



THE JACOB RADER MARCUS CENTER OF THE
AMERICAN JEWISH ARCHIVES

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

Series D: Adam Gamoran Papers. 1991–2008.

Subseries 4: The Jewish Indicators Project, 1996–2000.

Box
67

Folder
2

Professors Group Seminar. Correspondence, notes, and
presentation, 1999.

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

From: Bena Medjuck <bmedjuck@mandelny.org>
To: "Adam Gamoran (E-mail)" <gamoran@ssc.wisc.edu>,
 "Anna Richert (E-mail)" <annaer@aol.com>,
 "Barbara Neufeld (E-mail)" <bneufeld@edmmatters.com>,
 "Barbara Schneider (E-mail)" <schneider@norcmail.uchicago.edu>,
 "Barry Holtz (E-mail)" <bholtz@mandelny.org>,
 "Bena Medjuck (E-mail)" <bmedjuck@mandelny.org>
To: "Bill Firestone (E-mail)" <wilfires@rci.rutgers.edu>,
 "Dan Chazan (E-mail)" <dchazan@msu.edu>,
 "Danny Pekarsky (E-mail)" <danpek@mac.wisc.edu>,
 "David Kaplan (E-mail)" <dkaplan@udel.edu>,
 "David Purpel (E-mail)" <purpeld@dewey.uncg.edu>,
 "Deborah Ball (E-mail)" <dball@umich.edu>
To: "Deborah Kerdeman (E-mail)" <kerdeman@u.washington.edu>,
 "Ellen Goldring (E-mail)" <ellen.b.goldring@vanderbilt.edu>,
 "Fran Jacobs (E-mail)" <fjacobs@emerald.tufts.edu>,
 "Gail Dorph (E-mail)" <gzdorph@mandelny.org>,
 "Ken Zeichner (E-mail)" <zeichner@facstaff.wisc.edu>,
 "Leah Strigler (E-mail)" <lstrigler@mandelny.org>
To: "Marvin Hoffman (E-mail)" <hoff@consortium-chicago.edu>,
 "Mike Milstein (E-mail)" <milstein@unm.edu>,
 "Moti Bar-Or (E-mail)" <baror@netmedia.net.il>,
 "Nessa Rapoport (E-mail)" <nrapoport@mandelny.org>,
 "Pam Grossman (E-mail)" <grossman@u.washington.edu>,
 "Richard Cohen (E-mail)" <sfukushi@ucla.edu>
To: "Sam Wineburg (E-mail)" <wineburg@u.washington.edu>,
 "Sarah Feinberg (E-mail)" <sfeinberg@mandelny.org>,
 "Sharon Feiman-Nemser (E-mail)" <snemser@pilot.msu.edu>,
 "Susan Stodolsky (E-mail)" <s-stodolsky@uchicago.edu>,
 "Walter Feinberg (E-mail)" <wfeinber@uiuc.edu>
Subject: Seminar: June 3-6, 1999
Date: Mon, 3 May 1999 14:29:53 -0400
X-MIME-Autoconverted: from quoted-printable to 8bit by ssc.wisc.edu id NAA23355

Dear Professors Group,

Here is the technical information you need about our upcoming seminar. I am sending this memo to the entire list just to keep everyone informed, but if you've previously indicated that you are unable to come, you need not respond (unless you've changed your plans and you find you can join us after all!)

I am writing this memo from the email account of our new program assistant, Bena Medjuck, who will be handling arrangements (as Sarah used to) for the retreat. Please reply to her about technical arrangements, though you can certainly feel free to be in touch with me as well.

The seminar will run from 3:00pm, Thursday June 3rd to 1:00pm, Sunday June 6th. It will take place at the lovely Crowne Plaza Redondo Beach and Marina Hotel, 300 N. Harbor Drive, Redondo Beach, CA. (310-318-8888; fax: 310-376-1930). The hotel is convenient to the Los Angeles (LAX) airport.

Getting from LAX to the hotel, you have two options:

Super Shuttle: 1-310-782-6600 or 1-800-862-7771. When you arrive at baggage claim, find a courtesy phone and dial 56735 to get to a Super Shuttle agent. The agent will tell you where to go to meet the shuttle. This will cost \$9, and will take 30-45 minutes to get to the hotel, depending on the number of stops the shuttle makes along the way.

