



THE JACOB RADER MARCUS CENTER OF THE AMERICAN JEWISH ARCHIVES

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

Series D: Adam Gamoran Papers. 1991–2008.

Subseries 1: Lead Communities and Monitoring, Evaluation, and Feedback (MEF),
1991–2000.

Box
62

Folder
6

Update memos and progress reports, 1993-1994.

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

From: IN:"GOLDRIEB@VUCTRVAX.BITNET" 13-JUL-1993 12:10:21.68
To: IN:"GAMORAN@ssc.wisc.edu"
CC:
Subj: RE: draft letter to Julie --let me know if you advise changes or not sendingit

Return-path: <GOLDRIEB@VUCTRVAX.BITNET>

Received: from VUCTRVAX (GOLDRIEB@VUCTRVAX) by ssc.wisc.edu (PMDF #3035) id
<01H0HRQWISDS90MU98@ssc.wisc.edu>; Tue, 13 Jul 1993 12:09:57 CST

Received: from ctrvax.Vanderbilt.Edu by ctrvax.Vanderbilt.Edu (PMDF #3899) id
<01H0HLXJS18ABWZ00P@ctrvax.Vanderbilt.Edu>; Tue, 13 Jul 1993 09:35:48 CDT

Date: 13 Jul 1993 09:35:48 -0500 (CDT)

From: GOLDRIEB@VUCTRVAX.BITNET

Subject: RE: draft letter to Julie --let me know if you advise changes or not
sendingit

To: GAMORAN@ssc.wisc.edu

Message-id: <01H0HLXJS18C8WZ00P@ctrvax.Vanderbilt.Edu>

X-VMS-To: IN:"GAMORAN@WISCSSC.BITNET"

MIME-version: 1.0

Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

Why is Julie sending you these "long-winded" memos?, is this her personality and style of work, I sometime wonder why or how this is best use of her and everyone elses time and energy...oh well.

In terms of her request about the Quantitative skills, I would first get a sense from her what she means by her quantitative skills..what would she like to do that she is not doing now, and how this fits in with her present roles and responsibilities?

My only concern about what you asked her to do is that it needs to be systematic and not just a by the way type of task, you hav outlined a "big Job" for her if she is really going to undertake this, isnt she going to begin interview in Baaltimre, etc. All I am saying is you may want to prioritze this for her, I would suggest point one, is good, enumerating a community profile based on the Planning Guide and maybe beginning with Baltimore to see what they have "counted", I think the dialogue with the other LC's needs to be by Roberta for Milwaukee and put in context and in fact, I am not sure Julie should talk to Marshall about this now anyway, until it is clear to them from CIJE that this will be part of the fall's agenda etc etc. I think that conversation will be better after we know in broad strokes at least what typesof things we are thinking about, and then they can tell us what they have done, what they are thinking about, etc, not just an informal conversation.

At the beginning of your memo, I would also add that it was not a particular part of the MEF project the first year and they had "plenty" to do based on the plan the we had submitted and were expected to follow from CIJE's point of view (between the two of us, she really is or lead us to beive that she is very anti-survey anti statistical and I am not sure why she wants to push this point, all of a sudden, especially when she has not done this type of work for years and years, anyway I guess that is not important now.

What other things did she bring up in her memo?

I will send you by e-mail in a few minutes a memo to A & S regarding the meetins in August.

^{procedure}
This starts with
fall reports on
mobilization and visiting.

You and I - and the
rest of the adv. board
and Ellen - will have ~~to~~
a lot of work to do. ~~to~~

~~to~~

What about
Atlanta's report on
educators
I need to see that
too ASAP.

Baring - findings on EC

- explosion

+ crisis - strain on system

- ms - t.t.c. personnel

- best of J sites are comparable
to best of secular sites

- great EC + great Jewish sites

- supervisors crucial

- better HMOs than any
other area of J ed

- personnel training

- can't training + use w/
good EC training, not Jewish,
typical vs. 9

- good preschool work w/ families

- use as conduit to reach fams

Patron
best for
- planning
- leadership
- funding
- program

coalesce in IC's



// rpt to CITE Board

MEF proj has 3 purposes - ~~rept~~, fdbk, eval-minded

① ~~replicat~~ ^{use in other settings} - how will we know success?

