MS-831: Jack, Joseph and Morton Mandel Foundation Records, 1980–2008.
Series D: Adam Gamoran Papers. 1991–2008.
Subseries 2: CIJE Meeting and Planning Files, 1991–1999.

Box   Folder
63   1

Planning workshops at Mandel Institute in Jerusalem, 1991.

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

Mandel Institute   מכון מנדל

Planning Workshop with the
Council for Initiatives in Jewish Education

January 7-10, 1991

Held at the Mandel Institute, Jerusalem

Participants:

Ami Bouganim, Shulamith Elster, Seymour Fox, Annette Hochstein, Steve Hoffman,
Alan Hoffmann, Danny Marom, Marc Rosenstein, Arthur Rotman

Introduction

S. Hoffman reviewed his paper on the mission, method of operation, and structure of the CIJE
(Exhibit 1).

There was a discussion of relative priorities of the recommendations of the Commission in
order to determine where to begin: lead communities, building the profession, research, and
building community support.

**There was general consensus that all areas interact, but that lead communities seems to serve
as a focus for the others, as well as being visible, concrete and proactive. Therefore, it was
agreed that this area should be our first priority. At the same time, there was consensus that
the lead communities effort does not entirely subsume all other areas — and that we therefore
must move on the other fronts too.**

Lead Communities

Some concerns and dilemmas which arose in the discussion of how to implement the local
communities project:

a. We cannot ignore other efforts underway and focus only on lead communities; there may
   be other community and foundation projects deserving of our interest and support.

b. In choosing candidates for lead communities, do we prefer those which have weaknesses
   (e.g. lack of top leadership) which we can remediate as a demonstration, or do we choose
   communities which are already strong, to model excellence (but possibly not significantly
   replicable)?

c.   There may be a tension between the local perception of the community's priorities and our view of what must be done to fulfill our goals for the lead community as a demonstration site or model of excellence.

d.   Possible considerations in selection process:

   1. city size
   2. geographical location
   3. lay leadership commitment
   4. planning process underway
   5. financial stability
   6. availability of academic resources
   7. strength of existing institutions
   8. presence of some strong professional leadership
   9. willingness of community to take over process and carry it forward after the initial period.

In general, there was difficulty in conceptualizing a clear set of criteria for choosing lead communities—and in deciding among the goals of replicability/demonstrability/models of excellence. What emerged from this discussion was consensus on the idea of differentiated criteria: different communities might be chosen for different reasons. On the other hand, we clearly cannot afford to fail: however we choose candidates, we must be convinced that between the community's resources and our own, success is likely.

There was agreement that the CIJE needs to clarify what a lead community is: what are the specific categories of actions and/or programs and/or processes which form the heart of the lead community effort. However, there was no closure on content. Two aspects were considered:

a.   The lead community is characterized by a certain type of planning approach, involving comprehensive, systematic planning; a national perspective and involvement (via various national educational institutions, movements, etc.); and the bringing in of outside resources, human and material.

b.   In addition to "a," the lead community would be required to make certain educational, programmatic commitments (e.g., to in-service training, leadership development, etc.)

The following points were agreed upon:

a.   The centrality of systematic assessment and planning and the role of the CIJE in providing resources and incentives for this process.

b.   The full support of top local lay leadership as a sine qua non.

c.   The overall goal of creating fundamental reform, not just incremental change; of creating new approaches, not just extinguishing fires.

d. The importance of an approach based upon research, analysis and national decision-making.

e. Lead communities serve as laboratories, but not as the only laboratories: we might be supporting experiments elsewhere for eventual application in a lead community.

f. The need to establish a contractual relationship between the CIJE and the lead community.

The discussion moved on to the issue of what the CIJE would provide for a lead community. A model which served as a basis for discussion was that of an account manager: someone who must work closely with a client and understand all of his needs in depth and who must be creative in bringing in various other resources to fulfill those needs.

Thus, the CIJE would serve a facilitating, matchmaking, guiding, managing role. Closure was not attained on an exact role description, but a number of specific applications of this concept were discussed:

a. Providing a "roster of experts" (persons and institutions) on whom the lead community can call for specific assistance.

b. Arranging for the seconding of staff resources from existing institutions to the lead community.

c. Providing up-to-date information on developments in general and Jewish education relevant to the communities' planning process.

d. Finding and "certifying" best practices is a valuable service which the CIJE needs to provide to assist lead communities. This turns out to be not as simple as first appears. The CIJE will have to invest resources and energy into studying the whole concept of best practice, and developing procedures for finding, certifying, and communicating best practices to lead communities and others.

e. Serving as a broker between lead communities and foundations, for providing funding and for particular programs relevant to the communities' needs.

f. Guiding the local planning and research process, providing assistance as needed, quality control, monitoring and feedback.

There ensued a discussion of the essential "building blocks" which would have to be part of a lead community's plan of action. At this stage of our work, the following were suggested:

a. Programs to train personnel.
b. Lay leadership development.
c. Israel program development.
d. A framework or frameworks for deliberation on educational philosophy and goals.

It was agreed that the "tone" set by the CIJE is important: we need to embody and stand for excellence, continuously to hold before the communities a model of thoughtful, serious planning, research, and implementation.

The consensus was that the CIJE has a responsibility to set the very highest standards possible, demanding tough quality control, never "settling" for compromises on work quality.

ACTION AGENDA FOR IMPLEMENTING LEAD COMMUNITIES

1. Recruit planning team (in-house and/or borrowed) to map out overall program.

2. Develop selection procedure and criteria, and "visiting team" if necessary.

3. Prepare assessment/diagnostic tools to assist communities in self study ("educational profile").

4. Set up monitoring/feedback loop: procedure and framework for ongoing evaluation.

5. Set up process for identifying, documenting, and disseminating "best practice."

6. Set up framework for training and assisting community leadership in developing:
   1) proposals, 2) community educational plans, and 3) local monitoring/feedback loop.

7. Establish framework for creating "programmatic menus" to help communities choose new ideas and programs for implementation.

8. Start ongoing process of accumulating "roster of experts" — contacts in the academic world (and other worlds) who can provide assistance to communities in self-examination, planning, and introducing innovations.

9. Start ongoing process of building contacts with foundations with interests in supporting specific categories of programming, in order to help find funding for lead communities' innovations.

10. Develop key elements of contract defining relationship between lead communities and CIJE; what are the specific requirements of the lead community and of the CIJE?

11. Create framework for discussions with and among continental agencies (e.g., JESNA, JCCA, denominational education bodies, etc.) regarding a) their providing services to lead communities; b) the identification of "best practice" programming which may exist on a continental level under the auspices of these agencies and may be useful to lead communities.

4

Building the Profession

All participants contributed to a list of components of the process of building the profession of Jewish education:

- recruitment
- pre-service training
- in-service training
- senior personnel development
- retention
- image and recognition
- certification
- compensation
- professional organizations and networking
- career development
- supervision and evaluation
- research
- the contribution of general education
- empowerment
- paraprofessionals and volunteers.

Of these, five received highest priority ranking by the group:

1. Pre-service training
2. In-service training
3. Recruitment
4. Compensation
5. Networking

In discussion of how to attack this list, the issue arose of the tension between the CIJE's inclination to do its own process leading to a master plan for, say, pre-service training, and the need to involve other "players" in the planning (e.g., Y.U., J.T.S., H.U.C., J.C.C.A., federation planners, etc.). What will happen if there are conflicts between CIJE's standards, methods and directions and the possibly less exacting approaches of existing institutions? The Mandel Associated Foundations, the Wexner Foundation and others must also be integrated into the picture since they have decided to invest in pre-service education. It was agreed that this is a difficult issue, requiring sensitive and creative thought.

Moving to pre-service training, several suggestions were made:

1. We should see what we can learn from work being done in general education, and possibly use scholars and institutions from that world in our planning.

2. We should talk to all the current "players" to get a picture of the state of the art.

3. We could involve other foundations (Bronfman Foundation to fund Israel Experience components of teacher- training, Wexner Foundation for the training of elites, etc.).

4. The Mandel Institute in Jerusalem may be running a world-wide planning seminar in the spring, of which we could take advantage.

5. We must keep all options open and under careful scrutiny and look at all possible options including those in general education.

A. Hochstein accepted the assignment to produce a paper defining the questions and issues which must be addressed in developing a master plan for pre-service training, to guide the CIJE in beginning the process. A. Hoffmann accepted a similar assignment for in-service education.

With respect to compensation, discussion was brief; no closure was reached on a plan of action, or even whether the CIJE should remain in a study/advocacy role or actually become involved, for example through encouraging the setting up of a national pension plan.

Networking was also discussed briefly; while there was consensus that networks must be studied and supported, no specific suggestions were made.

ACTION AGENDA FOR BUILDING THE PROFESSION

1. A. Hochstein's paper to guide development of a master plan in pre-service training.

2. A. Hoffmann's paper to guide development of a master plan in in-service training.

3. Coordinate efforts with MAF in developing plans with existing pre-service training institutions.

4. Establishing contact with interested foundations to become involved in parts of the program.

5. Set up a planning team to map out efforts and assign roles in pursuing the five top priorities (and others).

Research Agenda

Two aspects of educational research which are necessary were presented:

- Policy research, including monitoring, evaluation and program design.
- Pure research including the education of educators, the philosophy of education, etc.

Participants suggested a number of areas crying out for research attention:

- standardized achievement testing
- market research
- research itself—a "map" of the field is needed
- best practices
- data about teachers
- evaluation methods
- history and philosophy of Jewish education.

And they proposed several different ways in which the CIJE might serve the needs of Jewish educational research:

a. Coordination of research efforts; influencing and stimulating.
b. Reaching out to research institutions to create centers for Jewish educational research.
c. Making useful connections among research needs, researchers, and sources of funding.
d. Modeling research-based planning.
e. Work to create new centers of research and train/recruit new researchers.

Three concrete results:

a. The CIJE will commission a preliminary paper, preferably by Israel Scheffler, on the state of Jewish educational research. This will serve as the basis of the work of a high level task force which will recommend a course of action in order to establish a research capability.

b. J. Woocher will prepare a thought paper on the issue of maintaining a data base of Jewish educational research.

c. There is a need to pay special attention to current good research while the longer term approach is being developed.

ACTION AGENDA FOR RESEARCH

1. Commission a preliminary paper, preferably by Israel Scheffler, on the state of Jewish education research and on the need for strategic planning.

2. Based on this paper, set up a high level task force which will recommend a course of action in order to establish a research capability.

3. J. Woocher will prepare a thought paper on the issue of maintaining a data base of Jewish educational research.

4. Seek to develop connections among and support for existing researchers, on specific need-drive projects, while waiting for the entire system to be rebuilt.

5. Actively model research-based planning from the beginning, commissioning research and borrowing researchers to provide a research base for every project we undertake.

6. Make it clear, to our lay leadership and to that of communities (e.g., lead communities) and agencies interacting with us, that we do not move without research.

Developing Community Support

A number of suggestions were made regarding models and directions for pursuing this goal:

a. The model of the Commission on Jewish Education in North America: give top leaders important decisions to make and let them work with outstanding professionals.

b. A constant flow of special events, programming, support, and personal cultivation is necessary to keep lay leaders enthusiastic and involved.

c. We need to select and cultivate first-echelon leaders in the federation and UJA worlds and bring them into education.

d. We should use exciting and dramatic methods to interest our target leadership; e.g., prestigious retreats, meetings with high-status leaders and scholars like Nobel laureates, university presidents.

e. We should capitalize on the headway already made in this direction, by working to involve people who already have been touched by the Commission.

f. Systematic creation of a supportive climate by PR and marketing activities; e.g., wide distribution of *A Time to Act*, newsletters, materials for rabbis, encouragement of Commission members to speak and write.

g. We should develop new programs for educating lay leadership, and work with existing ones (e.g., CLAL, JESNA, JCCA).

h. We need to cultivate the heads of the three religious movements.

No specific plan of action was agreed upon, though there was consensus that we need to develop one. Meanwhile, S. Hoffman undertook personally to work to involve several key leaders of national stature in the work of the CIJE.

ACTION AGENDA FOR DEVELOPING COMMUNITY SUPPORT

1. Marketing plan for *A Time to Act*.

2. Efforts to cultivate top echelon continental leadership from non-educational settings for involvement in CIJE.

3. Reach-out to existing top leadership with interest in education (e.g., denominations, Commissioners).

4. Planning team to develop series of high level programs for attracting new top leadership and keeping those already involved excited (e.g., retreats, prestigious meetings, etc.).

5. Establish systematic ongoing public-relations program.

Putting It All Together

The final session was devoted to considering some of the elements of a rough strategic plan, connecting priorities in a logical order and fitting them to a calendar.

Several general principles were agreed upon:

a. Work of CIJE must be characterized by expertise, quality, and excellence.

b. We must focus on change—planned, systematic, monitored change.

c. We must have a comprehensive outlook.

DRAFT 3/19/91

MINUTES
COUNCIL FOR INITIATIVES IN JEWISH EDUCATION
SENIOR POLICY ADVISORS
MARCH 12, 1991
10 A.M. - 4 P.M.
COUNCIL OF JEWISH FEDERATIONS
NEW YORK CITY

Attendance

Jack Bieler, David Dubin, Shulamith Elster, Sylvia Ettenberg, Joshua Fishman, Seymour Fox, Irving Greenberg, Stephen Hoffman, Richard Joel, Martin Kraar, Sara Lee, Virginia Levi, Daniel Pekarsky, Bernard Reisman, Arthur Rotman, Alvin Schiff, Barry Shrage, Stephen Solender, Eliot Spack, Jonathan Woocher

Copy to

Robert Abramson, Josh Elkin, Morton L. Mandel, Henry L. Zucker

....