Taxi: This option will cost up to \$25 and is about a 15 minute trip from LAX (7 miles).

(The transportation options for returning to LAX on Sunday are similar, however the negotiated taxi rate from the hotel is \$19. Bena will compare your departure schedules and try to group you accordingly.)

Please send Bena all of your arrival and departure information as soon as possible, so she can take care of hotel reservations.

About making your airline bookings, please call Ally our travel agent at World Travel. Their toll-free number is 1-888-421-7500. Ally is familiar with our seminar and the dates, so you just need to identify yourself as one of our participants and mention which seminar you are calling about. Make a note of the times we are starting and ending the seminar so you don't have to miss any of the program! The system for payment is as always: please book and purchase the ticket yourself, and the Mandel Foundation will reimburse you after the seminar. Be sure to save all original ticket receipts so that this reimbursement goes smoothly! The same goes for ground transportation expenses.

I will get back to you later in the month about the specifics of the program. Once again, Moti and Melila will be joining us to lead the study sessions.

Barry (via Bena)

Bena E. Medjuck
Program Assistant
Mandel Foundation
15 East 26th Street, Suite 1817
New York, NY 10010-1579
Phone: (212) 532-2630 ext. 12
Fax: (212) 532-2646
E-mail: bmedjuck@mandelny.org



No Recipient, No Subject

To: elleng, bethamie
From: Adam Gamoran <gamoran@ssc.wisc.edu>
Subject: draft notes -- comments invited
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:

Summary of conference call

Participants: Adam Gamoran, Ellen Goldring, Bethamie Horowitz
Date: May 3, 1999
Purpose: To brainstorm ideas for a supplement to the NJPS 2000

We agreed that we are thinking about a supplement, as opposed to a follow-up, in the sense that the additional survey will occur too close in time to the original to expect longitudinal change. Instead, the purpose of the supplement is to ask additional questions that were excluded due to time considerations from the original NJPS 2000. We developed four sets of ideas, or directions, for how the supplement could be used. For each direction we tried to answer the question, how would this serve the goals of the Foundation?

1) The obvious and probably most important new direction for the supplement (from our perspective) would be to obtain enhanced data on Jewish identity. Bethamie's review identifies subjective as well as behavioral dimensions of identity, but most of the data thus far address only the behavioral aspects (ritual activity, etc.). We have made several recommendations for subjective elements (centrality of Jewishness, content of Jewishness) for NJPS 2000, and depending on what is included, we may want to use the supplement for additional items on one or both dimensions of identity.

This plan is central to the Indicators Project. It fits well with the direction proposed by the CIJE Board, to use national data to assess the "outcomes" of education. The timing seems right from our perspective, in that we expect to have concluded a process of developing new indicators of Jewish identity, led by Bethamie Horowitz.

[Update 5/5/99: The second draft of the NJPS 2000 questionnaire excludes the subjective identity questions we had proposed. We are still working on including them, but if they are excluded from the main questionnaire that would elevate their priority for the supplement.]

2) More data on participation in Jewish institutions, especially schools and other educational institutions. Again, we need to wait until we see what is included in NJPS 2000, to see how much need there is for additional data on participation. It seems likely we will want additional detail on the participation of Jewish adults in educational activities.

This issue is also central to the indicators project. Participation rates are important as indicators at both the individual and institutional levels. The NJPS 2000 sample would yield individual-level data, although we may use the survey as an opportunity to develop indicators that could later be used as the basis of institutional indicators.

3) Choices and decision-making about involvement in Jewish educational institutions. In this plan, we would move beyond descriptive information about who participates in what, to ask why. What are the bases for decisions about participation? How much do finances matter? How important is proximity? Do institutional challenges and demands tend to bring people in or push people away? Addressing these questions would provide valuable information for policy decisions about increasing involvement

in Jewish institutions such as schools and summer camps for respondents' children, and synagogues and adult education for the respondents themselves. The NJPS gives a unique opportunity to pose these questions to Jews who are NOT currently participating in these institutions as well as those who are.

To understand choices, one needs to know about the context in which the choices occur. Consequently if we pursue questions in this area, we will also need to ask new questions about each respondent's perceived local Jewish context.