- document successes so can rpt,
record take note of obstacles so can avoid

- CITE not about B, A, M

- more than any other aspect of LC proj. perhaps,
MEF concerned w/ future - beyond CITE's

② feedback - what we learn in short term is
distrib back to comm-ns + CITE to help
them make informed decs

③ eval-minded communities - reflective practice
- new units will have eval components

aims for 92-93

- a planning yr for CITE

- our task doc process of becoming an lc

- qualit, interp

- more about commun dynam than
ed pers

- to carry out

- hired 3 fr's - one for each lc

- charged w/ addressing 3 q's

- (a) mobilizat - nature + extent - human + finance
- (b) what changes not lives of eds in the /cs
- (c) what are visions

- g's re mobilz, personnel are bldg blocks

- thinking about goals - ~~not addressed by ATA,~~
~~essent for LC's~~ ~~but essential~~

- instruments

- (a) interview protocols
- (b) survey of educators

products

- "feedback loop"

- reg updates, gen monthly,
 to CITE, + to each community
- oral or written, as sit, ~~down~~ reg

- eg of type of fdbk

- mobilz - all 3 have commiss. ins
- on commiss. ins sit repres of constituents
- how filter back to constts?
- what mech? what is diffus process
- id pt to which mobilz^{has} reached
- ~~helps~~ ^{helps} set agenda for ongoing
 seminar of CITE + LC's

prof lives - in depth rpts

- 3 components
 - qualit ^{rpt that presents info} based on inter-
 - tech ^{rpt that proposes directions} based on surveys
 - policy ^{rpt that proposes directions} drawing on both data sources

- same key findings (not Balt)

- juxtapos bkgrnd w/ prof devel

- diverse - ~~not~~ not geared toward variety

- pres chls - state ~~like~~ - so not level reg

- day, supplem - no accord or like reg

- voluntary, piecemeal

- ~~multiple~~ career tracks - no instltz career trks

- but some put together their own

- drawing on multiple roles w/ in instltz
or multiple instltz

- tensions - eg + in day, supplem

- min by day, adult ed by nite

- empowerment - ~~fin~~ ^{schl directors} - networks

- do not exist ~~in~~ t's - they work in silos

put together

moblz, vis - yr 1 cum rpt coming

plans for 93-94

① ongoing MEF

CITE/LC's collab on deal priorities

(a) goals - ~~develop~~ in CITE/LC partnership
- ~~the goals prog~~

- MEF task

- document process thru which goals are
- ~~be~~ consult w/ LC's, devel means by which
prog towards goals can be assessed

(b) mobilz - monitor progress - follow issues raised in yr

- es - diffusion of mobilz & suppt
- incr involvement of eds

(c) mot lines

- we've establ baseline
- monitor how info used - total plan

② incr involvement in common self-studies

- ed survey was first step
- now - collect data from insts & agencies
- Altim - needs assessment, mkt survey

③ seek assmt status

- Hdb lang ~~agreed on reports~~
- insts exist

MEF prog will be successful if each LC comes to ... eval goal

- foster this attit - reflection
- eval campaign

Diary of CITE work - August 1993

Sunday Aug 1

- 2 5½ hrs - editing, responding to Balt, Md ed rpts
- 3 1¼ hr - conference call w/ F.R.'s
- 4 3 hrs - consult w/ Ellen, Claire, Roberta
- 5 1¼ hrs - consult with Claire
- 6 2½ hrs - prepare + send letters re: recruitment
- 13½ 7

Sunday

- 8 3½ hrs - edit Atlanta educ rpt; Draft exec summary, consult w/ Allen
- 9 2½ hrs - consult w/ Claire, Ellen; revise exec summary
- 10 ½ hr - tel. conv. w/ faculty at GA state re: recruitment
- 11 ½ hr - letter to GA state
- 12
- 13

