



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
43

Folder
15

Green, Kathy. "Leadership and Vision for Jewish Education / An Institute for Leaders in Jewish Education," co-sponsored by CIJE and Programs in Professional Education at Harvard, 1996.

Pages from this file are restricted and are not available online.
Please contact the [American Jewish Archives](https://www.AmericanJewishArchives.org) for more information.

TO: Alan, 73321,1220
Barry, 73321,1221
Gail, 73321,1217
Josie, 102467,616

Re: Harvard documented

I am delighted to report that Kathy Green has accepted the job. We are envisioning a 10-12 page typed document that I hope to use in many ways--St. Com., Board, but others as well. (I am thinking toward creating a 4-page printed broadsheet for recruitment, the annual report, and "making the case"; perhaps the first document in the official packet of planning for JEWEL!)

I am also looking to hire a pro photographer for B & W photos on Wed. at Harvard. Gail: I am thinking about the day Twersky teaches. Do you think he would give us permission? Also, after your Monday gig, please give me five minutes to create a list of documents we should send her to contextualize our work. (She already has the kit.)

ALAN:

1. By separate memo I'll send you the formal details re Kathy. I don't even have a ball park yet for the photographer.

2. Following a call to me from Barry this AM: Please announce as chair that the next lunch seminar will be given by Sherry Blumberg. Her topic will be (not the final title): "Toward a Philosophy of Reform Jewish Education." Barry has suggested that we create a list of special guests for that seminar, which I will do with him and others.

March 11, 1996

Kathy Green
324 Ward St.
Newton Center, MA 02159

Dear Kathy:

In preparation for the Harvard Institute, Gail and I suggest the enclosed articles as background:

The Overview and Conclusions of CIJE's as yet unpublished work on educational leaders. This work on leaders is taken from *The CIJE Study of Educators*, from which the policy brief on teachers was drawn. The Harvard Institute has been conceptualized in relation to this data and to data and theory on school leaders in general education. (Note: This paper is confidential.)

Sergiovanni, T., "Becoming a Community of Learners"

Murphy, Joseph, The Landscape of Leadership Preparation: Reframing the Education of School Administrators, Chapters 4 and 6

Deal, Terrence E., "Leaders or Managers: Which Do We Need Most?" (Terry Deal was the speaker at the first CIJE Board Seminar)

I'm also including a preliminary draft of Prof. Daniel Pekarsky's paper on the "The Place of Vision in Jewish Educational Reform," as the necessary complement to all of the above.

I look forward to speaking to you on Thursday--and to seeing you next week.

Best,

Nessa Rapoport

9/4/96

W/Kathy Green on her Harvard piece

Not sure what she can do to make it better.

Doesn't feel like her writing.

Task To report on + event.

Can be critical. Not role.

Not a technical problem. In BP, jargon that she assumes everyone knows. Not a technical problem of defining terms.

Ways in which she can be critical.

1. More J content in future. Some specifics where I didn't agree.

2. Keegan of adult devel. servs - neglects Eric Emswiler.

3. happy to emphasize his therapeutic shift. positive impact; deserved to be praised.

Wasn't hostile or bored.

More personal - more casual.

I think the piece is competently done. Whether involving or boring is another question.

Ways of addr underlying issues: What does being, leadership mean? Not part of the conf. itself. They were given, but not part of the discussion.

Does she want to try again?

Themes were interviewers, whether by design or serendipity.

Let me think about it. A gen. unknown fact about my life. I asked as a newspaper reporter. She did a great job of reporting.

2 related interests:

-time - not the first or last time I write for CWK

-wants to wk w/me as an editor

-BP descriptions - semi-academic description

Chair
Morton Mandel

Vice Chairs
Billie Gold
Ann Kaufman
Matthew Maryles
Maynard Wishner

Honorary Chair
Max Fisher

Board
David Arnov
Daniel Bader
Mandell Berman
Charles Bronfman
John Colman
Maurice Corson
Susan Crown
Jay Davis
Irwin Field
Charles Goodman
Alfred Gottschalk
Neil Greenbaum
David Hirschhorn
Gershon Kekst
Henry Koschitzky
Mark Lainer
Norman Lamm
Marvin Lender
Norman Lipoff
Seymour Martin Lipset
Florence Melton
Melvin Merians
Lester Pollack
Charles Ratner
Esther Leah Ritz
William Schatten
Richard Scheuer
Ismar Schorsch
David Teutsch
Isadore Twersky
Bennett Yanowitz