4) Data to enhance the methodological rigor of NJPS analyses. We have three ideas:

a) Most important, we would propose to collect additional data on the childhood family background and experiences of adult respondents. These data are essential for asking questions about the impact of education.

b) The ideal way of adjusting for background differences is to collect data from the siblings of respondents. Because siblings share a common family background, one can use sibling data to distinguish between the effects of background (which are the same for two siblings) and the effects of other experiences such as years of Jewish schooling (which may differ between siblings).

c) Another supplement would be to gather data from other household members, e.g. spouses or children. This would greatly increase the reliability of our data on family practices and choices. It would also allow us to explore questions about Jewish family life in greater detail.

These supplements serve the Foundations' needs by improving the quality of analyses that address substantive questions of concern to the Foundation.

Following this discussion, we decide to wait until we see what is in the NJPS 2000 before making further decisions.

MEMO

MANDEL FOUNDATION

May 24, 1999

To: "Professors group" seminar participants
From: Adam Gamoran
Re: Education sessions at the seminar

One of the great benefits for me as a participant in the "professors group" is the opportunity to share some of the work we are doing with the Mandel Foundation and obtain your insights and guidance. You may recall that a couple of years ago, at the meeting in Florida, we introduced the idea of an Indicators Project, which would monitor key elements of Jewish education to find out where things stand currently and to assess progress that we hope will occur. Your suggestions at that time were very helpful, and now that we've made some progress, we'd like to ask for your feedback again.

Attached are two papers related to the project. In this memo I will describe the project briefly and provide a context for the two papers. Please read the papers in advance of the seminar in preparation for a discussion we will hold. Questions for discussion are noted at the end of this memo.

THE INDICATORS PROJECT

With all the activities occurring under the rubric of "continuity," how will we know if the efforts are making progress? In other fields, such as business, education, and medicine, widely accepted indicators are used to monitor change. In the Jewish world, one indicator -- the intermarriage rate -- has gained the headlines, but there are many other ways to assess current status and monitor trends. We need an indicator system that allows us to assess the quality of Jewish education, and the quality of those aspects of Jewish life that may be seen as outcomes of education. The Indicators Project offers a coordinated strategy for assessing whether the wide array of initiatives in Jewish education and communal life are making a difference. It can help galvanize attention and mobilize support for Jewish education.

A system of Jewish indicators would allow us to describe the current status of Jewish education -- both inputs and outcomes -- and to monitor change over time. We propose to provide reports at regular, ongoing intervals, about indicators that reach beyond the intermarriage rate. The purpose of the indicators is not to evaluate specific initiatives, but to monitor broader trends, at the national and/or community levels. However, the instruments could ultimately be modified for narrower purposes, such as self-assessments of individual communities, and the evaluation of specific programs.

Through a series of consultations, we identified key features of the inputs

and outcomes of Jewish education for which indicators need to be developed:

INPUTS

- * Educators who are richly prepared and committed to ongoing professional growth.
- * Strong, informed community support for education.
- * High-quality Jewish institutions driven by a guiding vision, providing life-long opportunities for learning, and offering Jewish content infused with meaning for those who participate.
- * Rabbis who view teaching and learning as integral to their work.

OUTCOMES

- * Jewish literacy and the centrality of Jewish learning
- * Strong Jewish identity
- * High level of involvement in Jewish life and Jewish institutions
- * Strong leadership
- * Commitment to social justice

For some of these elements, indicators are fairly well developed. For example, our own work has yielded indicators of prepared educators. In other areas, such as Jewish identity, substantial changes are needed to existing indicators. In still other domains, such as the centrality of learning and the quality of institutions, we are working almost from scratch.

THE PAPERS

As a first step in developing indicators, we commissioned papers in two areas which we deemed high priority: the quality of Jewish educating institutions, and Jewish identity. The charge to each author was to review the relevant literature, in both the secular and Jewish arenas, and to arrive at recommendations for how we should proceed towards the development of indicators. The two papers, one authored by Ellen Goldring and the other by Bethamie Horowitz, are attached. As a stimulus for discussion, please think about each paper with the following questions in mind:

1. What are your reactions to the recommendations presented? Are they well grounded in the literature? Are they feasible for implementation? Will they lead to a system of indicators that is useful for galvanizing attention and monitoring change?

2. Do you have alternative or additional recommendations?

3. Are there additional perspectives and literature that should be considered to help inform decisions about developing and implementing a system of indicators for Jewish educational institutions and Jewish identity?