I. Introductory Remarks

The chair noted that the senior policy advisors of the Council for

Initiatives in Jewish Education (CIJE) is a group in formation. We

anticipate additions to this group from the Reform movement, the

Orthodox movement, and the Association of National Youth Group

Directors. This group will work with the board and staff of the CIJE,

contributing individual and collective expertise to the CIJE effort.

It was noted that the Commission on Jewish Education in North America

chose to focus on the areas of personnel and community in an effort to

enhance Jewish education for Jewish continuity. Throughout its

deliberations, the Commission noted a lack of adequate data and the

importance of establishing a research component for the field of Jewish

education. The role of CIJE is to take the ideas of the Commission and

make them concrete through demonstration and implementation activities.

Since the final Commission meeting in November 1990, Dr. Shulamith Elster has been designated chief education officer, effective July 1, 1991, and a search is under way for a planning officer to bring expertise in community organization and social planning. Negotiations are under way for space at CJF and funds are being raised to cover the core budget of CIJE for a period of three years.

A preliminary planning meeting took place in Jerusalem in January. The minutes of that meeting were distributed to senior policy advisors and served as a basis for discussion throughout the day.

The purpose of this meeting was to determine how to move ahead with the establishment of lead communities, with efforts to build the profession, and with the building of a research capability. It was anticipated that the day would result in proposals to the CIJE board of a game plan which CIJE staff and identified experts could proceed to execute.

In the discussion that followed, it was agreed that the three directions to be discussed are interconnected and that one role of the senior policy advisors and staff is to maintain the linkages among them. Another role will be to bring the expertise of regional and national organizations to work with lead communities in accomplishing their goals.

Several advisors raised questions about the role of the CIJE in funding

its initiatives. It was noted that lead communities will be expected

~~-- ---r   -   - - --   - -   -- -- --- ---- ----   ---- ---- --- ----~~

role would be to provide expertise and to help identify funders to

assist with specific implementation action. The concept of the lead

community itself should energize a community and its personnel to take

action for Jewish education. Advisors noted that some pool of funds

available to the CIJE for implementation of lead community efforts

could be important and should be suggested to the board.

II. Review of Working Papers

Senior policy advisors spent most of the day in working groups, each

~~reviewing preliminary papers on one topic,~~ and concluding with the

~~following recommendations.~~

A. Lead Communities

1. How will Lead Communities be Identified?

Two possible approaches will be recommended to the board. The

first, described as the buckshot approach, would invite any

community in North America to apply to be a lead community.

The second approach is to ask senior policy advisors to

identify 10-12 communities with the potential to succeed, and

to invite them to apply. From the applicants, 3-5 communities

would be selected.

2. <u>What Criteria should be used in Selecting Lead Communities?</u>

The following criteria will be considered in selecting lead communities.

a. City size

b. Geographic location

c. Lay leadership commitment

d. The existence of a planning process

e. Financial stability

f. Availability of academic resources

g. Strength of existing institutions

h. Presence of some strong professional leadership

i. Willingness of community to take over process and carry it forward

j. Replicability

k. Commitment to coalition building (synergism)

l. Commitment to innovation

m. Commitment to a "seamless approach," involving all ages, formal and informal education

n. Commitment to the notion of Clal Yisrael - willingness to involve all segments of the community

o. Agreement with the importance of creating fundamental reform, not just incremental change

3. What will CIJE bring to Lead Communities?

   a. Expertise of CIJE staff and planning teams

   b. Help with the cost of outside experts

   c. The ability to link projects with potential funders

4. Minimal Program Areas to be Addressed by a Lead Community

   a. Programs to train personnel

   b. Lay leadership development

   c. Israel program development

   There was discussion about the value of pointing to a single program area. It was suggested that not all lead communities need focus on a single program area. This is to be discussed further.

   d. An ongoing focus on goals and philosophy

   Advisors felt that this area should be a focus of planning teams, but might not be a necessary precondition for every lead community.

5. Best Practices

   It was agreed that work should begin now to identify an array of successful approaches for possible implementation by lead communities. Each "best practice" would be accompanied by the names of one or more experts to be consulted.

It was suggested that the CIJE periodically convene representatives of the lead communities for workshops on how best to treat a program area such as early childhood, family education, etc.

It was suggested that each community be assigned an "account executive" and a team of experts to work with it. It was further agreed that the senior policy advisors would maintain close contact with this team and with the lead communities to provide quality control.

B. Training

The working group on training identified the following concerns for further consideration:

1. Recruitment

What type of recruitment activities should be undertaken? How can these reflect the variety of needs with the field? How many students can current programs accommodate? What efforts can be undertaken to enhance the profiles of the training institutions?

2. Definitions of "professional"

How should "professional" be defined? What are the elements of a working definition: full-time vs. part-time, professional training programs, certification, appropriate compensation?

What is the role of the professional school in the building of the profession? What role can professional organizations play? How can this definition reflect the "stratification" of the field and differentiated staffing within institutions?

3. Training objectives

What is the mission of current programs? How is this mission articulated? What is their "vision" of the profession? What should be the objectives of training programs? Should programs train for current needs and current delivery systems? Should institutions be working to design programs to prepare personnel to meet future needs?

4. Training

The training of professionals for Jewish education should be thought of as a continuum: pre-service/professional training--in-service/ continuing education.

What alternatives exist to degree granting programs? What training needs can be met through continuing education units? How can these programs be implemented--local sites, CAJE?

5. Standards for training and for the profession

How can standards of "excellence" be implemented? " 'Good enough' is not acceptable."

6. Selected research issues

   Identification of the qualities, or character traits, of highly regarded educators to serve as models of professionalism.

   Identification of inhibiting and enhancing factors that contribute to participation in in-service and continuing education programs.

   The impact of participation in continuing education activities and in-service programs.

   Building the Profession should include a thorough examination of all of the above.

7. Next steps

   a. The important first step is the mapping of the field--including a full description of training opportunities and identification of the needs of those currently working in the field.

   A study should be made of available and unfilled positions in the field and projections made as to needs five and ten years out.

b. Recruitment strategies should be developed to meet these
    needs and programs developed at the training institutions
    to meet the training needs of the recruits.

c. The research agenda should include issues related to the
    building of the profession.

In the discussion that followed, it was suggested that it will be
difficult for communities to provide professional training to
part-time educators in the same way that full-time educators are
prepared. Each lead community might look at particular ways of
training and upgrading part-timers.

It was suggested that one goal of the effort to build the
profession might be to create careers within the synagogue
setting. There should be room for one to two full-time people in
most synagogues to focus on classroom education, family education,
etc. These positions would require a special kind of training. In
this same context, it was noted that we anticipate the lead
community concept identifying new kinds of personnel, which will
require new training systems. We need to think creatively.

C. Research and Development of a Data Base

It was suggested that priorities for research include the following:

1. Development of an Agenda

A researcher working with staff and an editorial board should map out what is currently available, creating a blueprint or framework for further study.

a. A research agenda should be defined in reference to the CIJE's other agendas.

b. Any mapping or planning process should involve those currently working in the field.

c. This study should be done in the context of various definitions of research, e.g. experimental research anticipated in the framework of lead communities should be included.

d. This should show how research can lead to better practice and professionalism. The challenge is to effect change.

2. There is a need to develop a data base as quickly as possible. This can be accomplished by bringing together a group of experts (JESNA and JCCA have people available) for brainstorming, consultation, and preparation of a paper. They should identify the audience--the key decisionmakers--and determine what they need to know. They should indicate what this data bank will do for Jewish education.

During the consultation phase the team should talk with the experts involved in data gathering,, talk to people in the field to be sure that the data is needed, and be honest about what is available and what is not. It will be important to clarify such terms as formal and informal education so that everyone is talking about the same issues.

3. Research should play a central role in the work of the CIJE. The CIJE should serve as a model, showing that good education planning flows from a strong research program. It was suggested that one member of the CIJE staff serve as coordinator of the research effort.

4. Next Steps

Based on the foregoing report it was suggested that a researcher be identified now to prepare a map of the field and that a group of JESNA and JCCA staff be asked to move ahead quickly to prepare a paper on the data base for possible presentation at the April 9 CIJE board meeting.

III. General Discussion

In the short time that remained at the conclusion of the reports, general comments were invited.

It was suggested that an issue to consider in the future is the need to create a market. This encompasses the issue of how to attract to Jewish education those people not at all involved with the current system. In this context, it was suggested that each lead community be encouraged to include a marketing component in its efforts.

The CIJE staff will now move ahead to implement some of the specific steps recommended at this meeting. This will be done in consultation with senior policy advisors.

Future meetings of the senior policy advisors will be scheduled for early summer and early fall.

CIJE Board Members Invited to 4/9/91 Meeting

Name	Attendance Plans
Charles Bronfman	Yes
Gerald Cohen	Yes
John Colman	Yes
Irwin Field	
Max Fisher	
Charles Goodman	
Alfred Gottschalk	Yes
Arthur Green	
Neil Greenbaum	No
Thomas Hausdorff	Yes
David Hirschhorn	
Ludwig Jesselson	No - in Israel
Mark Lainer	
Norman Lamm	Yes
Norman Lipoff	
S. Martin Lipset	
Morton Mandel	Yes
Matthew Maryles	Yes
Lester Pollack	Yes
Esther Leah Ritz	Yes
Ismar Schorsch	No - in Canton, OH
Isadore Twersky	
Bennett Yanowitz	Yes

Other invitees:

Elster	Yes
Fox	Yes
Hochstein	Yes
Hoffman	Yes
Levi	Yes
Kraar	Yes (until 2:30)
Rotman	Yes
Woocher	Yes
Zucker	Yes

TOTAL Attending   20

MINUTES
COUNCIL FOR INITIATIVES IN JEWISH EDUCATION
APRIL 9, 1991
12 NOON - 4:00 P.M.
COUNCIL OF JEWISH FEDERATIONS
NEW YORK CITY

Attendance

Board Members: Charles Bronfman, Gerald Cohen, John Colman,
Alfred Gottschalk, Arthur Green, Thomas Hausdorff,
David Hirschhorn, Norman Lamm, S. Martin Lipset,
Morton Mandel, Matthew Maryles, Lester Pollack,
Esther Leah Ritz, Isadore Twersky, Bennett Yanowitz

Policy Advisors   Shulamith Elster, Seymour Fox, Annette Hochstein,
and Staff: Stephen Hoffman, Martin Kraar, Virginia Levi,
Arthur Rotman, Jonathan Woocher, Henry Zucker

I. Welcome and Introductions

Mr. Mandel called the meeting to order at 12:40 p.m. He welcomed
participants to the first meeting of the newly established CIJE board
and asked those present to introduce themselves. He extended the
regrets of Max Fisher, honorary chair. He reminded board members that
the Council for Initiatives in Jewish Education is an outgrowth of the
Commission on Jewish Education in North America. Its purpose is to
implement the recommendations of the Commission and to bring about
greater support for Jewish education in North America with the ultimate
goal of upgrading its quality.

II. CIJE Structure

The chair called board members' attention to the mission statement
which had been distributed in advance. He reminded the board that its
purpose is to set policy, authorize action, and galvanize resources for
Jewish education. He noted that, in addition to board meetings which
will occur approximately three times each year, there will be an annual
meeting of an Advisory Council, composed of board members, Commission
members, and other interested parties. The purpose of this meeting
will be to provide a progress report on efforts to enhance Jewish
education in North America.

Several board members raised questions about the actual role of the
board in the work of the CIJE. Should the board initiate new ideas,
evaluate funding proposals, and generally work with the staff to
accomplish the Commission's recommendations? Or should the board
react to proposals of the staff and policy advisors? It was suggested

that the board should set policy and strategy, and should shape the
direction of the CIJE. It should create an agenda, serve as a
catalyst, and generally work to make the Commission recommendations
happen.

It also was suggested that an important step toward bringing about
change is to establish a timetable for accomplishing concrete goals.
Where do we want to be in two, five, or ten years?

III. **Action Plan**

A. **Training**

Dr. Shulamith Elster, newly appointed chief education officer of
CIJE, spoke about the training of Jewish educators. She noted that
the Commission concluded that the number of well-trained Jewish
educators in North America must increase. In order to accomplish
this goal, we must recruit, train, and place highly qualified
educators.

As an initial step toward this goal, CIJE is establishing close
working relationships with the major institutions of Jewish
learning, encouraging them to be the best they can be. Each is
working to meet the changing needs of society. CIJE is working
with them to encourage the development of plans to develop and
enhance their strengths. In addition, CIJE is working with the JCC
Association to support the training of top leadership in the field
of informal Jewish education.

As it encourages an enhanced training capability, CIJE will focus
its attention on 1) clarification of current and future needs in
the field, 2) facilitating planning to meet the needs of the field,
3) the teaching of subject matter, 4) identification of areas for
joint projects, 5) means of attracting quality faculty, 6) the
current status of in-service training and how to meet those special
needs. It was noted that we must know more about the state of
pre-service and in-service education in order to work effectively
on recruitment, retention, and professionalization of the field.

In the discussion that followed, it was noted that the training
programs being proposed will differ from those currently in effect
by building on the current strengths of each of the training
institutions. We are working to develop programs which will train
more people for the field and to do so in innovative ways.

In response to a question about the role of CIJE in this effort, it
was noted that CIJE is working with each institution to develop a
strategy for meeting a particular set of needs.

B. Research

Jonathan Woocher, executive vice president of JESNA and a CIJE senior policy advisor, noted that the Commission had concluded that research is a key element for change in Jewish education. The Commission became aware of the paucity of research and the limited character of the research capability for Jewish education. It recommended, therefore, that one goal of CIJE be to strengthen the research capability for Jewish education in North America.

Senior policy advisors have recommended that research become an integral component of CIJE activities and that action be based on research. They also recommended that there is a need to address the lack of reliable data on specific elements of Jewish education, e.g., enrollments, personnel, program, etc.