7

14

~~strict conversations~~

Sunday

- 15 1 hour - ~~prepare, send fax to Claire~~
- 16 3 hrs - letters, consult w/ Ellen
- 17 3 hours - meeting w/ Roberta, cont call
- 18 2 hours - call w/ Annette; Md ed rpt
- 19 3 hrs - conv. w/ Claire, Roberta; memo for D. Hirschman
- 20 ½ hr - conv. w/ Claire

15½

- 21 3 hrs - call w/ Ellen; Md ed rpt

Sun
-Thurs

- 22-28 4 complete days + 1 evening: LC Consultation (Baltimore)
CITE Board (New York)

27
28

- 29 1 hr - phone conversations

- 30 2 hrs - ^{working on} conversats re. Atlanta rpt

3

21

39 hours
+ 4 complete days

CIJE Project on Monitoring, Evaluation, and Feedback in Lead Communities Progress Report — August 1993

Dr. Adam Gamoran and Dr. Ellen Goldring

How will we know whether the Lead Communities have succeeded in creating better structures and processes for Jewish education?

On what basis will CIJE encourage other cities to emulate the programs developed in Lead Communities? Like any innovation, the Lead Communities Project requires a monitoring, evaluation, and feedback (MEF) component to document its efforts and gauge its success.

By monitoring we mean observing and documenting the planning and implementation of changes. Evaluation entails interpreting information in a way that strengthens and assists each community's efforts to improve Jewish education. Feedback consists of oral and written responses to community members and to the CIJE.

This progress report describes the activities in which the project has been engaged during 1992-93 and the products it has yielded. The main activities include: (1) Ongoing monitoring and documenting of community planning and institution-building; (2) Development of data-collection instruments; (3) Preparation of reports for CIJE and for community members.

I. Ongoing Monitoring and Feedback

To carry out on-site monitoring, we hired three full-time field researchers, one for each community. The field researchers' mandate for 1992-93 centered on three questions:

- (1) What is the nature and extent of mobilization of human and financial resources to carry out the reform of Jewish education in the Lead Communities?
- (2) What characterizes the professional lives of educators in the Lead Communities?
- (3) What are the visions for improving Jewish education in the communities?

The first two questions address the "building blocks" of mobilization and personnel, described in *A Time to Act* as the essential elements for Lead Communities. The third

question raises the issue of goals, to elicit community thinking and to stimulate dialogue about this crucial facet of the reform process.

Monitoring activities involved observations at virtually all project-related meetings within the Lead Communities; analysis of past and current documents related to the structure of Jewish education in the communities; and, especially, numerous interviews with federation professionals, lay leaders, rabbis, and educators in the communities.

Each field researcher worked to establish a "feedback loop" within her own community, whereby pertinent information gathered through observations and interviews could be presented and interpreted for the central actors in the local lead community process. We are providing feedback at regular intervals (generally monthly) and in both oral and written forms, as appropriate to the occasion. An important part of our mission is to try to help community members to view their activities in light of CIJE's design for Lead Communities. For example, we ask questions and provide feedback about the place of personnel development in new and ongoing programs.

We are also providing monthly updates to CIJE, in which we offer fresh perspectives on the process of change in Lead Communities, and on the evolving relationship between CIJE and the communities. For instance, in July 1993 we presented views from the communities on key concepts for CIJE implementation, such as Lead Community Projects, Best Practices, and community mobilization. This feedback helps CIJE staff prepare to address community needs.

II. Instrumentation

A. Interview Protocols

The MEF team developed a series of interview protocols for use with diverse participants in the communities. These were field tested and then used beginning in late fall, 1992, and over the course of the year. The interview schema for educators were further refined and used more extensively in spring, 1993.

B. Survey of Educators

We also played a central role in developing an instrument for a survey of educators in Lead Communities. The MEF team worked with members of Lead Communities, and drew on past surveys of Jewish educators used elsewhere. The survey was conducted in Milwaukee in May and June, 1993, and it is scheduled to be implemented in Atlanta and Baltimore in the fall of 1993.