Indicators of Educational Organizations

Indicators are tools used in education, social services and other public policy arenas to provide decision makers, clients, and staff information about the 'state of affairs' of their enterprise. Indicators are central to the discourse about how to measure and monitor the quality of services provided. Most social service delivery, including educational services, is provided via organizations or institutions. Thus, a central aspect of many indicator systems pertains to the measurements of the quality of the organization or institution.¹

This paper is written to provide a basis for discussion to the Mandel Foundation regarding the development of an indicator system of high quality educational institutions. This paper will focus primarily on indicators in formal educational settings, namely schools. The paper will provide examples of the types of issues that would need to be addressed when considering the development of indicators for other institutional settings as well. Specifically, this paper will: 1) review some of the major purposes and uses of educational indicators, 2) discuss some of the indicator systems that have been developed for the study educational institutions, 3) critique the use of indicator systems; and, 4) provide alternative methodologies and perspectives.

¹Throughout this paper educational institutions and organizations will be used synonymously and refer primarily to formal school settings.

Purpose and Use of Indicators Systems

Indicators are a widespread policy tool “designed to provide information about the status, quality or performance of the educational system” (Burstein, Oaks, & Guiton, 1997 p. 410, encyclopedia). A review of the literature suggests that there are five general uses and corresponding purposes of educational indicators: 1)description; 2)advancement of policy agendas; 3)accountability; 4)evaluation; and 5)management information (Ogawa and Collom, 1999). Although these specific purposes are often differentiated in the literature, they are highly interrelated with one another.

Indicators provide a **description** of the general health of the educational institution. Thus, over time, indicators can chart trends and describe the status of education (Shavelson et al, 1989; 1991). The descriptive use of indicators can help policy makers and educators identify and describe problems (Oaks, 1986). An example of a descriptive indicator is the percent of Jewish educators in educational institutions that participate in high quality professional development.

By articulating indicators of educational institutions, they quickly become instruments of **policy**. As Oaks (1986) reminds us, indicators are political entities that reflect assumptions about the nature and purpose of education. What is measured will be what is important. Therefore, indicators simultaneously reflect and define an educational agenda or promote specific educational policies.(education counts, p. 7) Often, policy makers employ indicators to advance, highlight or defend their educational and ideological views (Ruby, 1994).

It is often suggested that the ability to focus attention on critical policy issues, is the most important use of indicators. “The strength of indicators ...is that they focus attention on critical issues. This focusing property means that they can become levers for change; indicators,

by themselves, can become tools of reform because they are such excellent devices for public communication. “(education counts, pg. 7). In the reporting of the percent of teachers who participate in high quality professional development, community leaders are focusing attention on the importance of professional development.

Indicators are often used as vital signs of **accountability**. Two aspects of accountability are often achieved through the use of indicators, regulatory compliance and performance monitoring (Ogawa and...1999). Regulatory compliance often involves the monitoring of organizational inputs and processes, such as, proper reporting of finances, or following specific procedures. Performance monitoring involves indicators that report outcomes for teachers and students. Typical performance monitoring for students usually involves standardized test scores, participation rates, and drop out rates. Teacher accountability indicators can include levels of preparation, participation in professional development, and implementation of curriculum as well as linkages to student learning.

When indicators are used as mechanisms for accountability, a system of sanctions and rewards, both intrinsic and extrinsic, is often utilized so there are incentives to hold institutions accountable. MORE HERE>>>>OR PERHAPS USE BURSTEIN FRAMEWORK FOR THREE USES.

Closely related to the accountability purpose of indicators, is their use in **evaluation**. When indicators have a standard against which they can be judged, indicators can be used as data for evaluation. In most cases, the evaluation standard employed is a comparison of an indicator with itself over time, or a comparison of the measure against the same measure in other contexts, other organizations or locations (Dickson and Lam, 1991). Using indicators as an

evaluation mechanism provides policy makers with feedback about the system. This information should not be used to infer causality, but rather provides data for working hypotheses about the educational enterprise and provides warning systems regarding already established relationships within the system (Bursetein, encyclopdeia). NEED EXAMPLE.

Beyond describing educational organizations, promoting policy agendas, monitoring and evaluating the system, indicators “can purportedly provide diagnoses and prescribe treatments for emergent problems” (ogawa, p. 15). As an information management tool, indicators can serve as ‘early warning systems’ to future problems (Nuttall, 1994; Ghutrie, 1993). Thus if an important indicator is monitored over time, such as the availability of highly qualified personnel, a trend that indicates fewer and fewer trained teachers in the subject matter that they teach, can be the early warning for the need to address teacher preparation.

