(For Those Who Were Required to Attend at Least One Workshop and Excluding First-Year Educators)



the supplementary teachers reported taking a Judaica or Hebrew course at a university, community center, or synagogue. These likely consisted mainly of synagogue courses of limited hours. As with day school teachers, professional development for supplementary teachers falls well short of common professional standards for public school teachers. Staff development activities were even less frequent in a Miami survey (Sheskin, 1988), where day school teachers averaged 3.7 Judaica workshops over a three-year period, supplementary school teachers average 3.2 Judaica workshops, and pre-school teachers averaged 3.4 such workshops. During the same three-year period, day school and pre-school teachers reported having taken 0.8 courses in teaching methods on average, and supplementary school teachers averaged 1.1 courses.

Consistent with their diverse backgrounds, the teachers varied substantially in the areas in which they would like to improve (see Table 4); among the most popular were skills in motivating children to learn and creating materials, and content knowledge in Hebrew and history. Variation across settings followed predictable patterns. For example, pre-school teachers were more concerned with child development, and teachers in non-Orthodox pre-schools were especially interested in learning about Jewish customs and ceremonies. Interest in rabbinic literature was largely confined to day and supplementary school teachers. Teachers in Orthodox day schools were most concerned with learning more history, while teachers in non-Orthodox day schools more often perceived a need for improved Bible knowledge. It is noteworthy that interests in creating materials, motivating students, and learning Hebrew were uniformly strong across settings.



Table 4. Areas in Which Teachers Would Like to Improve and Have Attended Workshops

Percent Desiring Improvement: Teaching Skills		Percent Desiring Improvement: Jewish Content	
Classroom management	46%	Hebrew language	57%
Child development	37%	Customs and ceremonies	45%
Lesson planning	31%	Israel and Zionism	29%
Curriculum development	42%	Jewish history	54%
Creating materials	58%	Bible	46%
Communication skills	32%	Synagogue skills/prayer	32%
Parental involvement	37%	Rabbinic literature	32%
Motivating children to learn	67%		

Percent who attended workshops on the following topics in the last two years:

Judaic subject matter	62%
Hebrew language	30%
Teaching methods	76%
Classroom management	61%
Curriculum development	49%
Art/drama/music	41%

In-service training is not only infrequent but, especially in day and supplementary schools, it tends to be sporadic and not geared to teachers' specific needs. On the survey, teachers indicated they typically find the workshops "somewhat helpful." Aside from Hebrew language, many teachers had in fact attended a workshop in an area in which they desired to improve. Yet our interviews indicated several concerns about the workshops. Particularly in day and supplementary schools, there is rarely any overall coordination or program of in-service training. Also, teachers feel that a workshop is an event unto itself, without any apparent connection to previous staff development activities, nor follow-up afterwards. Teachers who learn something practical and concrete see the workshop as useful; otherwise, it is seen as largely a waste of time. One pre-school teacher commented about workshops:

[S]ome of them are wonderful and really do address just the issues you need to hear about, very practical things. . . . I went to a wonderful one that covered several of

the major Jewish holidays. She showed us some very useful things we could take back to our classroom. That is very useful and I enjoyed that.

Conversely, another teacher who found nothing of practical value dismissed the workshop experience as "dreadfully boring and non-helpful to me." Moreover, in-service training tends to be provided uniformly for all teachers, rather than offering different programs designed to meet the varied needs of teachers with diverse backgrounds in pedagogy and Jewish content. Given the wide range of training, experience, subject matters and grade levels, it is unlikely that a given workshop will be appropriate for many teachers, even within the same school. As one day school teacher remarked,

A lot of times, I guess because Jewish education is so small, you end up in a [workshop] class with a range of people teaching all the way from preschool to tenth grade. You can't teach a [workshop] class like that. The way you approach the material depends entirely on the age that the children are. Developmentally what works for an eighth grader does not work for a kindergartner and vice versa.

### Summary and Implications

Compared to other settings, day school teachers are relatively well prepared, both Jewishly and pedagogically. Still, fewer than half have undergone the level of professional preparation that is standard among public school teachers. Ironically, day schools generally require their teachers of secular subjects to meet the standard requirements. In addition, staff development demands for day school Judaica teachers are minimal, and are less than the requirements for day school teachers of secular subjects, who typically meet state requirements for ongoing certification to maintain their teaching licenses. Both for pre-service preparation and in-service development, Jewish day schools in Atlanta, Baltimore, and Milwaukee typically hold teachers of secular subjects to higher standards than teachers of Jewish subjects.

Among supplementary and pre-school teachers, few are fully prepared as professional Jewish educators. That is, only small proportions of teachers in those settings have extensive training in both education and Judaica. In particular, only 46% of supplementary school teachers are trained in education, and most teachers in non-Orthodox pre-schools received minimal formal Jewish education as children, let alone at the college level. Professional growth opportunities are needed to advance their levels of professional knowledge and skills.

Professional development for Jewish educators is not only a matter of remediation, of making up for deficiencies. It is also a means of renewal and growth, something that is imperative for all teachers. Even those who are well prepared for their positions must have opportunities to keep abreast of the field, to learn exciting new ideas, and to be invigorated by contact with other educators. (For a concise review of current directions in professional development, see Dilworth and Imig, 1995.)