It was suggested that a Jewish education data bank is needed, based on current thinking and technology, to provide the data necessary for effective planning and implementation of programs. In order to take the first steps toward developing such a data bank, JESNA and the JCC Association propose to assess the data needs of potential decisionmakers, determine how best to collect the essential data, determine where and how to organize and maintain the data, and study ways to disseminate the data once it is in place.

Finally, the senior policy advisors recommend that CIJE develop an agenda for future research efforts and expand the current research capability in the field of Jewish education. It was suggested that the first steps toward this goal include a study of the research currently available and the development of a blueprint for what is needed.

Woocher summarized the recommendations of the senior policy advisors:

1. That the CIJE consider research an integral component of its activities.

2. That a plan be developed for the creation of a data base.

3. That the CIJE undertake a study of specific approaches to building a broadbased research capability.

In the discussion that followed it was noted that there is currently a North American Jewish data bank, that this does not focus on Jewish education, and that it would be consulted on the technology necessary to develop and maintain a data bank.

If the proposal to establish a data bank is approved, the CIJE
staff will work to identify funders for the project. JCCA and
JESNA would then take the necessary steps to develop a design for
the creation of the data bank.

It was suggested that parameters be set so that a data bank would
focus on research related to the mission of CIJE. It was also
suggested that any project supported by CIJE should build a
component of evaluation into the program.

It was suggested that a subcommittee be formed to consider research
needs and make a recommendation to the full board.

C.   Lead Communities

Stephen H. Hoffman, interim director of CIJE, reminded the board
that the Commission recommended the creation of lead communities to
serve as a laboratory to build Jewish education programs worth
replicating. Many communities have nominated themselves for this
role. We wish now to determine how to identify lead communities,
whether by inviting all communities to apply or by identifying a
small number of candidate communities and inviting them to apply.
We anticipate establishing three to five lead communities.

.. ----- -- ....   .   .-   .   . .   . ..   `.--,
communities was discussed. It was suggested that the availability
of new money to support innovative efforts in Jewish education be
among the criteria.

Several board members spoke in favor of issuing a general
invitation to apply, noting that this ensures a degree of
commitment that will be important to success. Others prefer
inviting communities to apply, to avoid raising the hopes of
communities that will then not be selected. It was suggested that
we identify a single lead community, establishing the best possible
program, and assessing its impact. Other board members suggested
that geographic and size diversity are significant for
replicability and that we should select at least three
communities. Finally, it was suggested that CIJE publish the
criteria for selection and invite all communities to apply, while
at the same time extending particular invitations to those we would
especially like to consider.

It was noted that the CIJE will bring the following elements to
each lead community:

1.   Expertise of CIJE staff and planning teams.
2.   Help with the cost of outside experts.
3.   The ability to link projects with potential funders.

We wish to encourage a focus on planning in each community. We
also propose to identify, codify, and disseminate information on
good practices which can be replicated elsewhere.

It was suggested that a timetable be set for the establishment of
lead communities. Short- and intermediate-term goals should be set
to encourage concrete action.

IV. Finance, Administration and Staffing

It was reported that we anticipate a professional staff of three for
CIJE: a chief professional officer to provide overall direction, a
chief education officer to provide expertise on issues of education,
and a planner familiar with community organization and social planning.
Dr. Shulamith Elster has accepted the position of chief education
officer and will assume that position on July 1. There is a need to
identify the chief professional officer as soon as possible.

An anticipated three-year operating budget for CIJE was presented and
discussed.

It was proposed that a search committee be established to select the
chief professional officer. Committee members will include Charles
Bronfman, Max Fisher, Charles Goodman, Neil Greenbaum, Morton Mandel,
Matthew Maryles, and Lester Pollack. The search committee will
consider engaging a search consultant. It will see that a position
description is written and that it is shared with the board. The
search committee will canvas the board, senior policy advisors and
others for possible candidates. A progress report will be presented at
the next meeting of the board.

V. Foundation Community Contacts

It was noted that a number of foundations are already actively involved
with support of or considering new initiatives for programs in Jewish
education. The CRB Foundation has an interest in Israel experience
programs, the Cummings Foundation in development of best practices,
the Jim Joseph Foundation is working with day schools, the Mandel
Associated Foundations on senior personnel, the Revson Foundation is
working on media and technology, the Wexner Foundation with
recruitment, and the Zanvyl Krieger Foundation on compensation and
pension programs.

VI. CIJE Mission

Following the presentations and discussion on an action plan, the board
returned to a discussion of its method of operation. It was
anticipated that three meetings per year would be held in New York.
Subcommittees may be established which will meet between meetings or on
mornings prior to board meetings. Materials for board discussion will

be sent out in advance and individual consultations will be held with board members between meetings. There will be periodic communications with the board to provide updates on progress which occurs between meetings. All of this will evolve as we go about our work.

It was suggested that CIJE's role as an advocate for Jewish education be considered further at a future meeting. The concept of lead programs or institutions was raised for further discussion at a future meeting. There was also a reminder of the importance of the replicability of programs within lead communities.

VII. Concluding Comments

The meeting concluded with a thoughtful D'var Torah by Rabbi Norman Lamm, president of Yeshiva University.

Second Planning Workshop of the CIJE

July 14-18, 1991

Table of Contents

CIJE Workshop
July 14, 1991-July 18, 1991

Schedule

Sunday, July 14, 1991

8:30 a.m.-12:15 p.m.	Work Session
12:15 p.m.-1:00 p.m.	Lunch
1:00 p.m.-3:30 p.m.	Work Session
8:00 p.m.	Dinner at the home of Seymour and Sue Fox 32 HaRav Berlin Street

Monday, July 15, 1991

8:30 a.m.-12:30 p.m.	Work Session
12:30 p.m.-1:30 p.m.	Lunch
1:30 p.m.-4:00 p.m.	Work Session
Evening	Free

Tuesday, July 16, 1991

8:30 a.m.-12:30 p.m.	Work Session
12:30 p.m.-1:30 p.m.	Lunch
1:30 p.m.-4:00 p.m.	Work Session
Evening	Free

Wednesday, July 17, 1991

8:30 a.m.-12:30 p.m.	Work Session
12:30 p.m.-1:30 p.m.	Lunch
1:30 p.m.-4:00 p.m.	Work Session
7:30 p.m.	Working Dinner

Thursday, July 18, 1991

8:30 a.m.-12:30 p.m.	Work Session
12:30 p.m.-1:30 p.m.	Lunch
1:30 p.m.-4:00 p.m.	Work Session
	Late evening departure

The Second Planning Workshop of the CIJE
Participants

Isa Aron

Hebrew Union College, Jewish Institute of Religion, 3077 University Ave.,
Los Angeles, CA 90007-3796, USA
Tel: 1-213-749-3424   Fax: 1-213-747-6128

On the faculty of the Rhea Hirsch School of Education, Hebrew Union College, Los Angeles, her academic interests and expertise are in the area of research in Jewish education. She also wrote a paper for the Commission on Jewish Education in North America entitled "Towards the Professionalization of Jewish Teaching."

Ami Bouganim

Mandel Institute, 22a Hatzfirah St., Jerusalem 93102, Israel
Tel: 972-2-662296   Fax: 972-2-619951

Completed a Ph.D. in Philosophy, is a Jerusalem Fellow, and has published several books on Jewish Thought and Literature. He has worked in the field of Jewish Education for 20 years and is presently a full time researcher for the Mandel Institute.

Shulamith R. Elster

5800 Nicholson Lane, Apt. 508, Rockville, MD 20852, USA
Tel: 1-301-770-0877   Fax: 1-301-230-2012

Chief Education Officer of the Council for Initiatives in Jewish Education, she has spent the past 33 years as a teacher, counselor, and school administrator in public, independent and college settings. Most recently, she served as Headmaster of the Charles E. Smith Jewish Day School in Rockville, Maryland.

Seymour Fox

Mandel Institute, 22a Hatzfirah St., Jerusalem 93102, Israel
Tel: 972-2-618728, 662296   Fax: 972-2-619951

President of the Mandel Institute. He is Professor of Education at the Hebrew University and
Chairman of the Academic Board of the Samuel Mendel Melton Centre for Jewish Education
in the Diaspora. He is Academic Director of the Jerusalem Fellows.

Adam Gamoran

University of Wisconsin at Madison, Wisconsin Center for Educational Research,
1025 W. Johnson St., Madison, WI 53706, USA
Tel: 1-608-263-4253   Fax: 1-608-263-6448

Associate Professor of Sociology and Educational Policy Studies at the University of Wiscon-
sin, Madison. His work in the area of the sociology of education has been published in
education journals.

Mark Gurvis

The Jewish Community Federation of Cleveland, 1750 Euclid Ave., Cleveland, OH 44115,
USA
Tel: 1-216-566-9200   Fax: 1-216-861-1230

Director of Social Planning and Research at the Jewish Community Federation of Cleveland.
He is a professional Director of Cleveland's Commission on Jewish Continuity.

Annette Hochstein

Mandel Institute, 22a Hatzfirah St., Jerusalem 93102, Israel
Tel: 972-2-662296   Fax: 972-2-619951

Director of the Mandel Institute. She is Co-Founder and Director of Nativ Policy and Planning
Consultants and was a Humphrey Fellow in Public Policy at M.I.T. She was Associate Director
of Research and Planning for the Commission on Jewish Education in North America.

Stephen H. Hoffman

The Jewish Community Federation of Cleveland, 1750 Euclid Ave., Cleveland, OH 44115,
USA
Tel: 1-216-566-9200   Fax: 1-216-861-1230

Executive Vice-President of the Jewish Community Federation of Cleveland and Acting
Director of the Council for Initiatives in Jewish Education.

Alan Hoffmann

Melton Centre, Mount Scopus, The Hebrew University, Jerusalem, Israel
Tel: 972-2-882033/4/5   Fax: 972-2-322211

Director of the Samuel Mendel Melton Centre for Jewish Education in the Diaspora of the Hebrew University, Jerusalem.

Barry Holtz

JTS, Melton Research Center, 3080 Broadway, New York, NY 10027, USA
Tel: 1-212-678-8034   Fax: 1-212-749-9085

Co-Director of the Melton Research Center for Jewish Education at the Jewish Theological Seminary. The Center has been instrumental in the development of curriculum and materials for a variety of Jewish educational settings.

Michael Inbar

17 Hamaapilim St., Givat Oranim, Jerusalem, Israel
Tel: 972-665196

Former Dean of the Faculty of Social Sciences, the Hebrew University of Jerusalem and Professor Emeritus of Cognitive Social Psychology and Education at the Hebrew University, Jerusalem.

Daniel Laufer

Mandel Institute, 22a Hatzfirah St., Jerusalem 93102, Israel
Tel: 972-2-662296   Fax: 972-2-619951

Holds a Masters of Jewish Education from Brandeis University. He taught Jewish history at the Alexander Muss High School in Israel, and presently, he is research and administrative associate at the Mandel Institute.

Zeev Mankowitz

Jerusalem Fellows, 22a Hatzfirah St., Jerusalem 93102, Israel
Tel: 972-2-618412   Fax: 972-2-619951

Director of the Jerusalem Fellows and Senior Lecturer at the Hebrew University, Jerusalem.

Daniel Marom

Mandel Institute, 22a Hatzfirah St., Jerusalem 93102, Israel

Tel: 972-2-662296   Fax: 972-2-619951

A Jerusalem Fellow, he is a full time researcher at the Mandel Institute. Currently, he is also involved in educational consulting, teacher-training and curriculum development.

Jacob B. Ukeles

Consulting Services, 611 Broadway Suite 505, New York, NY 10012, USA
Tel: 1-212-260-8758   Fax: 1-212-260-8760

President of Ukeles Associates Inc. and Adjunct Professor, Columbia University's School of International and Public Affairs. His firm has completed ten projects in Jewish education over the past four years. He is the former Executive Director for Community Services of New York's Federation of Jewish Philanthropies.

Jonathan Woocher

JESNA, 730 Broadway, New York, NY 10003-9450, USA
Tel: 1-212-529-2000   Fax: 1-212-529-2009

Executive Vice-President of the Jewish Education Service of North America (JESNA). He formerly served as Associate Professor in the Benjamin S. Hornstein Program in Jewish Communal Service and Director of Continuing Education for Jewish Leadership at Brandeis University.

Guests

Barry Chazan

JCC Association, 12 Hess St., Jerusalem 94185, Israel
Tel: 972-2-231371   Fax: 972-2-247767

On the faculty of the School of Education, Samuel Mendel Melton Centre for Jewish Education in the Diaspora. He is also the Jewish Education Consultant for the JCC Association.

David Resnick

JESNA, P.O.B. 3784, Jerusalem 91030, Israel
Tel: 972-2-636850   Fax: 972-2-666223

Lecturer in the School of Education at Bar Ilan University and serves as the Israeli representative for JESNA.