/no - not early warning - too late

As mentioned, the uses and proposed purposes of educational indicators are highly interrelated with one another. In other words, once an indicator is used to describe an educational organization, it quickly becomes an instrument of policy to signal to various audiences “what is important”. As indicators are collected over time, or across various contexts, inevitability, they begin to be used to monitor or evaluate. If sanctions and rewards are used, indicators become parts of accountability systems. For example, if participation rates are used to describe the level of engagement in a Jewish community, and those levels decline, or are less than those levels in other, comparable communities, they can be used as a vehicle of evaluation and assessment as well as warnings about possible problems that may require intervention. In sum, a viable and comprehensive system of indicators can simultaneously monitor the health of the organization, identify problems, and illuminate the road ahead (Education counts, pg. 6).

Developing Indicator Systems

To achieve these multiple purposes, it is almost universally agreed that indicators of educational organizations must be part of a system of indicators. "Indicator systems are developed, which (ideally) measure distinct components of the system of interest but also provide information about how the individual components work together to produce the overall effect (Oaks, 1986, p????). In other words, individual indicators should have "an understandable relationship to the health of the system and to each other so that together they can be viewed as model of the system. "Burstein, encyclopedia, p. 410.). In our case, system refers to educational institutions.

A system of indicators for educational organizations requires a model or working schema of the nature of the educational enterprise. In other words, a model should answer the questions, "How do the various components of the organization interact with one another"? The model specifies the important components of the organization, and presents assumptions, hypotheses or empirically validated information of the nature of the relationship between the various components. Each component is then operationalized and defined by specific measures.

Conceptual Models: What should be measured?

There are various models , or conceptual maps, of indicator systems of high quality educational institutions or organizations. Three examples are presented here . These examples represent prevailing views in general education literature today.

I. The Rand Model: Input/process/output

Most indicator systems applied to the quality of educational organizations are based on an input/process/output model of organizational functioning and effectiveness (Scott, 1987). An important theory of organizational effectiveness (Yuchtman and Seashore, 1967) posits the importance of all three types of indicators: the importation of resources (capacity, such as money and qualified personnel) + their use in specified activities (processes, such as teaching and learning)+output (outcomes, such as student knowledge, or heightened Jewish identity)= organizational effectiveness. One part of the indicator system refers to the level and types of **inputs**, or capacity available to ensure high quality. Examples of these types of indicators may include, level of training of personnel, ongoing professional development, financial support, and leadership. A second part of the model to identifying high-quality institutions is a focus on institutional or organizational **processes** or activities. Examples of process indicators may include the types of programs offered, level of the curricula, and the type/level of Jewish content in the programs. A third aspect to identifying high-quality institutions is a focus on **outcome** indicators, such as participation rates, drop out rates, and achievement.

How has this basic model, input/process/output been applied to indicator systems for high quality educational institutions? Figure One presents one of the models developed by RAND (Oaks, 1986). Inputs refer to fiscal and other resources, teacher quality and student background characteristics. Process indicators within the educational institution or school include school quality, curriculum quality, teacher quality and instructional quality, while outcomes refer to achievement, participation and dropout, and attitudes and aspirations. In the case of Jewish education, attitude and aspirations could refer to Jewish identity, while achievement could refer

to specific skills and knowledge.

II. Education Counts: Issue Areas

Another prevalent model of institutional quality has been set forth by the Special Study Panel on Educational Indicators, a panel of teachers, analysts, school administrators, employers and an academic from across the US who met and deliberated to suggest a strategy to develop “a comprehensive education indicator information system capable of monitoring the health of the enterprise, identifying problems and illuminating the road ahead”, (p. 6). This panel was constituted in response to the articulation of national educational goals, *America 2000*. (See FIGURE 2). They organized their indicator system around six “issue areas” of significant and enduring educational importance. For each issues area, the panel identified two to five main concepts and three to six sub-concepts. Indicators would be measured for each of the sub-concepts.