What must teachers know in order to teach? Beyond pedagogic and content knowledge is the notion of "pedagogic content knowledge," that is, the knowledge of what it is about the content that is most essential for teaching (Shulman, 1986). This is the knowledge of how to create bridges between student and subject matter. Teachers need a rich and deep knowledge of the subject matter to place it in a meaningful context for their students. Although students do not always respond to instruction in predictable ways, a teacher who possesses pedagogic content knowledge has the power to find new ways of enabling students to learn the material at hand. In thinking about professional development for Jewish teachers, then, we must consider not only pedagogy, and not only Judaica, but the education of Jewish subject matter.



### Conditions of Work

Having identified a need for professional preparation and development of teachers, we must also consider whether work conditions for teachers in Jewish schools make it reasonable to think about a profession of Jewish education. How many hours do teachers work each week? How many are full time? What are their earnings and benefits? What incentives might stimulate more teachers to work full time, if positions were available?

#### Settings and Hours of Work

Most of the teachers we surveyed reported that they work in one school. Specifically, 80% teach in one school, 17% teach in two schools, and 3% teach in more than two schools. Thirty-one percent of the respondents teach in day schools as their primary setting (the setting in which they work the most hours), including 18% under Orthodox sponsorship and 13% under other sponsorships. Forty percent work in supplementary schools. The remaining 29% teach in pre-schools, including 4% under Orthodox sponsorship and 25% under other sponsorships. Whereas 20% of teachers work in more than one school, approximately 35% of positions are held by teachers who teach in more than one school.

There is no agreed-upon definition of full-time work in the field of Jewish education. When we define full-time teaching as more than 25 hours per week, we find that 28% work full time in one school, and 32% work full time when all their positions in Jewish education are taken into account. When asked on the survey, 31% of the teachers described themselves as a "full-time Jewish educator". Thus, alternative definitions give similar results, on average.

Table 5. Weekly Hours of Work among Teachers in Jewish Schools (Primary Setting)

SETTING	HOURS			
	1-4	5-12	13-24	25+
Day Schools	5%	11%	37%	47%
Supplementary Schools	64%	32%	2%	2%
Pre-Schools	1%	19%	36%	43%
TOTAL	27%	22%	23%	28%

Note: Rows may not sum to 100% due to rounding.

Teaching in supplementary schools is overwhelmingly a part-time occupation; 96% teach 12 hours or less in their primary setting, and almost two-thirds teach less than 5 hours per week (see Table 5). By contrast, day school teachers are about evenly split between those who work 25 hours per week or more in their primary setting and those who work less. Among pre-school teachers, 43% work full time, 37% work 13 to 24 hours per week, and 20% work 12 hours per week or less. Similar differences appeared in Miami, where 55% of day school teachers and 50% of pre-school teachers reported working 25 hours per week or more, compared with 5% of supplementary school teachers (Sheskin, 1988). In Los Angeles, only 16% of teachers reported 25 hours of teaching per week or more (Aron and Phillips, 1988); this figure was not broken down by setting, but two-thirds of the respondents were supplementary school teachers, and one-third were day school teachers. (Pre-school teachers were not included in the Los Angeles survey.) In Atlanta, Baltimore, and

Milwaukee, about two-thirds of the teachers who work in more than one school teach in supplementary schools as their second school.

In our interviews with teachers, we discovered that teachers and principals work together to assemble "employment packages" to provide some teachers with more paid work. Rabbis in Orthodox day school settings are commonly recruited to take responsibility for tefillah and extracurricular activities to fill out their work week. Teachers in other settings assume responsibility for a variety of additional activities including working in the library, tutoring students at the school, engaging in family education, leading tefillah services, directing grant-related projects, and so forth. Even with these additional responsibilities, few are able to put together an employment package that is considered full time, although many find they devote more than 40 hours per week to their institutions.

One pre-school teacher who presently teaches part time exemplifies the struggle of putting together a full-time position. Looking ahead at her career plans, she expressed a desire to work full time as a Judaic pre-school teacher. But her school, like most others in her community, offers Judaic programs only in the morning. She could become full time only by teaching non-Judaic subjects in the afternoon, by working with older students in a day school in the afternoon, or by the school's reorganization of the timing of curricular offerings. Typically, the Jewish educational "marketplace" does not provide an opportunity for a teacher like this one to specialize (teaching a particular subject to a specific age group) and to work full time.



## Salary

Earnings from Jewish education must be viewed in the context of the part-time nature of Jewish education. Table 2 shows that 58% of the teachers we surveyed reported earning less than \$10,000 from their work in Jewish education in one school, while 43% reported earning less than \$5,000. (In Los Angeles, 69% of teachers earned less than \$10,000 per year, according to Aron and Phillips, 1988, but their sample was two-thirds supplementary

teachers.) Fifteen percent of the teachers in our survey said they receive between \$10,000 and \$15,000, 18% reported wages between \$15,000 and \$30,000, while 9% reported earnings of over \$30,000 annually. As one educational director of a day school lamented, "We certainly lose the best teachers to principalships, assistant principalships, administrative roles, because that is what day schools are willing to pay for. They are not willing to pay the same thing for teachers." This is a problem with which all education systems (not only Jewish education) must contend: Because of education's flat hierarchy, often a teacher must move out of teaching in order to advance professionally.

Teaching at more than one school provides modest gains to teachers' incomes; the gains are limited because teachers rarely work more than ten hours per week at the second

Table 6. Teachers' Earnings from One School

EARNINGS	PERCENT
Less than \$1000	3%
\$1000-\$4999	40%
\$5000-\$9999	15%
\$10000-\$14999	15%
\$15000-\$19999	9%
\$20000-\$24999	5%
\$25000-\$30000	4%
Over \$30000	9%

school. Seventy-four percent of those who teach in more than one school reported they receive less than \$5000 for the additional work, while 18% receive between \$5000-\$10,000.