Executive Director
Alan Hoffmann

May 7, 1996

*Harvard as a paradigm of excellence.
(Send her Wilson.)*

Dear Kathy:

Here is my attempt to formulate the changes I would like to see in the piece. As I said, you did a good job in describing the institute: the teachers, the schedule, the attendees, the course of the days. What I missed was an overriding conceptual structure and a synthetic--rather than chronological--approach to the institute, one that would give people a deep understanding of the content (see below) and answer the questions people may not even know how to ask:

Why does this institute matter? You need to be able to take your readers inside the issues behind the institute: That, according to CIJE's research, principals get even less professional development than teachers; that leaders, like all professionals, need to be able "to keep abreast of the field, to learn exciting new ideas and techniques, and to be invigorated by contact with their colleagues"--to quote from the end of the "Plan for Action" in the fold-out of the CIJE Policy Brief.

You might also look at section f. in that plan: "The plan should recognize what has been learned from educational research: The educational director is indispensable in creating a successful environment for teaching and learning. For teachers to implement change, they must be supported by leaders who can foster vision. These leaders must also be committed, knowledgeable, skilled--and engaged in their own professional development." This thinking was instrumental in the conceptualization and design of the Harvard institute. CIJE views the leaders' ability to rally their institution and those associated with it around a new vision of teaching and learning as pivotal for genuine change.

What is a typical professional development opportunity for Jewish educational leaders and why was Harvard different? Here you could draw on your own experience in years of observing, teaching, and running Jewish schools to talk about what has been missing for leaders of Jewish schools.

What were the concepts underlying this institute? What is the cutting-edge thinking about leadership and vision in general education--and what are the

implications for Jewish schools? How did the presenters make the case for vision? What might such a vision look like and mean in a Jewish school? You say, on p. 1, "Thus leadership strategies were seen as means for realizing our vision," or "The first night Daniel Pekarsky described a vision which he has for a Jewish school," but you don't tell us what the vision is. Rather, you are telling us "about," which does not allow us to understand.

For example, on p. 5 you say: '...in fact, these presentations conveyed significant ideas and information. Examples of these presentations include: panels led by Gail and Ellen Goldring,' etc., but you don't give the reader a "significant idea" that would help him/her understand the content of the presentation. If you look through your essay, you'll see that one cannot come away from it with a deep sense of ideas and their importance for the life of schools.

In addition: How did the institute attempt to bring together ideas from the Jewish and general domains? What kind of expertise did the institute assemble? Here I don't mean you to provide readers with a list of participants and their credentials but to emphasize the importance for the participants of juxtaposing very disparate fields of knowledge.

Identify the two or three most exciting presenters/ideas of the institute (at least one Jewish, one general) and take us inside those ideas. You do not need to tell readers everything that happened, but rather capture the experience by choosing the most dynamic, surprising, "transformative" events that took place. For example, at the CIJE board meeting, it was clear that Robert Kegan's categories, especially transformative thinking after 40, made a big impression. You might choose to focus on why a talk on adult development made such an impact on leaders who are immersed, for the most part, in child development. If appropriate--because I don't know the answer to this question--talk about the need to change the way the adult community of a school (leaders, teachers, board members, parents) think, to create a different culture in a school.

Or: When you say: "Ray Levi, an institute participant and principal of a Cleveland Jewish day school,...described in detail his leading his school into higher levels of self-definition and in so doing provided an inspirational

example for other school teachers,” you do not take us into any examples of the “detail.” As a result, we cannot even guess how Ray’s school might be different than it was before, or how the reflection on and implementation of a serious, coherent vision might transform the daily life of his school. (We can only know this only through living examples from that daily life.)

“Critical colleagues”: One of the important byproducts of this and the previous institute was not an aim but a hypothesis. That is, many are skeptical that leaders from very different backgrounds, ideologies and denominations can share an experience like this and truly grow together. In both institutes, the transdenominational nature of the experience was cited afterwards as having a transformative effect on the home community.

Similarly, I would mention the team approach from communities and CIJE’s commitment to make change not in one institution but “systemically”—meaning that people should create a community of professional peers, across school settings and denominational lines, to be able to get the kind of support and cross-fertilization that is so often missing. This has been considered one of the most important consequences of the institutes, since “community mobilization for Jewish education” is critical to the success of our mission. These kinds of high-level, high-intensity seminars do indeed rally people and excite them about change/reform efforts in Jewish education, especially since the participants communicate their enthusiasm to the lay boards, etc., when they return. (We heard concrete evidence of this at the board meeting.)