For the purposes of our interest in the quality of educational institutions, two issue areas will be discussed, learner outcomes and quality of educational institutions. The panel conceptualized learner outcomes in three broad areas, or in three main concepts: core content, integrative reasoning, and attitudes and dispositions. Core content refers to “the store of facts and knowledge grounded in traditional subject matter” (p. 30). Integrative reasoning are indicators of “the ability to reason about, and apply insight to, complex issues, drawing on knowledge from distinct areas of core content” (p. 30), while attitudes and dispositions refer to tolerance, self-direction, participation, engagement with learning, etc. These indicators are measured using NAEP and other achievement tests and national assessments, but many of these

learning outcomes are not currently measured. The panel noted the difficulty in developing “authentic” assessments, beyond multiple choice tests. The panel encouraged the development of these types of indicators.

It should be noted, that the panel did not view learning outcomes as necessarily a part of the indicator system of educational institutions. They conceptualized learner outcome indicators at both the institutional, state and national levels.

Quality of educational institutions (see figure 3) is defined in five major indicator areas, each with specific sub-concepts that are measured: 1) *Learning Opportunities* refer to exposure to subject matter, nature of learning opportunities, assignment of teachers and students, and curricular integration; 2) *Teachers* refers to quality and characteristics of those entering the profession, pre-service training, and competence in the classroom; 3) *Conditions of Teacher’s Work* includes measures of basic classroom resources, supporting resources, influence over core matters of work and support for ongoing teacher development; 4) *Institutions as Places of Purpose and Character* refers to clarity of mission, human environment, basic order and safety, and press toward academic work. The final issue in the indicator system for high quality educational institutions is 5) *School Resources*, such as buildings, libraries, labs and technology and professional personnel. According to the panel, high quality educational institutions are those that exhibit high levels of each of these indicators.

Some of the measures for these indicators are available through national data bases in the US. For example, the Schools and Staffing Survey and NELS (National Educational Longitudinal Study:88) provide information on teacher preparation, certification status, and self reports of efficacy. Other national data sets have measures of school climate and academic press.

Opportunity to learn has been measured by using a three prong approach. The intended curriculum is articulated by school system officials, as they report what is supposed to be taught. Implemented curriculum is measured by a survey questionnaire administered to teachers, and the attained curriculum is measured by student achievement and attitudes toward the subject matter (McDonnel, EEPA, 1995).

III. Committee on the Evaluation of National and State Assessments of Educational Progress:

Research Based system

Recently, a panel of scholars was charged with evaluating the status and purpose of the National and State Assessments of Educational Progress (NAEP) (Pellegrino, 1999). NAEP, known as the 'nation's report card', first administered in the late 1960s, is the only continuing measure of the achievement of US students in key subject areas. In the context of those deliberations, the panel recommended the following:

The nation's educational progress should be portrayed by a broad array of education indicators that include but goes beyond NAEP's achievement results. The U. S. Department of Education should integrate and supplement the current collections of data about education inputs, practices, and outcomes to provide a more comprehensive picture of education in America" (Pellegrino, p. 22, 1999).

The panel advocates an indicator system that suggests relationships among students, schools, and achievement variables. This model of an indicator system is presented in Figure 4. This model relies on the previous RAND and Special Study Panel models, and relies on areas that have been documented through empirical research to have associations with student achievement.

Specifically, this model does not specify inputs and processes, but the goal is to "embed

*elaborate on
new this note*

measures of student achievement within a broader range of educational measures” (p. 42, Pellegrino, 1999). These indicators, beyond achievement, are based upon school organizational processes that have been examined in prior research and provide a useful context for both understanding student achievement and support policy relevant implications (Third International Mathematics and Science Study, 1996; Porter, 1996). Thus, the NAEP panel suggests collecting indicator data on aspects of school organization that impact student achievement both in and out of the educational institution. Included in this indicator system are measures of students and home and community support for learning. School and classroom indicators include school climate/environment, financial resources, organization and governance, teacher education and professional development, standards and curricula, and instructional practice.

Summary: The three examples presented above suggest that a conceptual model about the interrelationships among components of an educational organization or institution is a central step in designing a comprehensive indicator system of institutional quality. The conceptual models presented above are heavily based upon decades of empirical research about the correlates of school achievement and are rooted in the political values about education in the United States. Although not all of the models ascribe to an input/process/output approach, they highly resemble that conceptual view of organizational effectiveness.

goal

A synthesis of the three models provides an example of a comprehensive system of indicators of high quality educational institutions. Rather than organize the indicators in an input/process/output model, we chose to organize them in terms of embedded levels of the organizational system (See Figure 5). Thus, high quality educational institutions are those that , that exhibit “high” levels, on each of the indicators specified.

center

What data is collected?