The purpose of the educator survey is to establish baseline information about the characteristics of Jewish educators in each community. The results of the survey will be used for planning in such areas as in-service training needs and recruitment priorities. The survey will be administered (was administered in Milwaukee's case with a response rate of 86%) to all teachers in the Lead Communities. Topics covered in the survey include a profile of past work experience in Jewish and general education, future career plans, perceptions of Jewish education as a career, support and guidance provided to teachers, assessment of staff development opportunities, areas of need for staff development, benefits provided, and so on.

III. *Reports*

A. Reports on the Professional Lives of Jewish Educators

Each community is to receive three types of reports on educators: A qualitative component, describing the interview results; a quantitative component, presenting the survey results; and an integrative component, which draws on both the qualitative and quantitative results to focus on policy issues. The schedule for delivering these products is dictated by the specific agendas of each community.

The qualitative reports elaborate on elements of personnel described in A Time to Act, such as recruitment, training, rewards, career tracks, and empowerment. Examples of key findings in reports written so far are the extent of multiple roles played by Jewish educators (e.g., principal and teacher; teacher in two or three different schools), and the tensions inherent in these arrangements; the importance of fortuitous entry into the field of Jewish education, as opposed to pre-planned entry, and the challenges this brings to in-service training; and the diversity of resources available to professional development of Jewish educators, along with the haphazard way these resources are utilized in many institutions.

B. Reports on Mobilization and Visions

Information about mobilization and visions has been provided and interpreted for both CIJE staff and members of Lead Communities at regular intervals. In September, we are scheduled to provide a cumulative Year-1 report for each community which will pull together the feedback which was disseminated over the course of the year. These reports will also describe the changes and developments we observed as we monitored the communities over time.

IV. *Plans for 1993-94*

A. Ongoing Monitoring and Feedback

A central goal for 1993-94 will be the continued monitoring and documenting of changes that occur in the areas of educational personnel, mobilization, and visions. In addition, we are proposing to play a larger role than we initially anticipated in the community self-studies, just as we did with the educators survey. (The educators survey is in fact the first element of the self-study, as described in the Planning Guide.)

In the spring, our field researcher for Atlanta notified us that she would be resigning her position, effective July 31. Although we regret her resignation, we are trying to use it to our advantage by hiring a replacement whose skills fit with the evolving responsibilities of the MEF project. The new field researcher in Atlanta will have expertise in survey research, and will play a lead role in working with the communities to carry out the self-studies.

B. Outcomes Assessment

Although specific goals for education in lead communities have yet to be defined, it is essential to make the best possible effort to collect preliminary quantitative data to use as a baseline upon which to build. We are proposing to introduce the diagnostic Hebrew assessment for day schools, created by Professor Elana Shohamy of the Melton Centre in Jerusalem, as a first step towards longitudinal outcomes analysis. The great advantage of the Shohamy method is its value as a diagnostic tool, encouraging schools to use the results of the assessment to guide their own school improvement efforts. The tests have common anchor items, but are mostly designed especially for use in each school.

C. Encouraging Reflective Communities

The MEF project will be successful if each Lead Community comes to view evaluation as an essential component of all educational programs. We hope to foster this attitude by counseling reflective practitioners — educators who are willing to think systematically about their work, and share insights with others — and by helping to establish evaluation components in all new Lead Community initiatives.

GAMOS type ellen.prn

From: IN%"GOLDRIEB@VUCTRVAX.BITNET" 12-SEP-1993 17:51:12.75

To: IN%"GAMORAN@ssc.wisc.edu"

CC:

Subj: RE: I will fax this to fr's if you think it's ok -- please advise

Return-path: <GOLDRIEB@VUCTRVAX.BITNET>

Received: from VUCTRVAX (GOLDRIEB@VUCTRVAX) by ssc.wisc.edu (PMDF #3035) id

<01H2VBFRODA890MVXG@ssc.wisc.edu>; Sun, 12 Sep 1993 17:50:58 CST

Received: from ctrvax.Vanderbilt.Edu by ctrvax.Vanderbilt.Edu (PMDF #3899) id

<01H2VAX0WH608XJKCZ@ctrvax.Vanderbilt.Edu>; Sun, 12 Sep 1993 17:45:48 CDT

Date: 12 Sep 1993 17:45:48 -0500 (CDT)