You touch on this briefly at the top of p. 8 but do not do justice, I feel, to the implications for change.

Narrative voice: The tone needs to be more objectively descriptive and less impressionistically personal. (Comments such as the one on the bottom of p. 4 about the transparencies would be delightful in another context, but are not appropriate for this audience.) You are writing not as one of the principals but as a journalist/observer, trying to engage people (often high-profile business/communal leaders) who are committed to changing Jewish education and to making sure their grandchildren don’t “hate Hebrew school” but know nothing about the “insides” of Jewish schools and issues of teaching and learning. Think the old *New Yorker* and the way its reporters could write about

geology in the Midwest and still make it interesting for the general reader.

As I said to you earlier, this is not the place for the analysis you offered on pp. 7 and 8 about what was missing in specific instances. Certainly there is room to talk about what might be further developed in the future, what directions seemed particularly interesting to participants, and how this kind of opportunity might fit into a more comprehensive plan for the professional development of educational leaders; no one who conceived this is under the illusion that one intensive seminar or even two a year represent systematic, comprehensive or sustained professional development for leaders.

Rather, the institute models an approach, acts as a “lab” for us, exposes serious leaders and communities to an example of what is possible, and provides the seeds to grow something more sustained in the future. Since, as you say, most have never experienced anything like it, that is an important contribution.

I hope these notes are clarifying and look forward to speaking to you soon.

Nessa Rapoport

revision.

To Nessa Rapoport
CIJE
Fax: 212 532-2646
Telephone: 212 532-2360

From Kathy Green
Telephone: 617 630-0896



3/14/96

w/ Kathy

Schools as agencies of cultural transmission

∴ not just curricular but social

Pek is clever in resolv. prob. in liberal day schools / lack of def. umbrella

but in creating this model in designing for outcome of student, authentic

Roy Arzt as stand-in director (was dir. in 1969)

Leadership and Vision for Jewish Education / An Institute
for Leaders in Jewish Education co-sponsored by Council
for Initiatives in Jewish Education and Programs in
Professional Education at Harvard

Kathy Green - May 1996



I have never attended a conference like it. The title said it all: Leadership and Vision for Jewish Education / An Institute for Leaders in Jewish Education co-sponsored by Council for Initiatives in Jewish Education and Programs in Professional Education at Harvard. Perhaps the word "institute" in the title was a key to accounting for its difference. Conferences have their ups and downs, their less than successful papers and their panels with presenters whose subject matter bears only the remotest relationship to the announced topic. Even the best conferences have their flaws. Maybe, I wondered, an institute is different from a conference. Resorting to a quick check of a dictionary proved that there is hardly any difference between a conference and an institute. Semantics did not account for the unique learning experience of participating in the CIJE / Harvard institute or conference or whatever you want to call it.

In fact, the experience began with just that, above quoted, title given out as the cover page of a bulging notebook at registration. The title "Leadership and Vision for Jewish Education" defined the institute. All presentations which would be offered in the coming four and a half days were related either to vision or to leadership or to their combination. Thus leadership strategies were seen as tools for realizing visions. "Change" played as a leit motif, for change is implicit in any new articulation of vision. The notebook was divided by conference day, and within each day articles were arranged chronologically by order of presentation. These articles were recommended reading suggested by each presenter; each presenter's collection of articles was prefaced by a brief prospectus of his or her presentation. The total anthology was superb, with articles ranging from such classics as John Dewey's writing on experiential learning and selections from Maimonides' Mishneh Torah to the latest thinking on governance and board members' responsibilities. Articles inter-related with one another. Thus Presenter John Kegan's collection of suggested reading contained an article by Osterman and Kottkamp on reflective practice; the article included references to Dewey's view that learning requires involvement and experience, a position espoused in an article by Dewey which could be found in Presenter Daniel Pekarsky's section of the anthology. The Osterman and Kottkamp article further identified two types of teaching leadership: reflective and more participatory versus abstract or more lecture style. It was interesting to realize that these styles were actually represented by presenters, with occasions when

both styles were contained in the same session. Thus the notion of reflective practice which is widely talked about in the world of general education served to stimulate Jewish educators to reflect on the styles of teaching to which they were exposed during the institute.