Staff and Consultants

Estelle Albeg	Technical Support
Caroline Biran	Administrative Assistant
Ami Bouganim	Researcher
Suzanna Cohen	Administrator
Seymour Fox	President
Annette Hochstein	Director
Alan Hoffmann	Consultant
Michael Inbar	Consultant
Daniel Laufer	Research Assistant
Zeev Mankowitz	Consultant
Daniel Marom	Researcher
Anat Reches	Secretary

COUNCIL FOR INITIATIVES IN JEWISH EDUCATION
1992-93 BOARD OF DIRECTORS

David Arnow
1114 Ave. of the Americas
New York, NY 10036
Phone: (212) 869-9700
FAX: (212) 921-4967

Mandell Berman
29100 Northwestern Highway
Southfield, MI 48304
Phone: (313) 353-8290
FAX: (313) 353-3520

Charles Bronfman
1170 Peel Street, Suite 800
Montreal, Quebec H3B 4P2
Phone: (514) 878-5201
FAX: (514) 878-5296

Gerald Cohen
Central Metals
950 Marietta Street
Atlanta, GA 30318
Phone: (404) 874-7564
FAX: (404) 885-7515

John Colman
4 Briar Lane
Glencoe, IL 60022
Phone: (708) 835-1209
FAX: (708) 835-4994

Maurice Corson
The Wexner Foundation
41 S. High Street
Columbus, OH 43215
Phone: (614) 461-8112
FAX: (614) 461-8276

Ms. Susan Crown
Ari & Ida Crown Memorial
222 N. LaSalle Street
Suite 2000
Chicago, IL 60601-1102
Phone: (312) 899-5030
FAX: (312)

Irwin Field
Liberty Vegetable Oil Company
P. O. Box 4236
Cerritos, CA 90703
Phone: (310) 921-3567
FAX: (310) 802-3476

Max M. Fisher
Fisher Building
3011 Grand Boulevard
Detroit, MI 48202
Phone: (313) 871-8000
FAX: (313) 871-5634

Charles H. Goodman
222 North LaSalle Street
Chicago, IL 60601
Phone: (312) 899-5020
FAX: (312) 899-5038

Alfred Gottschalk
Hebrew Union College
3101 Clifton Avenue
Cincinnati, OH 45220-2488
Phone: (513) 221-1875
FAX: (513) 221-2810

Arthur Green
Reconstructionist Rabbinical
  College
Church Rd. & Greenwood Ave.
Wyncote, PA 19095
Phone: (215) 576-0800
FAX: (215) 576-6143

Neil Greenbaum
Sachnoff & Weaver, Ltd.
30 S. Wacker Drive
Chicago, IL 60606-4784
Phone: (312) 207-3852
FAX: (312) 207-6400

Thomas Hausdorff
The Jim Joseph Foundation
494 Salem Street
Paramus, NJ 07652
Phone: (201) 599-0674/
       (718) 377-1100
FAX: (718) 258-0933

David Hirschhorn
The Blaustein Building
P. O. Box 238
Baltimore, MD 21203
Phone: (410) 347-7200
FAX: (410) 659-0552

Ludwig Jesselson
1301 Avenue of the Americas
Suite 4101
New York, NY 10019
Phone: (212) 459-9600
FAX: (212) 459-9797

Henry Koschitzky
IKO Industries, Ltd.
1 Yorkdale Road #404
Toronto, Ontario M6A 3A1
Phone: (416) 781-5545
FAX: (416) 781-8411

Mark Lainer
17527 Magnolia Boulevard
Encino, CA 91316
Phone: (818) 787-1400
FAX: (818) 7878-8719

Norman Lamm
Yeshiva University
500 West 185th Street
New York, NY 10033
Phone: (212) 960-5280
FAX: (212) 960-0049

Norman Lipoff
Greenberg, Traurig, Hoffman,
  Lipoff, Rosen and Quentel,
  P.A.
1221 Brickell Avenue
Miami, FL 33131
Phone: (305) 579-0500
FAX: (305) 579-0719

Seymour Martin Lipset
Institute for Public Policy
George Mason University
4400 University Drive
Fairfax, VA 22030
Phone: (703) 993-2283
FAX: (703) 993-2284

Morton L. Mandel
Premier Industrial Corporation
4500 Euclid Avenue
Cleveland, OH 44103
Phone: (216) 391-8300
FAX: (216) 361-9962

Matthew J. Maryles
Oppenheimer and Company, Inc.
1 World Financial Center
New York, NY 10281
Phone: (212) 667-7420
FAX: (212) 667-5785

Florence Melton
1000 Urlin Avenue #1505
Columbus, OH 43212
Phone: (614) 486-2690
FAX:

Melvin Merians
Union of American Hebrew
  Congregations
838 Fifth Avenue
New York, NY 10021
Phone: (212) 249-0100
FAX: (212) 570-0895

Lester Pollack
Lazard Freres & Company
One Rockefeller Plaza
New York, NY 10020
Phone (212) 632-4829
FAX: (212) 632-3125

Charles Ratner
Forest City Enterprises
10800 Brookpark Road
Cleveland, OH 44130
Phone: (216) 267-1200
FAX: (216) 267-3925

Esther Leah Ritz
929 N. Astor Street #2107-8
Milwaukee, WI 53202
Phone: (414) 291-9220
FAX: (414) 291-0207

Richard Scheuer
61 Associates
350 Fifth Avenue, Suite 3410
New York, NY 10118
Phone: (212) 947-9009
FAX: (212) 695-4248

Ismar Schorsch
Jewish Theological Seminary
3080 Broadway
New York, NY 10027
Phone: (212) 678-8072
FAX: (212) 678-8947

Isadore Twersky
Harvard University
Center for Jewish Studies
6 Divinity Avenue
Cambridge, MA 02138
Phone: (617) 495-4326
FAX: (617) 496-8904

Bennett Yanowitz
Kahn, Kleinman, Yanowitz &
 Arnson
2600 Erieview Tower
Cleveland, OH 44114
Phone: (216) 696-3311
FAX: (216) 696-1009

July 4, 1991   Draft 1

The Second Jerusalem Workshop of the CIJE

Implementing the Recommendations of the Commission for Jewish Education in North America:

Documents for Discussion—Prepared by S. Fox and A. Hochstein

Introduction

During its initial setting up period the CIJE has succeeded in establishing a human, organizational, and financial infrastructure that is now ready to launch work on several of the recommendations of the Commission. A first workplan and time line were established that include the following elements (Exhibit 1):

- Establishing Lead Communities

- Undertaking a "best practices" project

- Drafting a policy paper towards the establishment of a research capability in North America

- Building community support, including the preparation of a strategic plan

- Developing a masterplan for the training of personnel

- Developing and launching a monitoring, evaluation and feedback program alongside the implementation work

This paper will deal with Lead Communities. Separate papers will be prepared on each of the other elements (forthcoming).

Lead Communities

In the pages that follow we will outline some of the ideas that could guide the CIJE's approach to Lead Communities.

1. What is a Lead Community?

In its report *A Time to Act* the Commission on Jewish Education in North America decided on the establishment of Lead Communities as a strategy for bringing about significant change and improvement in Jewish Education (Exhibit 2). A Lead Community (LC) will be a site—an entire community or a large part of it —that will undertake a major development and improvement program of its Jewish education. The program—prepared with the assistance of the

CIJE, will involve the implementation of an action plan in the areas of building the profession of Jewish education, mobilizing community support and in programmatic areas such as day-schools or Israel experience programs. It will be carefully monitored and evaluated, and feedback will be provided on an ongoing basis.

Several Lead Communities will be established. Communities selected for the program will be presented with a menu of projects for the improvement of Jewish education. This menu, prepared by the staff of the CIJE, will include required programs (e.g., universal in-service education; recruiting and involving top lay leadership; maximum use of best practices) as well as optional programs (e.g., innovation and experimentation in programmatic areas such as day schools, supplementary schools; summer camps; community center programs; Israel experience programs). Each LC will prepare and undertake the implementation of a program most suited to meet its needs and resources, and likely to have a major impact on the scope and quality of Jewish education provided. Each community will negotiate an agreement with the CIJE, which will specify the programs and projects to be carried out by the community, their goals, anticipated outcomes, and the additional resources that will be made available. Terms for insuring the standards and scope of the plan will also be spelled out. The agreement will specify the support communities will receive from the CIJE. A key element in the LC plan is the centrality of on-going evaluation of each project and of the whole plan.

Through the LCs, the CIJE hopes to implement a large number of experiments in diverse communities. Each community will make significant choices, while they are being carefully guided and assisted. The data collection and analysis effort will be aimed at determining which programs and combination of programs are more successful, and which need modification. The more successful programs will be offered for replication in additional communities, while others may be adapted or dropped.

This conception of Lead Communities is based on the following conceptions:

a. Gradual Change: A long-term project is being undertaken. Change will be gradual and take place over a period of time.

b. Local Initiative: The initiative for establishing LCs will come from the local community. The plan must be locally developed and supported. The key stakeholders must be committed to the endeavor. A local planning mechanism (committee) will play the major role in generating ideas, designing programs and implementing them. With the help of the CIJE, it will be possible for local and national forces to work together in designing and field-testing solutions to the problems of Jewish education.

c. The CIJE's Role: Facilitating implementation and ensuring continental input. The CIJE, through its staff and consultants will make a critical contribution to the development of Lead Communities. (See Item 2a below.)

d. Community and Personnel: Meaningful change requires that those elements most critical to improvement be addressed. The Commission has called these "the building blocks of Jewish education" or "enabling options." It decided that without community support for Jewish education and dealing with the shortage of qualified personnel, no systemic change is likely to occur. All LCs will therefore, deal with these elements. The bulk of the thinking, planning, and resources will go to addressing them.

e. Scope and Quality: In order for a LC's plan to be valid and effective, it must fulfill two conditions:

> 1. It must be of sufficient *scope* to have a significant impact on the overall educational picture in the community.

> 2. It must ensure *high standards* of quality through the input of experts, through planning, and evaluation procedures.

f. Evaluation & Feedback-Loop: Through a process of data- collection, and analysis for the purposes of monitoring and evaluation the community at large will be able to study and know what programs or plans yield positive results. It will also permit the creation of a feedback-loop between planning and evaluation activities, and between central and local activities.

g. Environment: The LC should be characterized by an environment of innovation and experimentation. Programs should not be limited to existing ideas but rather creativity should be encouraged. As ideas are tested they will be carefully monitored and will be subject to critical analysis. The combination of openness and creativity with monitoring and accountability is not easily accomplished but is vital to the concept of LC.

2. Relationship Between the CIJE and Lead Communities

a. The CIJE will offer the following support to Lead Communities:

1. Professional guidance by its staff and consultants

2. Bridge to continental/central resources, such as the Institutions of Higher Jewish Learning, JESNA, the JCCA, CJF, the denominations, etc.

3. Facilitation of outside funding—in particular by Foundations

4. Assistance in recruitment of Leadership

5. Ongoing trouble-shooting (for matters of content and of process)

6. Monitoring, evaluation and feedback loop

7. Communication and networking

b. Lead Communities will commit themselves to the following elements:

1. To engage the majority of stakeholders, institutions and programs dealing with education in the planning process—across ideological and denominational points of view.

2. To recruit outstanding leadership that will obtain the necessary resources for the implementation of the plan.

3. To plan and implement a program that includes the enabling options and that is of a scope and standard of quality that will ensure reasonable chance for significant change to occur.

3. The Content:

The core of the development program undertaken by Lead Communities must include the "enabling options." These will be required element in each LC program. However, communities will choose the programmatic areas through which they wish to address these options.

a. Required elements:

1. Community Support

Every Lead Community will engage in a major effort at building community support for Jewish education. This will range from recruiting top leadership, to affecting the climate in the community as regards Jewish education. LCs will need to introduce programs that will make Jewish education a high communal priority. Some of these programs will include: new and additional approaches to local fund-raising; establishing a Jewish education "lobby," inter-communal networking, developing lay-professional dialogue, setting an agenda for change; public relations efforts.

2. Personnel Development:

The community must be willing to implement a plan for recruiting, training, and generally building the profession of Jewish education. The plan will affect all elements of Jewish education in the community: formal; informal; pre-service; in-service; teachers; principals; rabbis; vocational; a-vocational. It will include developing a feeder system for recruitment; using previously underutilized human resources. Salaries and benefits must be improved; new career paths developed, empowerment and networking of educators addressed. The CIJE will recommend the elements of such a program and assist in the planning and implementation as requested.

b. Program areas

Enabling options are applied in programmatic areas. For example, when we train principals, it is for the purpose of bringing about improvement in schools. When supplementary school teachers participate in an in-service training program, the school should benefit. The link between "enabling" and programmatic options was made clear in the work of the Commission. It is therefore proposed that each lead community select , as arenas for the implementation of enabling options, those program areas most suited to local needs and conditions. These could include a variety of formal and informal settings, from day-schools, to summer camps, to adult education programs or Israel experience programs.

c. The Role of the CIJE

The CIJE will need to be prepared with suggestions as to how LC's should work in program areas. Therefore it will need to build a knowledge base from the very inception of its work. The CIJE will provide LCs with information and guidance regarding "best practices" (see separate paper on "best practices"). For example, when a community chooses to undertake an in-service training program for its supplementary school or JCC staff, it will be offered several models of successful training programs. The community will be offered the rationale behind the success of those programs. They will then be able to either replicate, make use of, or develop their own programs, in accordance with the standards of quality set by those models.

d. Outcomes

The Commission on Jewish Education in North America was brought into existence because of an expressed concern with "Meaningful Jewish Continuity." The pluralistic nature of the Commission, did not permit it to deal with the goals of Jewish education. However the question of desired outcomes is a major issue, one that has not been addressed and that may yield different answers for each ideological or denominational group in the community. The role of evaluation in the process of Lead Communities will require that the question of outcomes be addressed. Otherwise, evaluation may not yield desired results. How will this be handled? Should, for example, each group or institution deal with this individually? (e.g. ask each to state what is educationally of importance to them). Should it be a collective endeavor? The CIJE may have to develop initial hypotheses about the desired outcomes, base its work on these and amend them as work progresses.

4. Monitoring, Evaluation and Feedback-loop

The CIJE will establish an evaluation project (unit). Its purpose will be three-fold:

1. to carry out *ongoing monitoring of progress* in Lead Communities, in order to assist community leaders, planners and educators in their daily work. A researcher will be commissioned and will spend much of his/her time locally, collecting and analyzing data and offering it to practitioners for their consideration. The purpose of this process is to improve and correct implementation in each LC and between them.