Once a conceptual model of an indicator system has been delineated to provide an organizing framework for the relationships among components in the institution, the next step is to operationalize the concepts with component measures (Burstein, 1991). What specifically should be measured for information on each indicator? Obviously, the models provide very broad conceptions, but provide little by way of definitions: What do we mean by clarity of mission? What is teacher quality?

Deciding upon specific measures to reflect the indicator system is very complex, and requires multiple trade offs and judgements. It also involves keeping in mind the purposes of indicator systems. Porter (1991) reminds us that indicators are statistics that can be easily aggregated. Therefore, three criteria are often used when deciding upon specific measures: 1) importance/usefulness, 2) technical quality, namely reliability and validity, and 3) feasibility, such as cost (Blank, 1991). All these three categories require considerable judgments and trade offs.

The substantive issues should already be addressed to some extent by clearly articulating a model or system of indicators that defines the components of high quality educational institutions. The specific measures implemented should provide information that is easily understood to a wide audience. Furthermore, measures should be 'few in number'.

"Policymakers and the public will not wade through hundreds of pages of tables describing each

of hundred and thousands of characteristics of curriculum, instruction, and school processes” (Porter, 1991, p.24). Therefore, indicators are often based upon averages of various measures. An indicator of quality teaching could be an average across ten measures of characteristics of “good teaching”. “Despite the complexity of school processes, indicators must provide straightforward and parsimonious description, or they will lack utility” (Porter, 1991, p.24).

Other criteria are offered for deciding upon specific measures. Indicators should measure ubiquitous and enduring features of schooling, that is, aspects of educational institutions that can be found throughout the system over time for purposes of comparison, across locals and settings (Oaks, 1986). If post Bar Mitzvah programs were only offered one year on an trial basis, this would not be an appropriate indicator of participation. Furthermore, specific measurement should include measures that can estimate change over time, or comparability from one system, context or location to another. This implies that the measures must be broad enough in their definition.

Issues of validity and reliability are of major concern. One concern is stability of measures. Measurements take at different times and by different data collectors must be valid. Another concern is the validity or distortion of self-reports. What is the relationship between what teachers say they are doing in the classroom and what actually transpires in the classroom? A third concern is non-response rates. How do we interpret measures when few participants respond? (Porter, 1991).

Feasibility and costs are other major criteria for selecting specific measures. As attempts are made to increase reliability and validity, costs are often increased. Therefore, policy makers often decide to measure fewer indicators in the system of institutional quality. Limited measures

of institutional quality may be implemented and reported over time, based on the criteria of importance, technical soundness, and feasibility. Often, those indicators and corresponding measures with the most consensus are those implemented, such as teacher quality, or participation rates.

How Is Data Collected?

Indicator data tend to be measured by relying on large-scale survey methodology, such as standardized tests, and other survey questionnaires with items that are then scaled to measure such indicators as school climate, school organization and governance and effective leadership. Other data are collected by administrative reporting in such areas as teacher characteristics. As mentioned earlier, through national data collection and other large scale research efforts, survey questionnaire items are available that measure most of the concepts presented in the indicator models above. Surveys are available that collect data about teacher classroom strategies and curriculum implementation. It is important to note that these survey items are heavily based upon a prevailing, normative view of the indicators of institutional quality. For example, survey questionnaires that measures educational climates that support learning are based upon one specific notion of school climate. (See Appendix for example of one such survey.)²

There are important indicators that are not well suited to survey and self-reports. In these cases, indicators can be measured with more complex and costly methods. In the TIMSS study, for example, complicated classroom and teacher indicators were measured by videotaped observations (Peak, 1996). Other non-survey methods include interviews, observations,

²It is beyond the scope of this discussion paper to present specific measures of the indicators of high quality educational institutions. This could be the focus another paper.

teacher logs and other samples of teacher and student work.

It should be noted that most indicator systems to date, rely heavily on survey methods of self-administered and self-reported questionnaires to allow for very large and broad samples, comparability, and reduced costs. As suggested above, indicator systems require trade offs between substantive issues, reliability and validity of measures, and cost. If an indicator is highly important, policy makers may be willing to invest more in the data collection strategies.