Why is the quality of the notebook with its many inter-connections important, or for that matter, why is the conference important? The quality of the notebook might be understood as paradigmatic. The high academic quality of the notebook credited participants with intellectual talents and thoughtfulness; participants were rightfully identified as leaders rather than dismissed as bureaucrats. The notebook represented only one among many thought provoking, intellectually enhancing elements of the institute. Finally if the notebook were to serve as a model that participants might choose to adapt for other conferences, it set a high standard. It conveyed important and subtle messages to participants: the conference faculty care so much about your learning and growth that we carefully prepared the materials for you in advance of the conference and give you this tangible gift to take home and ruminate over. With some from the world of general education and others from Jewish studies, the diverse articles were linked in theme and excellence. It also was interesting to note in contrast to many in house Jewish publications, each article's copyright was acknowledged along with publisher's permission.

And why was the conference itself important, as well as well done? That educational leaders are important is self-evident. Educational leaders are the shapers of policy and instrumental in bringing ideas to fruition. (For further substantiation see, "The educational director is indispensable in creating a successful environment for teaching and learning. For teachers to implement change, they must be supported by leaders who can foster vision. These leaders must also be committed, knowledgeable, skilled, and engaged in their own professional development."----- Plan for Action in the CIJE Policy Brief.) That their own professional development is probably the most neglected of all groups within the field of Jewish education may not be common knowledge, but a recent study by the Council for Initiatives in Jewish Education documented that of all workers in the vineyard of Jewish education top administrators and principals are the least likely to be serviced by professional in-service conferences. That such conferences can participate in professional development and thereby help the Jewish community is indeed highly likely. If a conference facilitates nothing more than "networking" among participants, such a venture might well be deemed successful. Finally, one good conference can serve as a model for others; participants take back

home with them paradigms for use in their own communities. In this case, they took home a paradigm of excellence.

The first night of the institute Daniel Pekarsky described a way of infusing a Jewish school with a sense of vision. The next morning the conference director, Gail Dorf distributed notes of the previous night's lecture. This pattern of next morning notes of the previous day's presentation would continue through out the conference. The participants' first reaction was: Great, I don't have to take notes. But actually participants did take notes, as one educator was heard explaining: It's my learning style; note taking helps me concentrate. After a few days, in a first-thing-in-the-morning check in session Danny Pekarsky pointed out the pedagogic benefit of these notes. He said that the notes represented a pairush, a commentary, to each presentation and would vary with each note taker. Certainly the distribution of notes supported participants' sense that they were being pedagogically well cared for.

It would be easy to suggest that the conference organizers were "modeling" teaching strategies and behaviors, (and yes, self-confessed modeling was happening) but more was going on. There was an intensity, a depth, and an integration of content and process which went far beyond "modeling." Trying to account for that intensity, depth and integration is what this article is about.

It maybe useful to return for a moment to those notebooks. The first pages of the notebook were devoted to daily schedules and to biographies of institute faculty members. Each day (with minor exceptions to adjust for the first "day" evening session) was structured alike. Each day began with a review lead by Gail of the above mentioned notes, and each day ended with an evaluation questionnaire which participants were asked to complete and hand in before leaving. Typical questions on the questionnaire included: What is the relevance and value of the session to your work? How was the instructor most/least effective and why? In between the parentheses beginning and ending the day were presentations. Styles of presentation varied radically; following below are some examples.

Daniel Pekarsy, a professor of education at the University of Wisconsin, a consultant to the Council on Initiative in Jewish Education, and otherwise known as Danny, as noted above, gave the first talk the first (Sunday) evening. Danny's manner of presentation was charming and dramatic within the confines of a traditional lecture. He

might well be understood as the “keynote.” Using John Dewey’s University of Chicago Laboratory School as a model, he discussed how Jewish educators might use the model of the Lab School to structure their own schools. He did not provide Jewish content; rather he exhibited the tools that Dewey and his colleagues had used to create a consistent vision in their school. Describing consistency of shared vision, he read from an artifact of the Laboratory School: a listing of goals by a shop teacher who wrote about how students could learn about the scientific method while mastering the use of a carpenter’s plane. The message was clear and clever: a liberal Jewish school might circumvent problems with ideology by orienting all its curricula as response to a single question. That question is what manner of Jewish adult do you want graduates of your school to be? If the educational leader has an answer to that question, then he or she can recruit or convince faculty to share, like the Laboratory School’s shop teacher, vision.