2. to *evaluate progress* in Lead Communities—assessing, as time goes on, the impact and effectiveness of each program, and its suitability for replication elsewhere. Evaluation will be conducted in a variety of methods. Data will be collected by the local researcher and also nationally if applicable. Analysis will be the responsibility of the head of the evaluation team with two purposes in mind: 1) To evaluate the effectiveness of individual programs and of the Lead Communities themselves as models for change, and, 2) To begin to create indicators and a data base that could serve as the basis for an ongoing assessment of the state of Jewish education in North America. This work will contribute to the publication of a periodic "state of Jewish education" report as suggested by the Commission.

3. *The feedback-loop*: findings of monitoring and evaluation activities will be continuously channelled to local and central planning activities in order to affect them and act as an ongoing corrective. In this manner there will be a rapid exchange of knowledge and mutual influence between practice and planning. Findings from the field will require ongoing adaptation of plans. These changed plans will in turn, affect implementation and so on.

5. Recruitment and Selection of Lead Communities

Several possible ways for the recruitment of LC's should be considered.

1. Communities, thought to be appropriate could be invited to apply, while a public call-for-proposal would also make it possible for any interested communities to become candidates.

2. Another method could be for the CIJE to determine criteria for the selection of communities and encourage only those appearing most suitable to apply as candidates.

As part of the application process for participation, candidate communities will be invited to undertake an organizational process that would lead to:

a. The recruitment of a strong community leader(s) to take charge of the process and to engage others to assist in the task.

b. Establishing a steering committee/commission to guide the process including most or all educational institutions in the community.

c. Conducting a self-study that will map the local state of Jewish education, identifying current needs and detailing resources.

d. Engaging a professional planning team for the process.

Some or all of these elements may already exist in several communities.

A side benefit from such a process would be community-wide publicity regarding the work of the CIJE and the beginning of a response to the expectations that have been created.

Criteria for the selection of Lead communities were discussed at the January Workshop and at the March meeting of Senior Policy Advisors (Exhibit 3). They must now be refined and finalized.

* * * * *

We hope that this document will help us in our discussions at the seminar. It is meant to be modified, corrected and changed. In addition we will need to consider some of the following issues:

1. How will the CIJE gear itself up for work with the LC? In particular it will have to recruit staff to undertake the following:

a. Community relations and community development capability

b. Best Practices

c. Planning; research; monitoring, evaluation and feedback loop (a research unit?)

d. Overall strategies for development (e.g. plan for the training of educators; development of community support).

e. Development of financial resources—including work with foundations, federations and individuals.

2. How many Lead Communities can be launched simultaneously? This will require a careful consideration of resources needed and available.

3. What are the stages for establishing an LC, from selection, to planning, to undertaking first programs and activities.

					1991							*1992*			
4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	1	2	3	4	5	6

1. Lead Communities

a. Articulate
   strategy & plan

b. Simulate Lead
   Community

c. Develop menu
   of projects

e. Develop recruitment
   process for LC

   1. Conditions for
      participation

   2. Recruitment Strategy
      (call for proposals?)

   3. Invite candidates to
      full-day seminar

      (a) Plan seminar

      (b) Send materials

   4. Develop terms of
      agreement (CIJE-LC)

f. Develop selection process

g. Jerusalem Planning
   Workshop (2)

h. Recruit "Fellows of
   the CIJE"

i. Discuss strategy &
   plan with Senior P.A.
   & CIJE board

j. Staff for CIJE
   1. Director
   2. Planners

k. Recruit & Select LCs

l. Announce decision
   Lead Communities

		1991								**1992**				
4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	1	2	3	4	5	6

m. Negotiate terms

n. Launch Lead Communities
   (set up local planning
   & implementation group)

o. Data collection, Evaluation
   & Feedback loop

   1. Hire researchers
   (for LC; coordinators;
   Steering Committee;
   Researchers in LC)

   2. Launch research

   3. Diffuse findings

p. Best Practices

   1. Hire consultant &
   launch

   2. Diffuse findings

q. Communication programs

   1. LC network &

   2. Other communities

2. Community Support

a. Prepare Strategic Plan

b. The CIJE Board

   1. Campers

   2. Board meetings

   3. Interim communications

c. Senior Policy Advisors

   1. Meetings

   2. Interim communications

					1991							*1992*			
4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	1	2	3	4	5	6

d. The Community-at-Large

   1. Develop communications
      program

e. Work with Foundations

   1. Engage foundations

   2. Joint planning of
      specific areas
      (e.g., Israel Experience;
      media; Early Childhood;
      supplmentary schools;
      research)

3. Develop a Research Capability

a. Commission policy paper

b. Engage Foundation for
   Implementation

4. Developing the Profession

a. Training

   1. Prepare comprehensive plan

   2. Work w/ MAF & training
      institutions

b. Ladder of Advancement

c. Terms of Employment

d. Etc.

5. Quality Control

a. Develop method for CIJE

Exhibit 2 (17

III: ESTABLISHING LEAD COMMUNITIES

Many of the activities described above for the building of a profession of Jewish educators and the development of community support will take place on a continental level. However, the plan also calls for intensified local efforts.

Local Laboratories for Jewish Education

Three to five model communities will be established to demonstrate what can happen when there is an infusion of outstanding personnel into the educational system, when the importance of Jewish education is recognized by the community and its leadership, and when the necessary funds are secured to meet additional costs.

These models, called "Lead Communities," will provide a leadership function for other communities throughout North America. Their purpose is to serve as laboratories in which to discover the educational practices and policies that work best. They will function as the testing places for "best practices" — exemplary or excellent programs — in all fields of Jewish education.

Each of the Lead Communities will engage in the process of redesigning and improving the delivery of Jewish education through a wide array of intensive programs.

Selection of Lead Communities

Fundamental to the success of the Lead Communities will be the commitment of the community and its key stakeholders to this endeavor. The community must be willing to set high educational standards, raise additional funding for education, involve all or most of its educational institutions in the program, and thereby become a model for the rest of the country. Because the initiative will come from the community itself, this will be a "bottom-up" rather than a "top-down" effort.

A number of cities have already expressed their interest, and these and other cities will be considered. The goal will be to choose those that provide the strongest prospects for success. An analysis will be made of the different communities that have offered to participate in the program, and criteria will be developed for the selection of the sites.

Once the Lead Communities are selected, a public announcement will be made so that the Jewish community as a whole will know the program is under way.

Getting Started

Lead Communities may initiate their programs by creating a local planning committee consisting of the leaders of the organized Jewish community, rabbis, educators, and lay leaders in all the organizations involved in Jewish education. They would prepare a report on the state of Jewish education in their community. Based on their findings, a plan of action would be developed that addresses the specific educational needs of the community, including recommendations for new programs.

An inventory of best educational practices in North America would be prepared as a guide to Lead Communities (and eventually made available to the Jewish community as a whole). Each local school, community center, summer camp, youth program, and Israel experience program in the Lead Communities would be encouraged to select elements from this inventory. After deciding which of the best practices they might adopt, the community would develop the appropriate training program so that these could be introduced into the relevant institutions. An important function of the local planning group would be to monitor and evaluate these innovations and to study their impact.

The Lead Communities will be a major testing ground for the new sources of personnel that will be developed. They will be a prime target for those participating in the Fellows program as well as the Jewish Education Corps. In fact, while other communities around the country will reap the benefits of these programs, the positive effects will be most apparent in the Lead Communities.

The injection of new personnel into a Lead Community will be made for several purposes: to introduce new programs; to offer new services, such as adult and family education; and to provide experts in areas such as the teaching of Hebrew, the Bible, and Jewish history.

Thus Lead Communities will serve as pilot programs for continental efforts in the areas of recruitment, the improvement of salaries and benefits, the development of ladders of advancement, and generally in the building of a profession.

Exhibit 3

Criteria for the Selection of Lead Communities

Senior Policy Advisors

What Criteria Should be Used in Selecting Lead Communities?

The following criteria will be considered in selecting lead communities:

a. City size

b. Geographic location

c. Lay leadership commitment

d. The existence of a planning process

e. Financial stability

f. Availability of academic resources

g. Strength of existing institutions

h. Presence of some strong professional leadership

i. Willingness of community to take over process and carry it forward

j. Replicability

k. Commitment to coalition building (synergism)

l. Commitment to innovation

m. Commitment to a "seamless approach," involving all ages, formal and informal education

n. Commitment to the notion of *Clal Yisrael*—willingness to involve all segments of the community

o. Agreement with the importance of creating fundamental reform, not just incremental change

Criteria for the Selection of LCs

January 1991 Workshop

Possible considerations in selection process:

1. City size

2. Geographical location

3. Lay leadership commitment

4. Planning process underway

5. Financial stability

6. Availability of academic resources

7. Strength of existing institutions

8. Presence of some strong professional leadership

9. Willingness of community to take over process and carry it forward after the initial period

In general, there was difficulty in conceptualizing a clear set of criteria for choosing lead communities—and in deciding among the goals of replicability/demonstrability/models of excellence. What emerged from this discussion was consensus on the idea of differentiated criteria: different communities might be chosen for different reasons. On the other hand, we clearly cannot afford to fail: however we choose candidates, we must be convinced that between the community's resources and our own, success is likely.

MEF

Thoughts on ~~a Research Agenda~~ in the Lead Community

Adam Gamoran

The purpose of this memo is to share my thoughts about the possibility of research and evaluation in lead communities and other areas of Jewish education in North America. I will discuss substantive issues, both general and those of special interest to me, and design issues.

Substantive Issues

If I understand the plan in the "Report," the primary issue for research must be the evaluation of specific programs taking place in the lead communities, with the goal of disseminating knowledge about these programs to the wider Jewish education audience. As I understand it, this evaluation process will not be one in which the researchers are completely outside the reform process; rather, there will be continuous feedback between the researchers and the educators in the lead communities. Thus, the project would involve both formative and summative evaluation.

The central problem for this investigation is the identification of outcomes. Selecting and/or developing indicators would need to be a primary task in the early years of the program. Such indicators would include those at the individual level (cognitive, affective, and behavioral) and at the community level (possible indicators include rate of teacher turnover, rate of educational participation, rate of intermarriage, etc.).

At the same time, the research should probably give equal weight to studying the process of change, especially during the early years. In the lead communities, what organizational mechanisms are used to foster change? What are the barriers to change, and how might they be surmounted? To what extent can we attribute successful innovations to the charisma and drive of particular individuals, and to what extent can we identify organizational conditions that supported successful change? These questions are critical if the lead communities are to serve as models for Jewish educational improvement throughout North America.

Studying the process of change becomes more critical when we recognize that the effects of innovation may not be manifested for several years. For example, suppose Community "X" manages to quadruple its number of full-time, professionally- trained Jewish educators. How long will it take for this change to affect cognitive and affective outcomes for students? Since the results cannot be detected immediately, it would be important to obtain a qualitative sense of the extent to which the professional educators are being used effectively. Studying the process is also important in the case of unsuccessful innovation. Suppose, despite the best-laid plans, Community "X" is unable to increase its professional teaching force. Learning from this experience would require knowledge of the points at which the innovation broke down.

Aside from these issues, which are paramount from the practical side, there are other points which are of special interest to a sociologist of education. These concerns are intellectually

provocative to me because of my long-standing interest in the effects of education "treatments" on outcomes; other researchers would obviously find different issues of special interest.

Wide Range of Treatment

In research on secular education in western countries, a major problem for studying the effects of schooling on achievement and other outcomes is that there is relatively little variation in the quality of schooling. In contrast, the range of educational experiences in Jewish education is enormously diverse, ranging, as Jim Coleman pointed out to me, from zero to total immersion. Yet to date, the best studies on the effects of Jewish education deal with only a restricted range of the total variation (Sunday school, afternoon school, and day school). By considering the full array of Jewish educational experiences of the youth of the lead communities (e.g., by including summer camps, Israel trips, and youth groups, as well as schools), the project could provide a better analysis of the effects of educational treatments on outcomes than has been possible in the past.

Emphasis on Communities

Currently, there is a fair amount of attention to connections between schools and communities in the wider educational literature. The research agenda has at least two dimensions: studying the coordination (or its absence) between schools and other social service delivery agents; and the social networks among teachers, parents, students, and other members of the community (as in Coleman and Hoffer, 1987). Both of these issues could be fruitfully examined in the Jewish education context.

The "Report" is quite explicit in calling for community-wide emphasis on education. This may take the form of increased cooperation among the Jewish schools and other Jewish institutions in the communities. If so, the process and its results would be interesting to a broad audience for both practical and theoretical reasons. At the same time, the improvement effort may lead to stronger networks of support for education among students and their parents, and this would be equally interesting to study.

Design Issues

What might the research program involve? My first thoughts are that initially, the research would require two major efforts: fieldwork studies of the process of change; and conceptual and experimental (or piloting) work on indicators of outcomes. These thoughts presuppose that educational institutions in the lead communities are automatically receptive to research efforts.

Fieldwork

I would think that a half-time researcher would be needed in each lead community. The researchers would have doctoral training and fieldwork experience. Are funds available for such an effort?

More generally, would the research program need to generate its own funds, or have the funds already been committed?

The field researchers would be responsible for (1) describing the basic structure and operation of Jewish education in the community, broadly defined; (2) describing changes in those structures and processes; (3) relating these conditions to outcomes, in a qualitative sense, drawing on the subjective experiences and meanings of participants, as well as providing an external analysis of the cultural context and the quality of Jewish education in the community. Although much of their work would be done independently, these researchers would meet as a group at regular intervals (perhaps quarterly?) to exchange findings and critique one another's reports.

In addition to the field researchers, I would advocate "reflective practitioners." A few teachers and/or administrators in each community could be explicitly funded to carry out research on their own efforts, and those of their colleagues, with innovative educational programs.

As to the selection of communities, I have little to say. The only thing that occurs to me is that mid-sized Jewish communities would probably be best from the standpoint of organizing the research: Too small, and it may be difficult to find qualified field researchers; too large, and the community may be too complex for us to cope with (i.e., New York, Chicago, Los Angeles).