We asked the teachers, "How important to your household is the income you receive from Jewish education?" Only 20% of teachers surveyed reported that their income from Jewish education is the main source of income for their household. Fifty-one percent indicated that their income from Jewish education is an important source of additional income, while 29% say their wages from teaching are insignificant to their household income. Responses to a similar question in Los Angeles were more evenly distributed: 32% said their income from Jewish education is the main source of household income, 34% called it an important supplement, and 32% said it was unimportant (Aron and Phillips, 1988). In Miami, 57% of day school teachers reported that more than half their household income comes from Jewish teaching, but only 24% of pre-school teachers and 18% of supplementary school teachers reported that level of importance (Sheskin, 1988).

An exception to the general pattern in Atlanta, Baltimore, and Milwaukee, and more consistent with Miami, is that for teachers in Orthodox day schools, income from teaching is typically not just an important source of additional pay, but their main source of income. Fifty-nine percent of teachers in Orthodox day schools reported that their wages from Jewish education are the main source of income, compared to 35% who indicated their wages are an important source of additional income, and only 6% who reported their income from Jewish education is insignificant. Moreover, among those who work full time in Orthodox day schools (that is, those who work 25 hours per week or more, or about four-fifths of teachers

in Orthodox day schools), 80% said their wages from Jewish education are their main source of income.

For many teachers the additional income, however small, is extremely meaningful. As one educator stated, "The salary is extremely important. That's how I pay for my kid's education. I have to be working. I want to be working, but also that salary is essential."

Table 7. Teachers' Satisfaction with Salaries

SETTING	VERY SATISFIED	SOMEWHAT SATISFIED	SOMEWHAT DISSATISFIED	VERY DISSATISFIED
Day Schools	14%	35%	28%	23%
Supplementary Schools	33%	42%	19%	7%
Pre-Schools	7%	30%	30%	32%
TOTAL	20%	36%	25%	19%

Note: Rows may not sum to 100% due to rounding.

Overall, teachers were more satisfied than dissatisfied with their salaries, but this varied substantially by setting. As Table 7 illustrates, a substantial majority of supplementary school teachers were somewhat or very satisfied with their salaries. However, just under half the day school teachers and only 37% of pre-school teachers reported satisfaction with their salaries. Comparing full-time and part-time teachers revealed somewhat less satisfaction among full-time teachers, but the main differences in satisfaction occurred across the three settings as exhibited in Table 7. Our interviews confirmed a general pattern of greater satisfaction with salaries among supplementary school teachers, and the most dissatisfaction among pre-school teachers. Teachers acknowledged, however, that it



is not the money that keeps them in the profession, citing intrinsic rewards such as working with children and teaching Judaism as more salient.

### Benefits

Few fringe benefits are available to teachers in Jewish schools. Given the part-time nature of teaching, the scarcity of benefits may not be surprising. However, most full-time Jewish educators (those teaching more than 25 hours per week) reported that they are not offered many benefits (see Table 8). Full-time teachers are most likely to be offered tuition subsidies (75%) (i.e., reduced tuition for their children at their school) and money to attend conferences (66%). Of those who teach full time, only 28% are offered disability benefits, 48% are offered health benefits, and 45% have pension plans.

Table 8. Availability of Fringe Benefits for Full-Time and Part-Time Teachers: Percentages of Teachers Who Are Offered Various Fringe Benefits

BENEFIT	FULL-TIME TEACHERS	PART-TIME TEACHERS	ALL TEACHERS
Tuition Subsidies	75%	42%	52%
Day Care	28%	15%	19%
Membership Subsidies	46%	33%	37%
Synagogue Privileges	17%	19%	19%
Conferences	66%	55%	58%
Sabbaticals	14%	6%	9%
Disability	28%	9%	15%
Health	48%	15%	26%
Pension	45%	16%	25%

When teachers put together "job packages" that include part-time positions in a number of settings, they are not eligible for health, pension, or disability benefits from any one institution. Even when fringe benefits are offered, the size of the benefits may be negligible. One day school principal indicated:

Today a health plan for a family is about \$5500 a year. A full-time teacher may get \$900 from the school, the rest they have to pay for. They get a small allocation. It's a token, but it's not that much. The same thing with pension plans. The pension plan until now was a fair plan. It was little, but it was fair. That's been suspended because of the financial crisis, so there is none at all. That's all the benefits there are.

Benefits differ somewhat across settings, mainly as a function of the percent of teachers in that setting who work full-time. Forty-seven percent of teachers in day schools reported that health benefits are available to them. Only 29% of those in pre-schools and a mere 7% of supplementary school teachers are offered health benefits. About 46% of teachers in day schools, and 27% of those in pre-schools, are offered pensions, as compared with just 7% of supplementary school teachers.

### Summary and Implications

Most educators work part-time, have few tangible fringe benefits, and receive salaries that they consider to be an important, supplementary part of their household income. For some educators, this situation is compatible with their goals and family situations. For others, the current situation does not meet their needs, and they are not pleased with their salaries and benefits. When part-time teachers were asked what possible incentives would encourage them to work full-time in Jewish education, salary, benefits, and job security/tenure were the most important incentives (see Table 9). Since we did not question persons who chose not to enter Jewish education, we cannot say whether these work conditions discourage people from entering the field at all, but these results are consistent with that speculation.