Danny had neatly done away with a problem that plagues non-orthodox Jewish schools. He had avoided the problem of ideology envy of the orthodox. (“They have a ready response for why you do it: God commanded it !”) At the same time he offered an exciting, albeit not unproblematic alternative. As a director of an early childhood program was heard to lament: Shared vision ! I have such recruitment problems that I have to employ teachers who aren’t Jewish. Danny assured participants that the dream could become reality; he had seen it work when as a child he had been a student in the Laboratory School. Provided with an example, i.e. the Laboratory School, it was up to participants to craft their own visions, melding Jewish content with forms taken from the world of general education.

The evening had begun strongly. It had included welcoming remarks by Gail and also from Linda Greyser from Harvard. Danny had set a tone of intellectual seriousness and articulated an organizing theme of vision for the conference. The first evening ended at about 9:30 and the next day began at 8:30 a.m. , which may be another factor in accounting for intensity. There was little free time; participants were constantly bombarded by issues and information. After a day it became apparent that participants were not getting much sleep. They were eating, sleeping and drinking Jewish education. (In fact, the last day, Gail responding to the query “How do you feel?” replied with typical, smiling good humor: “I wanna go home.”)

The major presentations of the next day (Monday) were by Daniel Marom and Eleanor Adam. Daniel, an advanced fellow at the Mandel Institute for the Advanced Study and Development of Jewish Education in Jerusalem, and co-director of the Mandel Institute’s Educated Jew project, was confronted by a difficult task. His task was no less

than to present the thinking of Menahem Brinker on vision and content of the Jewish educational enterprise. Brinker, a scholar of Hebrew literature and philosophy at Hebrew University, had along with his colleagues in the Educated Jew project been asked to write a description of his ideal graduate of a Jewish educational program. Included in his description was his thinking about what would constitute ideal content and form of Jewish education. Basically and most simply his vision is that of Jewish peoplehood or family free to pursue whatever they themselves define as Jewish. Realize the oversimplification of subtle and complex thinking on the part of a sophisticated scholar. Daniel Marom, who was rapidly being identified as Donny, valiantly worked with the 65 or so conference participants/students both to understand Brinker's thinking and to decide whether they agreed with it. The complexity of the Brinker text was reflected in two participants' reactions: Next year texts should be sent out weeks in advance so we aren't reading articles the night before they are discussed. And: We're doing well for a morning session, but Brinker is so challenging and interesting we could have used days to discuss him. These comments reflect the seriousness with which participants were taking the conference; it is difficult to imagine the busy head of a BJE volunteering to read a complicated philosophical statement as homework. A brief "free write" session later allowed participants to vent their disagreements with Brinker as well as ways in which they could identify with him. Participants were being exposed to the "cutting edge" ideas of some of the best thinkers in Jewish education; their ideas had consequences for participants. In fact, one of the most significant new strategies was the very act of soliciting the contributions of seminal thinkers (like Brinker) from within the Jewish community but outside the narrow confines of Jewish education per se. Eventually participants were divided into small groups and challenged by the following scenario.

A group of parents has petitioned the (secular) Brinker school to include prayer in its curriculum, arguing that it is important that Jewish students learn about Jewish culture through the actual experience of praying. In order to respond you must develop a series of possible responses for consideration and decision on the part of your teaching staff and board. What could be some of the possible responses which you would suggest for consideration? This truly difficult question had actually been experienced in other contexts by some participants.

After a brief break, the conference moved on to Eleanor Adam, education officer with the Ministry of Education and Training in Ontario. While ostensibly Eleanor was going to teach participant/students about promoting collaborative culture in educational institutions and strategies for facilitating change, in fact, she enriched the conference by

introducing another style of teaching. Thus, participants were witness to an example of manifest and hidden curricula: on the one hand, she was talking about building a learning community, and on the other, she was teaching about craft projects that could help adults “brainstorm” new ideas. She had participants cutting and pasting and drawing with magic markers. Groups were created by the happenstance of sitting at one or another of the perhaps ten long tables in the room. Participants made posters of their ideas and resources, secured them to walls, and cruised around the room, reading each other’s posters. Participants watched short clips of videotapes with symbolic or motivational messages. For example, the actor Steve Martin’s rapidly changing facial expressions when confronted with the news of his daughter’s engagement in the film Father of the Bride effectively illustrated

Eleanor’s point about how difficult institutional change is. Eleanor moved at rapid fire pace from one activity to the next. Participants who wanted tachlis to take home, were happy with new strategies for reaching teachers and parents or board members as Eleanor flew to her next overhead projector transparency.