Development of Indicators

Because of diverse skills and knowledge required for this aspect of the project, a team of researchers would be required, with skills in demography, social psychology, psychometrics, survey research, and Jewish content domains (Hebrew language, history, Bible, etc.). The team would have as its goals (1) to reach decisions on what outcomes, exactly, should be measured; and (2) the development of quantitative indicators of those outcomes.

For the lead communities, it would be preferable to gather baseline data from the very first year. This may be possible for demographic and school-organizational variables, but it is not likely feasible for affective and cognitive outcomes. I have little knowledge of survey and test instruments that are already available, but even if there are some, I would not be optimistic that they could be employed immediately, as one would prefer. However, the possibility should not be dismissed out of hand, for baseline data would be extremely valuable.

Subsequently, one should think about using the surveys and tests not only in the lead communities, but elsewhere, for comparative purposes. Assessment of causality is the central design problem for this part of the project. I am not sure that causal generalizations will in fact be possible, and more thought and discussion must be given to this issue.

June 27, 1991

To: Shulamith Elster
From: Barry Holtz
Re: Best Practice Version 2

Based on my original memo, our subsequent discussions and our
meeting with Annette and Seymour, here is the way I see the Best
Practice Project at this point.

I. Introduction

As I understand it the purpose of the project is to develop an
inventory of "Best Practice" Jewish education programs in North
America. This inventory would aid the future work of the Coun-
cil, particularly in the "Lead Communities" aspect of its work,
because it would offer a kind of data base (or Rolodex) of suc-
cessful programs/sites/curricula to which the Council staff could
refer as it worked with the various Lead Communities. Thus a
person from the Lead Community in "Toledo" (or wherever) could
ask the Council "where is Hebrew taught well?" and the Council
staff would be able to find such a program or school or site some
place in the country through consulting the Best Practice in-
ventory. E.g. You, Shulameth, would be able to say: "Go to
Temple Ansche Schmutz in Boston and there you'll see how Hebrew
can be taught well in a day school/afternoon school/JCC/whatever
setting." (I assume that the inventory would not be a published
document but a kind of data base that the Council would keep or
make available to particular interested parties.)

Theoretically, in having such an index the Council would be able
to offer both psychological and programmatic assistance to the
particular Lead Community asking for advice. "Psychological"--
because for many people (both lay and professional) there is
doubt about the actual existence of "Best Practice" about many
aspects of Jewish education. ("Is there really such a creature as
a good Hebrew School," I have been asked.) "Programmatic"-- be-
cause by viewing the Best Practice of "X" in one location, the
Lead Community could see a living example of the way that "X"
might be implemented in its local.

I say "theoretically" in the paragraph above because we really
don't know how this will play out in real life and certain sig-
nificant stumbling blocks will have to be overcome. First, do we
really know that viewing the Best Practice of "X" in Boston of-
fers psychological comfort or confidence building to the person
sitting in the Lead Community of Toledo. Perhaps he or she will
say: "Hey, that's fine for Boston, but in Toledo we don't have
"A" and therefore can't do "B." Of course, we could reply,
learning that they don't have "A" and discovering (by seeing it
in action) that they want to accomplish "B" may be the first step
toward defining goals and a plan of action for a particular Lead
Community.

For me, however, the programmatic side of the Best Practice model is more problematic than the psychological issue. Knowing that Boston is able to implement a particular program and seeing that program in action does not guarantee that Toledo will be able to pull it off in their locality, no matter how good their intentions. The issue of translation from the Best Practice site to the Lead Community community site is one which will require considerable thought. I will come back to this later on in this memo.

II. What do we mean by "Best Practice" and how do we go about figuring it out?

Let's say for the sake of argument (and this is a big assumption from the theoretical point of view, but probably justified in the realm of the practical) that "we" know what we mean by "Best Practice". The "we" here is the network of people we know, trust or know about in the field of Jewish education around the country. I assume that we could generate a list of such people with not too much difficulty. Let's say Best Practice is-- in the tradition of D.W. Winnicott to Sarah Lightfoot Lawrence (The Good High School) to Joe Reimer (Mandel Commission paper)-- something like "good enough". Let's say that when you and I talk about Hebrew schools and Day schools we know what we mean by good enough. And that there are people with expertise in other areas that you and I might not have (e.g. early childhood; JCCs) who could do a similar task in those areas.

Of course there is no such thing as "Best Practice" in the abstract, there is only Best Practice of "X" particularity: the best (i.e. good enough) Hebrew School, JCC, curriculum for teaching Israel, etc. The first problem we have to face is defining the areas which the inventory would want to have as these particular categories. Thus we could talk about some of the following areas:
--Hebrew schools
--Day Schools
--Early childhood programs
--JCCs
--Adult Ed. programs

Etc.-- Yes, this is beginning to get to be a long list and what's more it's only one cut into the problem. The above list is essentially "sites" in which Jewish education takes place. But you could also run another list here: subject areas.
-- Bible
-- Hebrew
-- Israel
etc.

Complicating this is another factor: As you pointed out to me, sometimes you can find a "Best Practice" program for one subject area in a site that isn't necessarily so great-- for example, a not so great JCC that runs wonderful programs for early child-hood.

Hence the following question needs to be decided: <u>What are the appropriate categories for the inventory?</u>

Perhaps the way to answer this is to say that we will choose the categories based on the following criteria:
a) what the Lead Communities appear to want and need. In other words, we wait for the Lead Communities before we do the job.
b) what we <u>think</u> the Lead Communities will want and need based on our discussions in Israel about the Lead Community business.
c) the quick and dirty approach: what we can get up and running quickly because we know the people (and maybe even some actual sites or programs) already (or can get that info. very fast.)

A guess on b-- Best Practice in: Hebrew schools, early childhood, Israel programs, family education curricula or programs.

III. Suggestions for a process.

What has to be done to launch and implement the Best Practice project? I would suggest the following steps:

<u>1. Define the categories</u>
I've tried to make a first stab at this immediately above.

<u>2. Create a document (I will call it a "definitional guide") for each category.</u>
The definitional guide is a document which is composed for each category. It briefly states what we are looking for when we use the term Best Practice of X. The definitional guide is an in-house "screen" used by the "location finders" (see below) as a reference guide. Since this is an "in house" document, my guess is that we should not waste a lot of time writing fancy docu-ments: You don't need to hand Vicky Kelman a definitional docu-ment to ask her to identify 3-5 best, really good, or good enough Hebrew Schools.

Okay we know we want to write some kind of definitional guide: how much expertise do you need to do this? Perhaps I should say, how many experts do you need? What I mean is this. You and I could do this job for day schools and Hebrew schools, could we do it for adult ed. programs? (I'll answer for myself: probably yes). For early childhood? (probably no) For special ed? (definitely no), etc. So how many people have to be involved

here? Here's a suggestion: I suspect that via "the network" we
know how to find out who knows about each of these areas (that
is, once we've figured out what the areas are). Can we commis-
sion a short statement from teams of people who could write this
for each area. These are short pieces. They should also include
a suggested list of "location finders" for each area. I suggest
two-person teams just so there can be some bouncing back and
forth of ideas.

3. Identify the location finders

Once we define a list of categories and definitional guides for
each, we would then want to find a group of "location (or sub-
ject) finders" who would recognize or know about "Best Practice."
It may also require a meeting of people to brainstorm places,
sites, people as well. Maybe there should be a brainstorming
group of well-traveled Jewish educators who could suggest the
"location finders"? And maybe there is another group of people
who are real generalists just because they've been around the
country so much that we would be able to ask them about any of
the categories: Bob Abramson, Joel Grishaver, Eliot Spack, Gail
Dorph, Vicky Kelman, Betsy Katz, etc.

4. Get the lists

Once we have the "location finders" for each category and the
definitional guides, we can then put together the suggested lists
for each category. This could come via meetings (as mentioned
above), through phone calls or simply through getting submissions
of lists from the location finders for each category. Obviously,
we will have to buy some time from people, but except for meet-
ings this should not be an expensive or burdensome task for them.

5. Evaluate the choices

Here is something we haven't talked about before. Once we
receive the proposed lists in each category, are we going to im-
plement some independent evaluation? Who would do that and is it
necessary?

6. Write up the reasons

This project begins to overlap with "Research" at this point.
Let's say we have received these lists of Best Practice sites,
programs, etc. Well, can't we ask what makes them "best" (or
"good" enough). Perhaps this is the same as #5, outside evalua-
tion; perhaps not. But I think we would have to go beyond mere
lists to figure out what it is that defines the "goodness" of the
good. (E.g. Reimer's Commission paper). Of course this is no
small job. We could probably get some of this from the location
finders. They could tell us their reasons for their choices. We

might be able to hire some of the location finders to write up the reasons in brief or in detail. Perhaps we would not need this for every example in every category but it does seem to me that we're going to need this if we want to get to #7:

7. Translate to Action for the particular Lead Communities

What in each Best Practice case can be translated to the Lead Community and what cannot? This is a complicated question and requires the job described in #6 above, at least for those cases in which the Lead Community is planning to implement action. It then requires a careful monitoring of what is going on when the attempt to translate particular Best Practices actually is launched. Which of course leads us to #8:

8. Research Dimensions

Here we can mean many things: action research in looking at the implementation of Best Practice from one place to another; evaluation research to see what is "best" about best and how things translate from one setting to another; comparative research as Best Practice from "Boston" is tried out both in Toledo and Los Angeles. And more too, I imagine, but I will leave this to Isa's project.

IV. Timetable

What of the eight steps above can and should be done when? I will not address this here, but leave it as an open question for us to determine. But one thing is clear-- we do have to have a sense of schedule and probably should discuss this with the group in Israel.

V. Don't underestimate the political dynamite in such an inventory.

A bit of advice here: This is a matter that needs to be well thought out. Who sees this inventory? Is is public? If it's a secret that's also a problem. How do you keep this from becoming politicized by denominations or localities? Does making it onto the inventory mean you have a running start on getting funding? (I can hear it now: "after all our school is on the Inventory"-- it's now a capital letter) How do you deal with people who are annoyed because they are not on it?!

COUNCIL ON INITIATIVES IN JEWISH EDUCATION

I. ## Mission

The CIJE has six basic roles to fulfil -- advocacy on behalf of Jewish education; initiating action on the specific recommendations on personnel and community development called for by the Commission on Jewish Education in North America; forging new connections among communities, institutions and foundations; establishing and acting on a new research agenda; helping to facilite synergism within the emerging foundation community; and energizing new financial and human resources for Jewish education.

A. ### Advocacy

The best lay and professional leadership of the Jewish community need to be attracted to the cause of Jewish education. Visions of what should and can be achieved in the 21st century need to be repeatedly placed before our communities' leadership and the wherewithal to do so obtained. The CIJE can provide a unique blend of individual and institutional advocacy in North America.

B. ### Initiatives

Several specific recommendations are being promoted by the Commission on Jewish Education in North America. These include the need to radically strengthen personnel in the field and deepen local community leadership's commitment to Jewish education. Through comprehensive planning programs and experimental initiatives in designated lead communities, CIJE will bring together continental institutions and other experts to yield breakthroughs in Jewish education development at the local level.

C. ### Connections

Creative people, institutions, organizations and foundations are all acting on new ideas in Jewish education. The CIJE seeks to provide a meeting place that will bring together:

- Funders and those with proposals for action;

- Proven ideas developed through foundation initiatives and communities eager to know what works;

- Institutions that are developing new
approaches and the personnel and resources
to make breakthroughs possible.

The CIJE will be a setting where funders can
share accomplishments and possibly agree to
join together in supporting new undertakings of
large magnitue.

D.   Research

While there are many people engaged in Jewish
education research, there still appears to be
no coordinated, systematic analysis of what
works in Jewish education. Research interests
have been understandably idiosyncratic. The
Commission on Jewish Education in North America
found gaping holes in what we can say we know
with real confidence, rather than relying on
conventional wisdom. A comprehensive,
multi-year research agenda needs to be outlined
by the best thinkers on the continent, assigned
to the most promising talent, supported, and
the findings critically examined and
disseminated.

E.   Synergism

One of the most exciting new developments in
Jewish education -- one that holds great
promise for the field -- is the serious entry
of strong private foundations into Jewish life
in general and Jewish education in particular.
This is an unprecedented development. The
foundations are deploying creative staffs and
developing recognizeable signatures of their
interests and accomplishments. Recruitment,
day schools, media, training high potential
professionals, identifying master teachers and
programs, and Israel experiences are just a few
of the interests being pursued. The richness
of foundation endeavors is a real blessing.
Through the synergy of coming together at the
CIJE, foundations could efficiently diffuse
their best innovations throughout the lead
communities and should they desire it even help
each other advance their agendas by consulting
with each other, exchanging professional
resources, avoiding recreating notions, etc.

F.   Energize

Through the work of the Commission on Jewish
Education in North America and the work of
other entities, a new group of professionals

for Jewish education has begun to be identified. Generally these are people who are experts in general education who have an interest in Jewish affairs. Also, academicians with expertise in Judaica, the humanities, and social sciences want to contribute. CIJE will seek to identify these people and provide them with effective avenues to use their talents on behalf of the Jewish people, much the way we now benefit from many of the best lay leaders in the business community and other professions.

Further CIJE will attempt to generate new financial resources within local communities in partnership with existing resources and on a continental basis to back the ideas that are proven to work in Jewish education.

CIJE hopes to energize new professional and financial resources to add to the gifted people already at work. Ultimately local federations, school supporters, congregations, and consumers will need to commit more resources to accomplish the Jewish education agenda for the next century. This will not be an easy thing to achieve. It is hoped that CIJE will be able to facilitate foundations interested in providing a quick start to the development of new innovative efforts and then provide some longer term support.