From: GOLDRIEB@VUCTRVAX.BITNET

Subject: RE: I will fax this to fr's if you think it's ok -- please advise

To: GAMORAN@ssc.wisc.edu

Message-id: <01H2VAX0WH608XJKCZ@ctrvax.Vanderbilt.Edu>

X-VMS-To: IN%"GAMORAN@WISCSSC.BITNET"

MIME-version: 1.0

Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

Hi Adam, In general I do not have any problem with your memos, but I do have a few comments. I agree with you about the time frame although I am not sure I would state it as such without indicating that on the TUES Conf Call we will decide when we will meet, because obviously given our schedules we will need to have self imposed deadlies to get this all done (Firs t week of Oct. is difficult for me too and this educator survey stuff is now eating a lot of time too). In addition, by pushing the deadline back a little maybe we could incorporate some interivewing or reviewing of candidates, is that a bit optimistic? To be very honest with you as much as possible I think we should not use how busy we are to push deadlines because I am worried how this will appear when we need to push the FR, hence indicating the tight time frame in general may be enough.

In terms of audience I agree even more, I mentioned this on the Conf Call before last as well, however I am not sure you need to make the dichotomy you are making, it is correct that the LC dont need to be told what they already know, but they need to be able to reflect on what has happened and that should be the point of our report for the LC's, having things in black and white in a nice little package (our report) may give them both the reason to reflect as well as the context for that reflection or a revisiting of some issues that need more attention. Hence, your comments are correct but maybe can be toned down a little. I would suggest sending the memo to both LC's and Allan (and Annette) this way the LC will also know what to expect and may even be able to put the report on some agenda's of committee work and deliberations (how can we do more for mobilization, etc?) much like using info from the survey and prof.lives reports as a basis of discussion around personnel issues. So the main change may be that this report is extremely important to CIJE and not mainly for the LC's. Am I trying to do to much in one report by assuming the same report is useful to both? I do not think so, but I am not sure you and the FR agree.

The memo to Allan (and I think LC's as well is fine).

I havent had a chance to type up the summary of our call on Friday but hopefully I will get to it tonight. i think it was a good call too, and I am glad Ruth is pleased. Thanx for you input .

Let me know what you think?

PS my message on Friday came from your E-mail in Scotland did you check messages there?



From: EUNICE::"secada@mail.soemadison.wisc.edu" 21-OCT-1994 09:26:53.89
To: BRUCEK@mail.soemadison.wisc.edu, FREDN@mail.soemadison.wisc.edu
CC: gamoran, DIANER@mail.soemadison.wisc.edu, GARYW@mail.soemadison.wisc.edu,
patb@mail.soemadison.wisc.edu
Subj: chapter 3 authors' meeting

Dear Fred and Bruce,

I just spoke with Patty Berman. She has class on Tuesday, November 22. Hence, we should plan on meeting on Wednesday, November 23 from 9:00 am to 11:30 am.

The agenda, per our earlier conversation, is to review what we've written up about Central Park East and Carlson based on our reading of the team reports. We will focus on (a) getting vignettes which illustrate their high quality pedagogy and (b) showing how high quality pedagogy is related to the Three Central Ideas (TCI--not the Madison cable company).

Recall that pedagogy includes both instruction and tasks. The instruction can be gotten from the team report and/or the site visit notes. The tasks should be gotten from Diane Randall.

Also, Fred and Bruce are developing some questions for the teams about how each of the schools in the SRS do on TCI. If we have any results from that effort, we'll talk about it in November.

It would be a good idea if we could share our write-ups with one another by Monday, November 21.

See you then; Diane should reserve the 6th floor meeting room.

See you then,

Walter Secada