Interestingly, referring back to the article about reflective practices, it was apparent that Eleanor encompassed both “experiential” learning and a more traditional didactic mode. Once again another example of the inter-connectedness became apparent: an article about reflective practice could be used to reflect on the teaching style of a presenter.

There were many themes that could be traced through conference presentations and readings, but first as the days of the institute begin to unfold it may be useful to categorize presenters and their presentations in terms of the conference’s structure. Presentations can, in fact, be divided into two categories: major and not-so-major. There were major presentations by Richard Chait, a management specialist beginning his tenure at Harvard; Paul Hanson, a professor of Bible at the Harvard Divinity School and at the Dept. of Near Eastern Languages and Civilization at Harvard University; Mary Louise Hatten, a visiting scholar at the Harvard Graduate School of Education and a professor in the Graduate School of Management at Simmons College; Robert Kegan, a “life span developmental psychologist” and senior lecturer in human development at the Harvard Graduate School of Education and Educational Chair of the Institute for Management of Lifelong Education; and Isadore Twersky, professor of Hebrew Literature and Philosophy at Harvard and CIJE board member. Interspersed among these major presentations were shorter presentations which were offered by “in house” CIJE staff or institute participants. While not-so-major serves as a convenient label, in fact, these presentations conveyed significant ideas and information. Examples of these presentations included: a panel lead by Gail and Ellen Goldring, professor and

associate dean at Vanderbilt's Peabody College and co-director of CIJE's Monitoring, Evaluation and Feedback project; another panel lead by Gail and Barry Holtz, associate professor of Jewish Education at the Jewish Theological Seminary and consultant to CIJE; and yet another panel lead by Gail and Ray Levi, an institute participant and principal of a Cleveland Jewish day school.

Two examples of these panels should serve to convey their flavor. Ray Levi, for instance, described in detail his attempt to lead his school into higher levels of self definition through pursuit of a new strategic plan. He spoke of bringing together all participants in the school - faculty, staff, students, parents, board members - in search of an articulation of a defining vision. He even spoke about how architectural decisions in the course of school remodeling could be interpreted as manifesting the values and vision of the school. Donny Maron had worked, consulting with Ray, and the coincidence of "good chemistry" as well as very hard work was acknowledged. Gail had introduced the session as integrative of threads of the conference brought into real life. Ray acknowledged that part of his own motivation had been to raise the level of his thinking about the school's problems beyond the daily mundane. It was apparent that Ray was guiding his school closer to the ideal vision that Danny Pekarsky had described on the first night of the conference.

Barry and Gail's panel was the last presentation of the institute and functioned as a net to capture suggestions for improvement. One idea to emerge was to create a centrally (CIJE) dispersed directory of participants' e mail and fax numbers as a response to complaints from some participants that they feel lonely and isolated professionally in their home communities. This suggestion has already been implemented.

There were eight major presentations, including those of Robert Kegan, who spoke twice; surely the number of major presentations also serves to help account for the intensity of a four day conference. Gail, Ellen, and Daniel Marom stayed for the whole conference while Danny Pekarsky and Barry Holtz attended most of the time. Nessa Rapoport, leadership development officer, and other CIJE staff participated for shorter time spans. Harvard coordinators Linda Greyser and Lelia Seropian were in attendance but their presentations were in such areas as introductions and welcoming remarks. The Harvard presenters were available after their presentations. In fact, Mary Lou Hatten stayed to brainstorm with a group of participants from Atlanta. But they did not attend other sessions, possibly contributing to a feeling that they were "hired guns,"

in contrast to the CIJE staff, which enjoyed the added advantage of previously working with many conference participants.

Occasional visits by such local Jewish educators/leaders as Barry Shrag, director of Boston's Combined Jewish Philanthropies; Josh Elkins, Solomon Schechter Day School headmaster; Herman Blumberg, congregational rabbi; and others also lent support to the enterprise.

The succeeding days brought presentations as varied as those of the first day and a half. The "major" presentations by Harvard faculty could be further subdivided into more subtle categories. Some were more methodological in content, while others seemed more directed at nurturing the inner psychological or intellectual or religious life of the leaders/participants. Talks by Mary Lou Hatten and Robert Chait could be labelled as methodological; they each taught management techniques using case study strategies. The task of the participants/students was integration or synthesis, to take sophisticated business school methodologies and apply them in their own Jewish institutions. Mary Lou used vocabulary from the world of business and finance, vocabulary that Jewish educators needed to translate or integrate into their own, not for profit frameworks. For example, Mary Lou explained how functional analysis could be applied to four functions within an institution: marketing, programs, finances and human resources. After seeing how functional analysis could apply to a case study of the Steuben Glass Co., participants were asked to apply it to their schools and agencies. No one objected on ideological grounds, but the task was not easy. Mary Lou had made her case effectively and passionately. She was offering new tools to what Jewish educators see as age old problems of recruitment of teachers and students and collection of money.