II.   Method of Operation

The CIJE will not be a big new comprehensive direct service provider. It isn't seeking to displace any existing institution or organization. Rather, CIJE expects to operate with a very small core staff -- no more than 3 or 4 professionals -- and work through the efforts of others -- JESNA, JCCA, CJF, Yeshiva University, JTS, HUC-JIR, Reconstructionist College, Torah U Mesorah, denominational departments of education, Brandeis, Stanford, Harvard, Spertus, Boston Hebrew College, educator organizations, etc. This list could go on and on! The need is not for a new service delivery mechanism but for a catalytic agent -- one that can convene meetings of peer organizations on the national scene, including denominational institutions and departments, communal agencies, foundations, and the like.

No existing organization plays this role today in Jewish education. CIJE, building upon the already successful engagement of these entities through the Commission on Jewish Education in North America, can play this role. The identity of all partners would be preserved and their missions enhanced. The rich diversity of foundation interests would be infused into the consciousness of the established community.

III. Structure

A simple structure to govern the CIJE is envisioned.

A. Board

Approximately 20 to 30 people will govern the CIJE. They will be drawn from among the leaders of the foundation community, continental lay leaders, outstanding Jewish educators, and leading Jewish academicians.

B. Senior Policy Advisors

A group of 12 to 20 senior policy advisors will provide ongoing professional guidance to the professional staff and board of the CIJE. They will be drawn from the ranks of the continental organizations and institutions and outstanding individual professionals.

C. CIJE Fellows

Beyond the Senior Policy Advisors group, the CIJE intends to assemble 50 or so fellows to provide intellectual, educational content to its work. These Fellows would be identified from among the people currently at work in Jewish education, and leading academicians and practitioners in general education, Judaica, humanities, and social sciences with a strong interest in Jewish life. In addition to providing ongoing advice to CIJE, the Fellows should be a rich resource for consultants for lead communities, foundation initiatives, the research agenda of CIJE, and the institutional objectives of CIJE working in concert with others.

D. Advisory Council

At least once a year CIJE will reconvene the members of the Commission on Jewish Education in North America, augmented with other key figures in Jewish education. This will provide an opportunity to check on the progress of implementing the Commission's recommendations and provide fresh insight on new developments that should be on CIJE's agenda.

E. Staff

The staff of CIJE will consist of a chief professional officer (initially Stephen Hoffman, the Executive Vice-President of the Cleveland Federation); a chief educational officer; and a planner. Appropriate support staff would be in place as well. An initial budget is attached.

8/28/90

SEE:gc:B1:39J

Att.

CIJE Workshop
AGENDA

Sunday, July 14

Morning

Plenary
Introduction and Procedures
The Lead Community Concept
Small Groups: The Lead Community Concept

Afternoon

Plenary
Reports from small groups and Discussion

Monday, July 15

Morning

Plenary
Lead Communities: Selected Issues

Small Groups
A. Working to Establish a Lead Community: — Steve
    1. Recruitment and Selection; Working and Planning with the Lead Community
    2. Agreement between the CIJE and the Lead Community

B. Scope and Content of a Lead Community — Barry
    1. Best Practices
    2. Required and Optional Topics

Afternoon

Plenary
1. Reports from Small Groups
2. Reformulation of the Lead Community Concept

Tuesday, July 16

Morning

Plenary
Building the Profession: Introduction

Small Groups
    A. Recruitment
    B. Training
    C. Profession Building
       — Salaries
       — Benefits
       — Career paths

Afternoon	**Plenary** Reports from Small Groups and Discussion **Plenary** Personnel in the Lead Community

Wednesday, July 17

Morning	**Plenary** Research: Introduction

Small Groups
  A. Research:
    1. Monitoring, Evaluation and Feedback Loop
    2. Building a Personnel Capability
  B. The Community:
    1. Strategic Plan
    2. Financing Lead Communities

Afternoon	**Plenary** Reports from Small Groups Research and the Lead Community Building Community Support in the Lead Community

Thursday, July 18

Morning	**Plenary** Lead Communities Reconsidered
Afternoon	**Plenary** Summary and Conclusions

Setting on Research Agenda

for Jewish Education

Broad Question to be Answered:

What strategies can ~~we~~ CIJE use to encourage and support the development of research which is of greater quantity and higher quality?

Audience: the CIJE board; potential fund ~~raisers~~ sources

instits of higher lng

I: Why do we need research in Jewish education?
     (not a complicated answer; much can be taken from A Time to Act).

no — intuitive — need validat bs.t

Some points to be made:
a) without research, complicated decisions tend to be made in simplistic, knee-jerk fashion.

b) without research, we tend to get stuck in old approaches, rather than being freed to imagine new ones.

— yes

1

II: The current state of research in Jewish Education.

1)   Currently research in Jewish education is conducted in only a limited number of settings: institutions of higher learning in Jewish education, some bureaus, and (in a more limited way) by some sociologists of the American Jewish community.   Contrast this with the variety of settings in which research is conducted in secular education.

2)   The paucity of research in Jewish education will be documented through a review of journal articles, going back 10 - 15 years.   Most research in Jewish education is conducted by doctoral students as part of their doctoral theses.   These studies are, of necessity, of small scope.

3)   Aspiring researchers in Jewish education do not have any of the supporting infrastructure that enables research in secular education to flourish.   There are no funds for research, no research centers, and only a limited number of venues for publication.

4)   Even the most basic data on enrollments, finances, salaries of teachers, etc. is not routinely collected.   This section will summarize the data collected by Debra Markovic in the fall of 1989, and show how even these data are highly suspect because of the methods employed in their collection.

5)   In contrast with secular education, in which large-scale replication of important studies is routine, Jewish educational research consists largely of isolated studies which are rarely replicated.   An additional problem is that the audience for research in Jewish education is methodically unsophisticated.   Thus, isolated studies which may be methodically problematic are widely disseminated and accepted without much critique; the Bock and Himmelfarb studies and the NYBJE study will be discussed as cases in point.

III: What type of research do we need in Jewish education?

A - Topics

From among the plethora of interesting and worthwhile research topics, this paper must present a manageable, validated list of high priority items.

How will this "short list" be developed and validated?

1)   select members of the CIJE board will be interviewed: (Arnow, F. Melton, Hirshorn, Mandel, Lipset).

2)   opinions will be solicited widely, (perhaps through Barry's "Best Practice" groups?).

3)   the advisory board (see below) will validate the final choices.

B - Methodologies

1)   data gathering:
What types of data, and how best collected?

2)   evaluation and assessment:
Evaluation and assessment in secular education have advanced far beyond the simple checklists and multiple choice tests of previous decades. The extent to which these methodologies may be adapted to the field of Jewish education will be discussed. An important point to be made in this section is that both assessment and evaluation are predicated on agreement regarding the goals of particular forms of schooling. Before we can assess, we must reach consensus on our goals.

3)   programmatic research addressing issues that are of priority:
The most sophisticated research in secular education is conducted by teams of researchers, employing an eclectic combination of methodologies, comparing a number of different sites. This type of research, commonly known as programmatic research, is usually conducted by a research institute, or by several institutes working in tandem. Both the research agenda and the dissemination of the findings are likely to be overseen by a team which includes practitioners and policymakers, as well as researchers. In this section the virtues of programmatic research will be discussed, and examples will be given of areas of inquiry which would benefit from this type of concerted approach.

4) "basic" research:

In addition to all of the above, there should still be room for "basic" research, conducted by independent scholars on questions whose implications for practice or policy might not be readily apparent. Not all research should be linked directly to policy and/or practice; there must be support for purely intellectual pursuits, such as historical studies.

5) research as a way of encouraging reflective practice:

One way of linking research and practice is to encourage and enable practitioners to do their own research. In the past 10 years this type of research has begun to take root, and attract the attention it deserves, to the point that typologies have been developed. In this section the particular benefits which this type of research might have for Jewish education will be suggested.

C - how the same topic can be treated differently by different methodologies should be exemplified by a number of charts.

FOR EXAMPLE: Topic: What is the best way to teach Hebrew in a supplementary school?

Data Gathering: _____|_____

Evaluation & Assessment: _____|_____

Programmatic Research: _____|_____

"Basic" Research: _____|_____

Reflective Practice: _____|_____

4

D - A caveat on the relationship between research and practice.

Conventional wisdom holds that good educational practice ought to be "derived" from educational research, in the same way that principles of engineering are derived from the laws of physics. And, indeed, a number of research traditions in secular educate (for example, "process-product" research on teaching and "effective schools" research) operate under this assumption. In the past two decades, however, this "logistic" view of research has been increasingly called into question. Three alternative views will be presented:

1) the operational, which holds that research and practice are entirely different realms, and that research ought to be done for its own sake.

2) the problematic, which holds that research ought to originate from practical problems, and be conducted, wherever possible, by practitioners themselves.

3) the dialectical, which sees research as a tool for critiquing and revolutionizing current educational practice.

Examples of studies conducted from within each of these perspectives will be given. I will not advocate for any one of these views, but argue that a rich and balanced research capability would draw on each of the four perspectives.

IV: Creating an infrastructure which supports and encourages high quality research in Jewish education:

1) How can we create a climate of opinion which values and supports research in Jewish education? How can researchers reach a broader audience of policymakers, practitioners and the interested public?

2) How can the quality of the research which is produced be raised?

3) What is the function of conferences, journals and other publications?

4) By what means can funds be disbursed fairly and equitably, while assuring high quality?

V: Concrete Proposals for Developing a Sophisticated Research Capability.

Recognizing that research is a multi-faceted enterprise, I expect that I will end up proposing that a number of different support structures be set up. The following are some _very_ _preliminary_ and _very_ _sketchy_ proposals:

1) the institution of a mechanism for routine data collection, perhaps under the auspices of JESNA or the Bureau Director's Fellowship.

2) the funding of a number of model evaluation/assessment studies, perhaps in conjunction with experiments in the various lead communities. These would be conceived of as models or prototypes which could be emulated by groups in a variety of settings.

3) the establishment of a fund for "basic research," which is not tied to any programmatic agenda. This fund might operate along the lines of the National Endowments, soliciting proposals at regular intervals and convening new panels of reviewers each year.

4) the establishment of a mechanism to encourage research by practitioners.   — in lc's

5) the adoption, by the CIJE, of a programmatic research agenda. This would constitute the most ambitious, and most costly, of the proposals. The following are some thoughts as to how to proceed:

wait??

a) In the fall, I would send out a mailing to members of the Jewish Education Research Network, AIHLJE, bureaus, and other interested parties, soliciting their ideas on high priority research items.

b) When the advisory board for this project meets, presumably in the fall of '91, one of its tasks should be to prioritize these research needs, and to delineate a mechanism whereby each would be carried out (perhaps a range of plans, from modest and inexpensive to ambitious and costly).

c) Working closely with members of the advisory of the committee, I would flesh out each of the 4 - 8 proposals which were assigned high priority. This would include developing a budget, assessing the availability of appropriate personnel, and establishing mechanisms for open competition, if that were deemed by the committee to be appropriate.

6

An important agenda item for me, when we meet in Jerusalem, is to create a diverse, but still manageable, advisory board. The following are the types of people that should be represented:

--established researchers in secular education, with an interest in Jewish education.
--academics/researchers in Jewish education.
--practitioners with a research background.
--representatives of policy-makes: federations, bureaus, and perhaps other organizations.

Working to Establish a Lead Community

Application and Selection

A two round screening process is proposed.

a.   Round one will include a public Request For Proposal. Communities will have 6 weeks to send in 2-3 page long applications. These will be processed rapidly and a list of 10 plus 10 communities selected for round two.

b.   A more detailed application process for the 10-20 leading candidates. The process would involve a day-long joint seminar, a more extensive application form and site visits.

Criteria for Round #1 Application:

1.   City size (to be based on CJF criteria)
     a.   Intermediate   15,000 → 1/4 million
     b.   Large Intermediate
     c.   Large (below 1/2 million)

2.   Commitment

The president of the community's Federation would submit a statement of commitment indicating how the following elements fit into his community:

     a.   Evidence and capacity to pull together all elements of the community

     b.   Evidence of planning process, initiatives and progress in Jewish education within the past 5 years

     c.   Evidence of a serious commitment of lay leadership and potential to recruit strong community leaders to engage in the lead community process

     d.   A survey of what potential sources for funding could become available for the lead community process.

     e.   Commitment to involve all stakeholders in the community in the Lead Community process

     f.   Agreement with the importance of creating an environment conducive to innovation and experimentation in Jewish education.

     g.   Commitment to developing personnel for Jedc

     h.   A statement explaining why his/her community should be a lead community. What it has to offer etc.

3.   Include a sample of letters indicating support by various
stakeholders and leaders.

met! (handwritten)

Selection Process

1.   First round screening by CIJE staff to reach top 10 and next
10 candidate communities.

2.   Send list of 20 to Senior Policy Advisors for comments

3.   Convene a teleconference of a committee of Board members
including:
    a.   Charles Bronfman
    b.   Mark Lainer
    c.   Gerald Cohen
    d.   Esther Leah Ritz
    e.   Matthew Maryles

Time Line

1.   RFP - early September   *no rabbis..* (handwritten)

2.   Applications in by October 15

3.   Decision (including CIJE Board) by mid November

4.   Seminar for 20 communities - early December

5.   Second round applications in by late January

6.   Decision by March 1, 1991 (latest)

? time too short (handwritten)
self-study? (handwritten)
(after selection (handwritten)

By 1997 all you will be thinking
about is Tourism education!!
We try, each year, to have
someone visiting who uses the
year for their own purposes
but also do some teaching
and collaborating.

we usually are able to
offer a fair amount of help
towards transportation, salary
etc. And it would be
possible to combine such a year
with the general ~~~~~ sociologist
of education. ~~~~~
We should continue to be in
contact.