Those who have chosen the field of Jewish education typically find their greatest rewards in the intangibles. As one supplementary school teacher commented:

Table 9. Most Important Incentives for Full-Time Work

INCENTIVE	FIRST	SECOND	THIRD
Salary	33%	18%	7%
Benefits	3%	22%	13%
Job security/tenure	4%	6%	14%
Better Judaica Background	6%	4%	5%
Better Education Background	3%	3%	2%
Career Development	6%	6%	9%
More Job Opportunities	4%	3%	4%
Training Opportunities	1%	1%	2%
Change in Family Status	9%	3%	5%
Work Resources	-	1%	2%
Presence of Colleagues	1%	2%	4%

[F]inancially, no, this is not the best job in the world. The reward is watching children grow. I don't think any of the synagogues really pay that well. We have no benefits. I've worked 26 years without any benefits whatsoever. Nothing. When I retire, it is 'Good-bye. It was nice knowing you.' You really have to love what you are doing, let's face it.

What do these findings imply for the notion of building a profession of Jewish education? The working conditions of teachers in Jewish schools, particularly the part-time nature of work, the modest significance of earnings, and the absence of benefits for many teachers, are not typical for professional occupations. Moreover, we found that many teachers chose their positions because of the availability of part-time work. On the one hand, these conditions may make it difficult to build a profession. The scarcity of full-time positions with substantial salary and benefits packages may make it difficult to recruit teachers who are willing to conform to high standards of professional preparation and



development. On the other hand, just because someone chooses to work part time does not mean he or she would necessarily resist efforts to raise standards. A part-time teacher may be experienced and committed to Jewish teaching, and therefore welcome opportunities for professional development. To resolve these issues, we need to examine the career orientation and experiences of full-time and part-time teachers.

### **Career Patterns**

To enhance the profession of Jewish education, it is essential to learn about the career patterns of today's teachers. How were they recruited into Jewish education? How experienced are they? Do they view Jewish education as a career? What are their plans for the future? Answering these questions will tell us whether investing in our current teachers is a sound strategy for improving the personnel of Jewish schools.

#### Recruitment into Jewish Education

Jewish education provides relatively easy access to prospective members, although pre-schools are more highly regulated by the state than other settings. In interviews, we learned that teachers in Jewish schools enter the field as early as high school and as late as retirement. This wide range, combined with the part-time nature of teaching in Jewish settings, allows educators to teach while they are pursuing other endeavors, such as post-secondary schooling.

Since educators typically enter the field in an unregulated manner, without complete formal preparation or certification, there is a common perception that "anybody can do it". Some educators make casual decisions to enter the field and expect on-the-job training to prepare them as they teach. Interviews with supplementary school teachers suggest that an

overwhelming number entered the field without much planning. They became Jewish educators because someone, usually a friend, told them about an opening at the synagogue.

As one supplementary teacher recounted:

Well, basically, I got recruited through a friend. I have a friend who was teaching here and she said it was fun and great and a good thing to do. She thought I might like doing that. My first reaction, of course, was, "Who am I to be teaching?" I have no formal education as a teacher and certainly not of Judaica or Hebrew. And she just said from what she knew that I knew, I had all the qualifications. I had no experience in Jewish education, but my friend persuaded me. And so just indirectly, and luckily, I became involved in Jewish education.

Teachers most commonly obtained their current positions by approaching the school directly (29%), through a friend or mentor (30%) or by being recruited by the school (24%). Our interviews indicated that it is rare for teachers to be recruited for their positions from outside their current community.

Most educators are attracted to Jewish education for intrinsic rewards, such as transmitting the joy and enthusiasm for Judaism to children. Some teachers also emphasized the warmth of the Jewish community. One explained:

I think the reason I am in Jewish education is the community. . . . I feel very comfortable. When I first came to the Center, it was almost a sense of family. I just always enjoyed coming to work, enjoyed the people that I was working with.

Factors influencing the decision to work at a particular schools coincide with the part-time nature of teaching. On the survey, 87% of teachers said the hours and days available for work was an important reason for choosing to work at a particular school. This was the most prevalent reason mentioned. As one teacher explained,

I had my third child, and I was feeling like I needed to get out and do something, but I couldn't do something on a full-time basis. [Working as a Jewish educator] seemed to coincide with what I needed at the time.

Location was also an important factor, cited by 75% of the teachers, and the reputation of the school was listed as important by 66% of the teachers. Religious affiliation was indicated as important by 62% of the teachers -- 56% percent of supplementary school teachers teach in synagogues where they are also members -- and 51% of the teachers mentioned salary as an important factor in choosing to work at a particular school.

The most important reason for choosing a specific second school was the same as that for the first, namely scheduling. In addition, 64% percent of those teaching in a second school reported that location was a significant factor in their decision to teach in a particular school, and 56% listed salary as an important factor.

### Experience

There is considerable stability in the field of Jewish teaching. The top panel of Table 10 indicates that 14% of teachers have been in the field for more than 20 years, 24% for between 10 and 20, and 29% for 6 to 10 years. Another 27% have worked in Jewish education for 2 to 5 years, and only 6% were in their first year at the time of our survey.

At the same time, teachers' tenure at their current schools is less extensive than their experience in the field. The majority of teachers, 59%, have been teaching in their current institutions for five years or less, and 18% were teaching in their current settings for the first time. Others, totalling just 18%, have been teaching in their current institutions for more than 10 years, and 23% have been teaching 6 to 10 years in their current schools.