Similarly Richard Chait spoke convincingly about strategies for assembling and managing a board. He asked how professionals could help create boards that are "more active but less intrusive." What constitutes appropriate tasks for board members and what doesn't? he asked. One participant probably spoke for many others when she observed: If our board chair person knows about governance from his or her business, then it seems only right that we have the same strategies available to us.

While Richard Chait dealt with such quasi external issues as what decisions are or are not appropriate for board members to grapple with, Robert Kegan asked participants to consider internal issues. He began the first of his two sessions advocating adult learning and development and suggested that for educational institutions to thrive Jewish

educators must work with adults. His insight was buttressed by demography which sees the aging of the American populace. He expounded his own theory of development within the adult years (the socializing mind, the self-authority mind, and the self-transforming mind). Perhaps more importantly, in his second session he asked participants to consider themselves. He identified himself not as a “shrink” but rather as a “stretch” and through note taking with a partner guided participants in confronting obstacles that stand in the way of changing, especially in professional ways. The categories that Bob asked participants to react to were challenging: In column A, write your genuine commitment or conviction. In column B what are you doing or not doing to stop your commitment or conviction? In column C write your fear in changing what you wrote in column B and also write about the commitment implicit in that fear. Finally in column D complete the statement: I assume that if I do/do not (am/am not), then what will happen is _____. While Bob assured participants that no one need reveal anything they did not want to, individuals were surprisingly frank and open. Bob cautioned participants who wanted to change their behaviors to do so slowly. He cited his first exercise with the group as an appropriate beginning place. In that exercise participants learned that it was more effective to compliment someone by speaking directly to that person. It is more effective, for example, to say “Hayim Yonkele, I really like the way you did your job,” rather than before an audience, “Hayim Yonkele did a really fine job.” Bob was a popular speaker; Gail announced that institute participants had bought out his latest book at the Harvard Coop Bookstore.

What was more significant than the fact that participants responded positively to Bob’s presentation was the degree to which his entire approach was consistent with new ideas in education articulated by the CIJE. This new thinking suggests that it is more important to invest in the personality of an educator rather than in just providing educational strategies. The idea is that the personality of the educator is the heart and soul of teaching; teaching strategies are only band-aids. A teacher who by dint of personality is able to reach out effectively to students will find materials and methods for teaching; all the strategies and tricks in the world can only be of marginal help to a teacher lacking in appropriate human skills.

Professors Twersky and Hanson, although very different from one another might be linked in a category of religious thinker/teacher. Dr. Hanson reflected on the state of American religious community and upon Christianity’s need for both the Jews and dialogue with the Jewish community. For educators working and perhaps living completely within the confines of the Jewish community it was an important message.

Dr. Hanson delivered his talk after dinner on the top floor of the Kennedy School, an impressive setting replete with views of Cambridge. Professor Twersky's presentation was quite different. He came into the large room at the Harvard Education School that was used throughout the conference. He put down a few books on a table, seated himself and began to teach. With few introductory remarks, he began reading from and commenting on his texts. He encouraged questions: Don't hesitate to ask; we will get through as much as we get through. He began by discussing the notion of vision within Judaism and related the story of Hanina ben Tradyon, who when burned by the Romans, saw the letters of Torah flying to heaven while the parchment was consumed by flames. Dr. Twersky interpreted the story as expressing the eternal power of the essential Jewish vision, namely Torah. Later he turned to Maimonides' Guide for the Perplexed and Mishneh Torah, where he found such insight as the importance of loving kindness in Jewish life in general and Jewish education in particular. A participant observed: If we take seriously the dictum that everything should be done with loving kindness, shouldn't that loving kindness extend to include the reception we give to parents whom we know are only motivated to walk into our schools because they want a bar mitzvah for their kid? Participants sensed the authenticity of the enterprise of studying with Professor Twersky. Other presenters had come to the institute on a first name basis; no one thought of calling Professor Twersky Isadore. There is within Judaism the concept of the ba'al midot, a person of fine moral qualities, and there was the sense that Professor Twersky, who read each text with a strong but gentle and patient voice, was striving to realize the qualities of a ba'al midot. Ironically Professor Twersky, whose teaching style was most devoid of clever techniques and was most traditionally Jewish, embodied the latest idea in Jewish education: namely that the central task is to focus on the personality of the teacher.