The real question is:
have you missed anything

~~What does~~
Is your Fulbright year
also a sabbatical?
How about thinking
about a "Jewish education"
Sabbatical with us
sometime soon?

colleagues on
stratification
research.

Fulbright year is not a sabbatical.
I'll be on leave for the academic
year, with my salary covered by
grant funds (mainly from the Spencer Fund)

We'd like to spend a year in Israel, but
probably not until ~~1998 1999~~ 1997 or 1998.
Not clear that I'd study Jewish education, though
more likely I'd collaborate with Israeli.

Jewish Community Federation

of Cleveland

July 10, 1991

" How do we work w/ leadership?"

ENHANCING JEWISH EDUCATION

·THROUGH COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

Prepared by Mark Gurvis and Dr. Jonathan Woocher

FOSTERING LEADERSHIP DEVELOPMENT IN EDUCATION

Community development is defined here as a plan to marshal the community
leadership resources necessary for Jewish education to thrive. There is an
assumption inherent in this that with the right community leadership, the
community will be able to 1) influence funding decisions on Jewish education in
a positive direction; and 2) assure effective leadership for Jewish education
activities.

Leadership in Jewish education needs to happen on several levels within a
community. Strong, effective leadership is needed at the school and
congregational board level, at the communal agency board level, and at
Federation. While there may be some people who operate comfortably at more
than one level, each level represents specific roles and responsibilities
vis-a-vis Jewish education. What is common across these levels is the need for
leaders who are committed to Jewish education, who believe in its value in both
personal and communal terms, and who appreciate the enormous complexity of the
field.

Stock cmt

dollar interests — entrepreneurs

concept interests — profess. study

ISSUES IN LEADERSHIP DEVELOPMENT

There are a number of issues which need to be addressed in order to more
clearly focus on leadership development in Jewish education:

1. The Nature of "Effective Volunteer Leadership" for Jewish Education

   What do we want and expect of lay leaders in Jewish education? What
   characterizes "effective" leadership by lay people? Is their role to be
   one of active participation in educational decision-making? If so, in
   which types of decisions and with respect to which educational issues? Is
   their role to be primarily one of institutional stewardship and advocacy?
   If so, is this sufficiently important to engage and hold top quality
   volunteer leadership?

2. The Need for New and Revitalized Frameworks

   Are additional and alternative frameworks (i.e., beyond existing
   institutional boards and committees) needed to appropriately involve and
   utilize lay leadership? Should the model of "community commissions" be
   extended into permanent structures? What changes in the missions,
   composition, functions, and operating styles of existing vehicles for
   leadership involvement might be required? How can these be achieved?

3. Intra-Communal Linkages

How can stronger linkages be built between educational leadership at the
institutional (especially synagogue and school) level and at the communal
level? What does each need to understand about the concerns and frames of
reference of the other? In what frameworks can they interact? How can we
answer regular and productive communication between and among leaders
operating within the same community in different settings?

4. Lay-Professional Relations

Can improving the quality of lay-professional relations in Jewish education
enhance the likelihood of attracting and retaining top volunteer leadership?
If so, what must be done in this area? How can professionals be helped to
work with and utilize quality lay leaders more effectively?

5. Training Volunteer Leadership for Jewish Education

How do we infuse prospective lay leaders with appropriate knowledge,
skills, and values? What do they need to know about Jewish education? Is
there a "curriculum" for effective educational leadership? If so, how do
we design and deliver it? Can outstanding adult Jewish learning programs
be mobilized for this purpose? What role can Israel play? How can we
institutionalize educational leadership development on the local and
continental levels?

6. Linkages to Trans-Local Contexts

    What relationships and frameworks need to be established or strengthened in
    order to involve community leadership in Jewish education beyond the local
    community? Can opportunities for meaningful activity at the trans-local
    level be important in attracting and retaining top quality lay leadership
    for Jewish education? If so, what forms might such trans-local frameworks
    take: stronger, more prestigious national agencies? special task forces
    and think tanks? conferences and consultations? What role should Israel
    play in this regard?

APPROACHES TO LEADERSHIP DEVELOPMENT IN JEWISH EDUCATION

Some possible approaches to developing stronger leadership in Jewish education
include:

1. Improving Status - More people in the community need to view Jewish
    education as an important area in which to get involved. To what extent if
    Federation human resource or leadership development departments encourage
    up-and-coming leaders to consider placements in education agencies and
    institutions? How often do we tell people who we think are important
    leaders that we need them to get involved in their congregation's school
    board?

2. <u>Mentoring</u> - In each community, there are generally at least a few
   established high-powered leaders in Jewish education. Can they work with
   specifically identified potential leaders to learn about Jewish educational
   leadership from a veteran?

3. <u>Training School Boards</u> - Do school board members view educational problems
   strictly through the lens of their institution's personnel and fiscal
   constraints, or can they be given broader exposure to the potentialities of
   the field through a community-based training program for school board
   members?

4. <u>Tapping Adult Learners</u> - Programs like the Wexner Heritage Foundation,
   CLAL, and the Melton Adult Mini School are creating pools of adult learners
   engaged in Jewish study for its own sake, often in a broad community
   context. Such programs often develop within the participants a strong
   commitment to Jewish education. Communities with such programs might
   actively recruit leadership from amongst participants. Other communities
   may want to explore how to develop or expand such programs.

5. <u>Future Operating Leadership</u> - Related to #4, the kind of people who are
   groomed leadership of agencies in major Federation committees often have
   little exposure to positive Jewish educational experiences. They arise
   through the federation system, often through formal leadership development
   programs which focus on the structure of the community and major issues

faced by the community, but which don't develop any kind of in-depth knowledge about specific areas of service. Communities might want to consider specialized leadership development courses for people who are committed, high-powered, but largely ignorant of Jewish education issues to educate them about critical issues in Jewish education. Similarly, actively recruiting participation by such individuals in programs like the Wexner Heritage Foundation, CLAL, and the Melton Adult Mini School can accomplish the same goal.

6. Reaching the Funders - Many communities are developing a variety of philanthropic instruments which supplement annual campaign involvement of significant contributors. Some principals of private and support foundations have an interest in Jewish education, but many do not. Are there ways of using forms for such funders to build a climate of greater support for Jewish education? It is possible that some strategic partnering by those who are committed to Jewish education on specific projects could yield some new players who have a new or greater commitment to Jewish education. In particular, this is a strategy which needs to be looked at from a continental as well as a local perspective. There are relationships between foundations and between the members of the continental communities' most significant philanthropic leaders which can be better accessed on the continental level.

Draft

Proposal for

Developing a National Strategic Plan for

Training of Jewish Educators

Submitted to:

The Council for Initiatives in Jewish Education

Ukeles Associates Inc.

Suite 505

611 Broadway

New York, NY 10012

212-260-8758

July 1991

Purpose

The purpose of this project is to assist the Council of Initiatives in Jewish Education (CIJE) in producing a strategic plan to guide the systematic development of pre-service and in-service training for Jewish educators over the next five to ten years.

Specifically, the project has four objectives:

- To assess currently available resources and needs for pre-service and in-service training in the field of Jewish education;

- To develop a strategic plan to expand and improve training in support of the Jewish education system in North America. This plan will incorporate an overall view of the future training system; priorities for the use of resources; and recommendations for new policy and program initiatives.

- To develop a three to five year implementation plan specifying: policy and program priorities; revised and innovative program needs, organizational, staffing and financial resources required to carry out recommendations; a budgetary needs, resource development and allocation framework, timetable and evaluation framework.

- To begin the development of a periodically updated database on training in Jewish education, including information and projections about numbers of institutions providing training, staffing (full-and part-time status, salary levels, credentials, years of service, turnover), enrollments, expenditures, etc. The baseline data will illuminate currently available resources, and permit measurable assessments of progress in future years.

Background

The field of Jewish education in North America is plagued by a severe shortage of trained and qualified educators for its numerous formal and informal settings. It is estimated that there are approximately 5,000 full-time positions for Jewish education graduates (outside of the Charedi sector) together approximately 100 people per year - a figure woefully inadequate to meet the needs of the field. Improvement is contingent upon a significant increase in the number of well-trained educators. This will include training for matters such as: competence in Judaica, proficiency in Hebrew, mastery of theory and practice of education. It is estimated that today less than half the educators in the field possess these qualifications.

The work of the Commission on Jewish Education in North America underlines the urgency of upgrading the quality and quantity of personnel at all levels in Jewish Education, and has made a number of recommendations to achieve this goal. One of its recommendations is to build a profession of Jewish educators. Significantly expanding the training capability serving North America is necessary as a cornerstone to that recommendation.

Work Plan

1.0 Start-Up

The project begins with a review of project purposes, methods, and work plan with the Board, professional advisors and staff of CIJE; defining working assumptions and priorities; establishing and meeting with a strategic planning committee; and reviewing background materials.

2.0 Resources and Needs Analysis

A detailed assessment of in-service and pre-service training needs of Jewish educators in both formal and informal settings will be carried out: annual demands for educators (at different levels, and with different kinds of knowledge and expertise); estimates of the qualified Jewish educators now being produced by higher education institutions in North America and Israel; and comparing the two to identify gaps. A variety of sub-markets will be identified by: geography (regions of the country), level of education (pre-school, elementary, secondary, post-secondary) educational role (e.g. professors, teachers, senior educators, guidance counselors), knowledge and skill areas of expertise. In addition to estimating the size of each submarket, we will examine related needs, such as job definitions and hierarchies, and salary structures.

3.0 Strategic Issues

In charting future directions there are a number of important policy choices: i.e., strategic issues.

Key informants - lay leaders, professionals, subject area experts - will be interviewed to elicit their views of the important choices in design and implementation of the training system.

Issues will be classified into:

- Mission-level issues-i.e. choices relating to the vision and philosophy of Jewish education and the role of different types of training institutions in relation to the emerging needs in the field. Examples of mission-level issues include: what elements of the continental training system should be local; which should be regional and which should be national? What should be the role(s) of the school; denominational network; local university and Board of Jewish Education in the provision of in-service training?

- Policy and program issues-i.e., choices relating to the broad policies relevant to carrying out the mission. Some of these choices relate to existing programs (e.g. policies relating to creating or locating skilled educators of educators). Others relate to the creation of the new programs (programs to market Jewish education careers to undergraduates on a multi-school basis). Other policy issues relate to degrees, curriculum, students, faculty and other aspects of the educational enterprise.

Resources and organization issues - i.e. choices relating to the internal capacity of present institutions to support mission and policies (e.g., the financial resources, organizational structure, possible coordinative and integrative mechanisms.

4.0 Mission Statement

A draft of the Mission Statement will be developed by the UAI team with the Strategic Planning Committee of CIJE. It will represent the resolution of mission-level strategic issues and frame a broad response to the Needs Assessment. The Mission Statement should describe in broad terms a model of the future training system. It should define the roles of various types of institutions both existing and new. It should project an overall approach to upgrading the quality of Jewish educators in the future.

5.0 Preliminary Recommendations

In this phase the Mission Statement will be developed into preliminary recommended policies and programs. The probable effectiveness and feasibility of each proposal will be assessed. The entire package would be reviewed from the perspective of completeness and internal consistency.

The recommendations may include the allocation of scarce resources among competing priorities (e.g., intra-regional priorities) and suggested criteria for deciding what kinds of programs to fund under what circumstances.

6.0 Implementation Plan

A detailed implementation plan will be developed that specifies: major tasks, persons or organization responsible for carrying tasks, annual costs and time frames. The process of developing the implementation plan provides a useful opportunity for developing partnerships among key stakeholders (e.g., consortia of institutions). The implementation plan becomes the framework for assigning accountability for getting work done.

7.0 Final Report

The Final Report will be in two parts: part one will include a summary of the needs; mission statement and recommended policies and programs for the next decade; part two will spell out the implementation plan priorities, tasks, timetables, budget and evaluation measures.

האוניברסיטה העברית בירושלים

THE HEBREW UNIVERSITY OF JERUSALEM

THE SAMUEL MENDEL MELTON CENTRE
FOR JEWISH EDUCATION IN THE DIASPORA
Mount Scopus, Jerusalem 91905 Israel, Tel:(02)882033
Facsimile:972-2-322-211

LIST OF LECTURERS AND AREA OF EXPERTISE

NAME	EXPERTISE
Dr. Janet Aviad	Sociology/Sociology of Education/Israeli Society
Prof. Emmanuel Etkes	History of the Jewish People/ History of Education
Shmuel Ben Hallal	Jewish Thought/Philosophy of Education
Dr. Howard Deitcher	Primary school/ Teaching of Texts
Alan Hoffmann	Innovation in Education/ Policy Planning Consultant
Dr. Gaby Horenčyk	Jewish Identity/Psychology of Education
Dr. David Hartman	Jewish Thought
Prof. Shlomo Haramati	Teaching Hebrew/Reading Comprehension
Debbie Weissman	Sociology/Sociology of Jewish Education
Dr. Ora Zohar	Development of Teaching Staff/ Teacher Training
Dr. Barry Chazan	Philosophy of Education/ Informal Education/Moral Education/Teaching Israel
Jonathan Cohen	Jewish Thought/Philosophy of Education/Didactics of Jewish Subjects.
Dr. Nechama Moshieff	Early childhood education
Dr.Ze'ev Mankowitz	Contemporary Jewry/The Holocaust and Teaching of the Holocaust

Nava Nevo	Teaching Hebrew
Marc Silverman	Teaching Contemporary Jewry
Dr. Dalia Ofer	Contemporary Jewry/Teaching the Holocaust
Prof. Seymour Fox	Curriculum Development/ Philosophy of Education
Prof. Michael Rosenak	Philosophy of Jewish Education/ The Morton Mandel chair for Jewish Education
Dr. Ilana Shohamy	Assesment of achievement in hebrew learning/ language testing/hebrew as a second language
Dr. Asher Shkedi	Workshops for teacher development/curriculum development