Supplementary schools have the highest proportion of novice teachers. Whereas only 9% of supplementary school teachers were new to Jewish education, 27% were new to their current schools. Twelve percent of day school teachers and 13% of pre-school teachers were



new to their current schools. Figures for new teachers reflect new faculty positions as well as movement across schools.

### Career Opportunities

There are limited career advancement opportunities in the three communities. Teachers can make horizontal moves from one setting to another, although one's denominational or philosophical orientation constrains this movement to a certain degree. Many educators feel comfortable in specific settings, and they would not be considered for other settings due to qualities that go beyond credentials (e.g., denominational preferences).

There are two ways teachers move out from their regular positions. Some apply for non-teaching positions when they become vacant, while others are tapped by administrators who see promising qualities in them. The fact that teachers are recruited without benefit of a position's being advertised narrows the perceived range of opportunities. Our interviews indicated that many positions are filled before it is generally known that they

Table 10. Stability and Continuity of Teachers

TOTAL YEARS OF EXPERIENCE IN JEWISH EDUCATION	
1 or less	6%
2 to 5	27%
6 to 10	29%
11 to 20	24%
20 or more	14%
TOTAL YEARS OF TEACHING EXPERIENCE IN THE CURRENT COMMUNITY	
1 or less	11%
2 to 5	34%
6 to 10	27%
11 to 20	19%
20 or more	10%
TOTAL YEARS OF TEACHING EXPERIENCE IN THE PRESENT SETTING	
1 or less	18%
2 to 5	41%
6 to 10	23%
11 to 20	13%
20 or more	5%

Note: Columns may not sum to 100% due to rounding.

are vacant. Vertical movement is constrained by the small number of positions, and top-level administrative positions are sometimes filled by recruits from outside the community.

### Career Perceptions

Interestingly, although only a minority of teachers work full-time in Jewish education (32%), most, 59% of teachers, describe themselves as having a career in Jewish education (see Table 11). In fact, 54% of those who work part-time in Jewish education (those who teach less than 25 hours per week) indicate that they have careers in Jewish education. At the same

Table 11. Teachers' Career Perceptions

SETTING	REPORTED HAVING A CAREER IN JEWISH EDUCATION
Day Schools	79%
<i>Orthodox</i>	88%
<i>Other</i>	66%
Supplementary Schools	44%
Pre-Schools	60%
<i>Orthodox</i>	89%
<i>Other</i>	56%
TOTAL	59%

time, 31% of the full-time Jewish educators say Jewish education is not their career. For a majority of educators, part-time or not, Jewish education is their career.

Teachers in day schools and pre-schools under Orthodox sponsorship are the most likely to indicate they have a career in Jewish education. In these settings close to 90% describe themselves as having a career in Jewish education. Almost two-thirds of teachers in other day schools also describe Jewish education as their career, as do 56% of teachers in other pre-schools and 44% of supplementary school teachers.

### Retention

The majority of teachers we surveyed plan to continue working in their present positions (see Table 12). Across all settings, 64% of the teachers reported that they plan to

stay in their present positions over the next three years, and only 6% planned to seek a position outside Jewish education. In day schools, as many as 76% reported that they expected to stay in their current jobs. (Teachers in Orthodox and other day schools were similar in responding to this question.)

Table 12. Future Plans of Teachers in Jewish Schools

FUTURE PLANS	SETTINGS			TOTAL
	Day	Sup	Pre	
Continue Same Position	76%	56%	63%	64%
Change Schools	6%	4%	3%	4%
Change Positions	3%	2%	2%	2%
Seek a Position outside of Jewish Education	3%	9%	6%	6%
Other (e.g., going back to school)	2%	7%	5%	5%
Undecided	10%	22%	21%	18%

Note: Columns may not sum to 100% due to rounding.

Day school teachers who do not plan to stay in their current positions are most likely to be changing to a different school (6%) or do not know their plans (10%). Among supplementary and pre-school teachers who anticipate a change, the vast majority are uncertain about their plans for the next three years: 22% of supplementary and 21% of pre-school teachers are undecided.

#### Teacher Professional Involvement

Our interviews with teachers indicated that they play little role in developing school policies for curriculum and instruction. In general, the teacher's role is not to participate in developing the curriculum, but to implement it. Teachers generally feel autonomous in their



classrooms, but this freedom is constrained by curriculum and resources. Teachers seldom participate in networks beyond their own schools. Moreover, teachers have few opportunities to collaborate with other teachers even within their own schools. While the phenomenon of teacher isolation is not unknown in general education, it is exacerbated in Jewish education due to the part-time nature of most teachers' work.

By and large, teachers are at their institutions to meet their classes and to attend infrequent faculty meetings. This is true across all settings. Since their agreements with their institutions call for a certain amount of pay for a certain number of contact hours with students, principals are often reluctant to ask them to be present for professional discussions and teachers have accepted the "drop in" structure laid out for them. The framing of their work agreements and the structure of their work settings conspire to discourage teachers from collaborating together either in curricular areas or on professional matters that extend beyond the classroom walls. There are some exceptions, but, in general, teachers lead isolated professional lives that are separated from the conversations that affect their professional futures.

### Summary and Implications

Most teachers in Jewish schools have substantial experience in Jewish education, but many teachers are new to their current schools. Most plan to continue teaching in their current positions. In addition, a majority of teachers indicate that they have made Jewish education their careers. Even among part-time teachers, more than half describe themselves as having a career in Jewish education. Most strikingly, 44% of supplementary school teachers view their work in this way.