Having considered the institute's distinguished faculty, it is time to ask who participants were. About 90% (?) were women. Very few had not been born in America. Perhaps two were Israeli, one or two South Africans, probably a few Canadians. They ranged from novice to veteran in their jobs which were generally in leadership positions within day schools, bureaus, day care programs, supplementary schools. Since this was the second annual assemblage of the institute, why had they come or in some cases come back? For some the answer was obvious: connection with the CIJE, especially in such model cities as Atlanta, Baltimore, and Milwaukee, or subsidizing grants. The representation of teams from these model cities afforded the added benefit that members of teams could work together without interruptions and scheduling problems they might encounter at home. They also benefitted not only from their encounters with authorities in

their fields but also from witnessing how effectively the CIJE staff functioned as a team. Once again the CIJE staff served as an important model. Furthermore a participant who was not the beneficiary of subsidy but rather an individual who “came on his own” explained the attraction : It is not denominational. If CAJE is its non denominational competitor, then the quality here is higher. Reaching across denominational barriers is a powerful experience for us. And the networking can be helpful reaching far beyond the for and a half days of an institute. Another participant commented: It was gratifying to have the opportunity to come together with peers and to be pushed to think about ideas rather than solving bureaucratic problems.

What was missing from the conference? A strategic and wise decision had been made in planning the conference: denominational conflicts were mitigated by eliminating public prayer. Some felt its absence but all appreciated the lack of conflict. While Gail’s authentic Judaism came through as she announced Rosh Hodesh or found a reference in Pirkei Avot, there were fewer major sessions with explicit Jewish content than there were sessions from general education. Form perhaps won out over content. The message seemed to be that participants would, in their own persons, supply the Judaism. Their task was to integrate what was relevant from the methodologies presented. But that is not quite fair, for it neglects to recognize the constant questions raised by Ellen Goldring, Donny Marom, Danny Pekarsky and others about vision driven schools. Yet a nagging question remained: Participants were asked to integrate or synthesize insights from disparate sources, from general education and from Jewish education, but what if their own knowledge was heavily weighted in favor of one camp or another? A survey conducted a few years ago by CIJE in its model cities of Atlanta, Baltimore and Milwaukee revealed the following information about professional training of teachers in Jewish education. Thirty-five percent are trained in education; 12 % in Jewish studies; 19 % in both; and 34 % in neither. Hopefully if such a survey selected out people in positions of administrative leadership, namely participants in the conference, the statistics might tell a better tale. But might there be room for further development in the future for the institute to serve a remedial function by offering more Jewish content? Gail explained that the conference had been planned on a collegial model with no ambition of remediation. Clearly significant goals for the conference had been realized: participants were struggling at synthesizing insights from widely disparate sources toward evolving their own visions and leadership for Jewish education. In fact, the level of each presentation had been wonderfully high; and questions from participants were at equally high levels. The atmosphere had been warm and at the same time professional in tone.

The feeling was of peers learning from peers, and in some special moments learning from great scholars, such as time spent with Professor Twersky. By the end of the conference there was the sense that each participant, with his or her varied needs, had something to take home: ideas, strategies, questions, insights, methods, contacts, personal/professional growth. Furthermore, if remediation, however defined, was a task awaiting participants in their home communities, then the conference helped strengthen them to assume that responsibility. Participants are, after all, the leaders. There was a sense that whatever their role definitions at the institute, everyone learned from one another in the spirit of: I have learned much from my teachers; more from my colleagues; but most from my students.

So what really accounts for the quality of the institute? Was it the quality and diversity of faculty and staff? The strength of the planners' conceptualization? Participants' willingness to participate seriously and even stay up late to do preparatory reading? The thoughtful choice of speakers? The integration of speakers' topics and varied styles of presentation? The willingness on the part of participants and staff to work hard at the conference? Hevrashaft, roughly translated as conviviality and good humor? Lack of sleep and tight schedule? The fact that most participants and staff were largely separated from family and other professional obligations? Participants' eagerness to grow, willingness to reflect and to share insights with personal openness combined to make for a truly extraordinary experience.

No, I have never been to a conference like it, but then I realized, it wasn't a conference; rather it was an educational experience. The vocabulary had been wrong. The group was not comprised of participants and presenters, but rather of students and teachers: learners and leaders one and all.