The commitment and stability reflected in these findings suggest that the notion of a profession of Jewish education is not as far-fetched as its part-time nature might indicate. If teachers plan to stay in Jewish education, and view it as a career, they may respond positively to increased opportunities for professional growth. Through professional growth, the weaknesses in pre-service training may be addressed. Moreover, the commitment and stability of teachers in Jewish education suggests that investment in their professional growth would have a long-term payoff.

### Conclusions

The findings in this report shed light on the characteristics of teachers in Jewish schools in North America. Although the study was restricted to three cities, the findings are similar to data available from other cities, and most likely reflect patterns that are common to many communities. The results show substantial diversity among teachers, both within and across settings, but on the whole one can say that although the field of Jewish teaching is not highly professionalized, the potential exists for enhancing the professional standards and conditions of teaching in Jewish schools.

A number of key findings contribute to this conclusion:

- (1) Roughly half the teachers have completed formal training in the field of education. Far fewer have degrees or certification in Jewish content areas; outside of Orthodox day schools, such training is especially rare.
- (2) Overall, 19% of teachers are formally trained in both education and Jewish content, 47% are trained in one area or the other, and 34% are not formally trained in either field.
- (3) Pre-collegiate Jewish education does not make up for teachers' limited backgrounds in Jewish content. Almost one-third of the teachers received no pre-collegiate Jewish education after age 13; this included 29% of supplementary school



teachers and 55% of pre-school teachers. Eleven percent of teachers in non-Orthodox pre-schools are not Jewish.

(4) In-service education also fails to compensate for limited formal training. Required workshops averaged 3.8 over two years for day school teachers, 4.4 for supplementary school teachers, and 6.2 among pre-school teachers. Particularly in day and supplementary schools, the amount of required in-service training was far below common standards for public school teachers.

(5) Interviews raised questions about the quality of in-service education, highlighting the isolated and fragmented character of workshops. In-service education is not targeted to meet teachers' diverse needs, and it is not part of a coherent plan for professional growth, particularly in day and supplementary schools.

(6) Coupled with limited formal training is the finding that work conditions are not professionalized. The teaching force is largely part-time. Even in day and pre-schools, around half the teachers work part time. Only 20% of teachers say their earnings from Jewish education are the main source of family income. Supplementary teachers are generally satisfied with their salaries, but day school teachers are less so and pre-school teachers are largely dissatisfied.

(7) Benefits are scarce, even for full-time teachers. Among full-time teachers in all settings, just 48% reported that they are offered health benefits, 45% have access to pensions, and 28% are offered disability coverage.

(8) Despite these conditions, most teachers in Jewish schools describe their work in Jewish education as a career. Even among supplementary school teachers, almost all of whom work part time, 44% say they have a career in Jewish education. Most teachers have six or more years of experience, and most plan to stay in the field.

What should we make of these findings? Taken as a whole, they suggest that improving the quantity and quality of professional growth for teachers, along with enhancing the conditions of employment, is the strategy most likely to improve the quality of the teaching force in Jewish schools.

#### Improving Opportunities for Professional Growth

Why should professional growth be the focus of reform efforts? First, obviously, many teachers are limited in their formal training, and improved and extended in-service



education may compensate for the lack of pre-service training. Second, the field of Jewish education is largely part-time, and many teachers choose it precisely because of that characteristic. Hence, while we do not mean to dismiss intensified recruitment efforts, the part-time nature of the work means it is unlikely that the field will be transformed through recruitment of a large cadre of teachers who are formally trained as Jewish educators.

Third, and most strikingly, enhancement of professional growth is a powerful strategy for reform because teachers are committed, stable, and career-oriented. Even among part-time teachers who lack formal training as Jewish educators, many view their work in Jewish education as a career, and plan to stay in their positions for some time to come. These teachers are a ripe target for higher standards for professional growth. While it is not realistic to expect Jewish schools to hire only trained teachers -- because the candidates are simply not available -- our data suggest that it is realistic to ask teachers to participate in some degree of high-quality on-going professional training.

Our findings about in-service education point to two directions for reform. First, the quantity must be increased. At present, the extent of in-service is far too meager, especially in day and supplementary schools, to compensate for background deficiencies. Second, the quality must be improved. Our interviews indicated that in-service experiences are isolated, fragmented, not targeted to meet diverse needs, and generally not part of a coherent program. These problems should be remedied.

Other analyses of our data suggest ways of addressing these problems. Gamoran et al. (1995) noted that supplementary teachers in a community that provided financial incentives to teachers and schools for attending workshops reported significantly higher levels

of required in-service. Also, teachers in pre-schools that are certified by the state reported more required workshops on average. These findings indicate that raising standards is possible, that the community as a whole can be a source of standards, and that financial inducements may help maintain adherence to standards.

Raising standards for quantity will be of little avail, however, if the quality of professional growth is not improved simultaneously. Staff development should emphasize the diverse needs of teachers, corresponding to their varied training, experience, subject matters, and grade levels. In-service reforms should also emphasize the need for a coherent, on-going program for teachers, instead of one-shot, isolated workshops. In light of teachers' commitment to their work, we anticipate that they would be eager to participate in high-quality, targeted programs.

#### Improving the Conditions of Work

Coupled with raising standards for professional growth of teachers, conditions of work must also be shifted towards higher standards. This is important for three reasons. First, it may encourage more people to train professionally as Jewish educators. Our data do not address this possibility, but it is plausible. Second, improving the conditions of work may encourage more teachers to work full time. Our data do address this notion: part-time teachers indicated that salary, benefits, and job security could make them consider full-time work. Standards for professional growth can be higher for full-time teachers, so the two reforms (more professional growth and more professional working conditions) could build upon one another. Third, improving work conditions for teachers is a moral imperative. In

this day, it is not appropriate that many teachers in Jewish schools work full time in Jewish education but are not offered health benefits.

Indeed, perhaps the most important reform of working conditions would be to extend benefit packages to teachers who work full time in Jewish education. Community agencies could create programs to provide benefits to teachers who create full-time work by teaching at more than one institution. Such programs could serve as incentives to increase the proportion of full-time teachers, and could include demands for intensive professional development.

Salaries for pre-school teachers pose a more difficult problem. Earnings are low and teachers are dissatisfied, but this is a characteristic of the field of early childhood education, and is not specific to Jewish schools. However, if Jewish schools could be on the forefront of increasing pay standards for early childhood education, they could also demand professional growth in the area of Jewish content as well as in child development, and this would address the most serious shortcoming among teachers in Jewish pre-schools.

#### Towards A Comprehensive Plan

To some extent, these problems can be addressed on a community by community basis, as each community studies its educators and devises a comprehensive plan in response. The need for community-wide planning in education is clear. Opportunities for full-time work and career advancement ultimately rest with the community as a whole. For example, the position of "community educator" provides an opportunity to create full-time work, with appropriate salary and benefits, by teaching at more than one school. In addition, these



educators may take on leadership responsibilities within the community, such as mentoring new teachers or peer coaching.

Questions about standards and accountability for educational personnel might also be addressed at the community level. Communities may design systems for professional development, which include standards for in-service training coupled with increased salaries and benefits for qualifying teachers. Although communities cannot set binding rules for individual schools, community guidelines might provide a moral force which would upgrade the quality of personnel. In addition to moral suasion, community standards might be backed up with community incentives, such as providing salary and benefit supplements to create "community educator" positions.

To succeed, a comprehensive plan would have to incorporate the full spectrum of the community, address the critical needs identified in this report, and be adequately funded to do so. At the same time, national Jewish organizations can play an important role in supporting these reform efforts, through setting standards, developing programs of in-service education, and providing intellectual resources and normative support for change. The task may be daunting, but the stakes are high, and now is the time to act.

### **Appendix: Data and Methods**

This study draws on two sources of data: a survey of teachers in Jewish schools; and a series of interviews with Jewish teachers, principals, and other educational leaders, in Atlanta, Baltimore, and Milwaukee. (Educational leaders were also surveyed; those results were reported by Goldring, Gamoran, and Robinson, 1995.) The surveys were administered in spring and fall of 1993 to all Judaica teachers at all Jewish day schools, supplementary schools, and pre-school programs in the three communities. General studies teachers in day schools were not included. Non-Jewish pre-school teachers who teach Judaica were included. Lead Community project directors in each community coordinated the survey administration. Teachers completed the questionnaires and returned them at their schools. (Some teachers who did not receive a survey form at school were mailed a form and a self-addressed envelope, and returned their forms by mail.) An updated version of the survey and the interview protocols is available from the CIJE (Gamoran et al., 1996).

Over 80% of the teachers in each community filled out and returned the questionnaire, for a total of 983 teachers out of 1192 who were surveyed. In analyzing the results, we avoided sampling inferences (e.g., t-tests) because we are analyzing population figures, not samples. Respondents include 302 day school teachers, 392 supplementary school teachers, and 289 pre-school teachers. Teachers who work at more than one type of setting were categorized according to the setting (day school, supplementary school, or pre-school) at which they teach the most hours (or at the setting they listed first if hours were the same for two types of settings). Each teacher is counted only once. If teachers were counted in all the settings in which they teach, the results would look about the same, except

that supplementary school teachers would look more like day school teachers, because 61 day school teachers also work in supplementary schools. In most cases, we report results separately by setting (day, supplementary, and pre-school); in some cases where differences were salient we further separate day schools and pre-schools under Orthodox sponsorship from other day and pre-schools.

Despite differences in the Jewish populations of the three communities, results were generally comparable across communities for schools of a given type, and we do not provide separate results by community in this report. The broad comparability of results from the three communities in this study suggests that the profile of teachers presented here is likely to resemble that of many other communities. Where possible, we provide results from other surveys carried out in Boston, Miami, and Los Angeles, which shed light on the generalizability of our results. We also compare findings to the 1990 National Jewish Population Survey, to see how teachers differ from other Jewish adults on some indicators.

Missing responses were excluded from calculations of percentages. Generally, less than 5% of responses were missing for any one item. An exception was the question about certification in Jewish education (see below). In two communities, many teachers left this blank, apparently because they were not sure what it meant. On the assumption that teachers who did not know what certification meant were not themselves certified, for this item only we calculated percentages based on the total who returned the survey forms, instead of the total who responded to the question.

The interviews for our study were designed and carried out by Julie Tammivaara, Roberta Goodman, and Claire Rottenberg, CIJE field researchers. Interviews were



conducted with teachers in pre-schools, supplementary schools, and day schools, as well as educational directors and educators at central agencies and institutions of Jewish higher learning. In total, 125 educators were interviewed, generally for one to two hours. All quotes in this report derive from those interviews.



## References

- Aron, Isa, and Bruce Phillips. (1988). Findings of the Los Angeles BJE Teacher Census. Paper presented at the Conference of the Research Network on Jewish Education, New York.
- Commission on Jewish Education in North America. (1990). A Time to Act. Lanham, MD: University Press of America.
- Dilworth, Mary E., and David G. Imig. (1995). "Professional Teacher Development." ERIC Review, 3 (3), 5-11.
- Frank, Naava, Daniel J. Margolis, and Alan Weisner. (1992). The Jewish School Teacher: Preliminary Report of a Study. Boston: Bureau of Jewish Education of Greater Boston.
- Gamoran, Adam, Ellen B. Goldring, Bill Robinson, Roberta Louis Goodman, and Julie Tammivaara. (1995). Background and Training of Teachers in Jewish Schools: Current Status and Levers for Change. New York: Council for Initiatives in Jewish Education.
- Gamoran, Adam, Ellen B. Goldring, Roberta Louis Goodman, Bill Robinson, and Julie Tammivaara. (1996). Manual for the CIJE Study of Educators. Version 2.0. New York: Council for Initiatives in Jewish Education.
- Gamoran, Emanuel. (1924). Teacher Training for Jewish Schools. Cincinnati: Union of American Hebrew Congregations.
- Goldring, Ellen, Adam Gamoran, and Bill Robinson. (1995). Educational Leaders in Jewish Schools: A Study of Three Communities. New York: Council for Initiatives in Jewish Education.
- Kosmin, Barry A., Sidney Goldstein, Joseph Waksberg, Nava Lerer, Ariella Keysar, and Jeffrey Scheckner. (1993). Highlights of the CJF National Jewish Population Survey. New York: Council of Jewish Federations.
- Schechter, Solomon. (1915). "The Problem of Religious Education." In Solomon Schechter, Seminary Addresses and Other Papers, pp. 105-117. Cincinnati: Ark Publishing Co.

Sheskin, Ira. (1988). The Miami Jewish Educator Study: Final Report. Miami: The Central Agency for Jewish Education.

Shulman, Lee S. (1986). "Those Who Understand: Knowledge Growth in Teaching." Educational Researcher, 15 (2), 4-14.





TO: Adam Gamoran, INTERNET:gamoran@ssc.wisc.edu  
CC: Ellen, INTERNET:GOLDRIEB@ctrvax.Vanderbilt.Edu

Re: Re: publications

Adam, first of all, thank you for your list, which I thought was terrific. I've been at the GA, which is why you haven't heard from me. Let me tell you where I'm at.

I have begun the serious, word-by-word editing of the Teachers Report and have three issues so far.

One is that I am not finding the overview as on target as I think it needs to be, and would like to set up a phone date to talk to you about it. I met with Gail for her preliminary "reality check," and she thought the questions I raised were worth pursuing with you.

Two is that I'm still not satisfied re the title. It still seems flat, and I've begun to think that "building the profession" doesn't mean anything to someone who isn't inside CIJE.

Three: When I raised a question with Gail about the context of one of the quotes from the interviews, she suggested that we may be able to ask Julie to retrieve some of the most potent quotes of her work to illuminate this report in a systematic way--on each subject as it comes up. This is a longer conversation.

I have already received quotes from the designer and we are getting very serious about the data base, so I think we'll be in a good position to distribute this properly. But we need to clarify the editorial issues that remain.

Here are a couple of times that would work for me:

11/26: any time between 3 and 5:30 New York time.

11/27: any time, but the morning is better.

Let me know if you can do those. If not, we'll work out something else. This project is on my 1996 workplan, and is now at the very top of the pipeline, if you'll forgive the mixed metaphor. By the time we speak, I'll have completed all the line-editing and should be able to review these larger questions, as well as smaller ones.

Thanks, and look forward to speaking to you.

Nessa


FROM: Adam Gamoran, INTERNET:gamoran@ssc.wisc.edu  
TO: Nessa Rapoport, 74671,3370  
DATE: 11/18/96 5:18 PM

Re: Re: publications

Sender: gamoran@ssc.wisc.edu  
Received: from duncan.ssc.wisc.edu (duncan.ssc.wisc.edu [144.92.190.57]) by  
arl-img-6.compuserve.com (8.6.10/5.950515)  
id RAA06255; Mon, 18 Nov 1996 17:17:42 -0500  
Received: from [144.92.174.173] by duncan.ssc.wisc.edu;  
(5.65v3.2/1.1.8.2/10May96-0433PM)  
id AA19309; Mon, 18 Nov 1996 16:15:12 -0600  
Message-Id: <2.2.16.19961118221700.41371188@ssc.wisc.edu>  
X-Sender: gamoran@ssc.wisc.edu  
X-Mailer: Windows Eudora Pro Version 2.2 (16)  
Mime-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"  
Date: Mon, 18 Nov 1996 16:17:00 -0600  
To: Nessa Rapoport <74671.3370@CompuServe.COM>  
From: Adam Gamoran <gamoran@ssc.wisc.edu>  
Subject: Re: publications

The afternoon of 11/26 would be a good time for me. I am free as of 2:30 my  
time, which is 3:30 your time. Should we make it a 3-way call, with Ellen?

Adam



TO: Ellen, INTERNET:GOLDRIEB@ctrvax.Vanderbilt.Edu  
Adam Gamoran, INTERNET:gamoran@ssc.wisc.edu

Re: Re: publications

Adam: 3:30 NY time on 11/26 (2:30 your time) is fine to discuss the Teachers Report. I'm letting you know, Ellen, by means of this e-mail. Please give me the numbers where you'll each be, so that Chava can set up the call. If I am ready, I'd like to send you the edited document ahead of time. Could you each e-mail the best address for you to receive it on, let's say, Friday? And then give me a Monday address, in case I'm not done.

Looking forward to it.

Nessa