Limits and Critiques of Indicators of High Quality Institutions

Indicators are limited in their scope and purpose. Indicators can only describe general properties or characteristics of educational institutions. They are limited to aspects of the institution that can be captured in numbers and statistics. Hence they reduce complex phenomenon into static measures.

Limitations on the description of the system

Limitations of measurement

Limitations of numbers

Indic Disc - Prof Gr - 6/4/99

identity

WF - paper shows shift in identity

- issues of definition
 - what defines a Jew
 - dual identities
- not only subjective identity, "ob" identity
- also by institutional arrangements

BH - yes

DP - accord to the paper, def of identity is method rather than culture

- missing - cult context
- es - no disc of race

RC - self identity

- how Jews define who is a Jew
- how does outside define who is a Jew

WT - pos, could examine what is contested about J ed
- a study of the range of what people take to be Jewishness

FT - look at devel of J ident over time
- what does ident look like at 6 vs 12 etc.

* - NB J ident as outcome of J ed
- what pt in time? what's the devel
- devel of J ident
- devel of "relativism" (spirituality)
- relat to J educ

- need to think abt general psych dev of ident
- and to know abt dev of J ident

EG - impts of inst. + context - fams, peers, schools, etc.
(vs. devel psych)

* - how does empir res fit deal w/
conceptual models - operational, measures concepts
(contestedness etc.) - what can we learn from that (i.e.)

BN - census - people don't ident selves consistently
BH - yes - Mary Waters etc.
BN - don't overstate what can know from indices

DP - emphas what Jews contribute

BH - ~~that~~ prioritize the list using as criteria the relat bta educ & identity

* MM - this is a major theme of ch
 - recs 1-7 are hypotheses
 - test w/ J pop, ^{various} w/in J pop, ^{larger world} that make ^{issues abt Jews}

BH - hard to pick among these bcs diff ones are impt in diff contexts

BN - what's Jewish abt these indicators

BH - Connects & J's explored context of J identity

EG - agreement abt messiness, nonlinearity of J ident
 - what nature want this to look like? ~~the~~
 - what do we want to say

BH - would like to have people more aware or conscious of selves as Jews

AG - not just that - also - J knowledge / context
 - cont to J community
 - universal etc. values esp ^{justice}

RC - need broad indicators not just MF criteria for pos J ident - esp

MM - so link to policy, doc-mak, res alloc
 - need to hold up a mirror to see where we are

FS - need to build the train of argument
 - from J to J identity

RC - this is baseline

J instits

general view - paper is well balanced
 - limits of indices are noted

MM - what abt outcome data?

EG - that could be in rec #2

DP - art (lit, dance, etc.) as ind. of what's going on in J life + J ed

* general - what do we mean by "high quality"?

RC - formal, non-formal, informal instits
 - Tam Labelle

DP - nb absence of ref to J in both papers

FJ - what do people want from J educ?

EG - NJPS supplem study
 - but not for indicators

FJ - what do people want, whether or not parties? - market
 - what brings satisfac among the parties
 - no fuzzy abt "dosage" - what ^{level of} inter leads to what result
 - intervene thro needs to incorp
 - meas what kids ind - build an argumt, meas steps
 - need to construct argumt abt linkages

EG - probl of what to measure

general - need to know abt context of what ~~that~~ ^{taught,} learned
 - also hidden currie

BN - if looking at a s.w, should look at
 things s.w.s do

BH - harder to dev indices ~~vs~~ informal - more ~~the~~ ^{so}
 - link to raise issues eg identity

EG - analogy still holds - measure close to what
 the instits do

RC - first, test the skill against what it says it's doing
 - second, what are conseqs of d.fts among s.w.s (instit)

MM - desire for self-knowledge implied by paper
 - accred. tat - user driven
 - comb stds from outside w/ d.fts from inside

RC - very complic for this case
 - lack of agreed on boundaries w/ formal h
 - indiv choices are made

WF - indices can be very top-down
- another model

- Dartmouth sociol who meas common repts to diseases
- eg # hysterectomies in a community
- he just puts it out there w/o ^{a story} ~~analysis~~
- but provokes conversat among doctors
- we could put it at there in straightforward
- positive way, grand it (w/o making a case)
- then ask schls what they think is
- input not or edc

FTJ - what ^{elements of} ~~what~~ makes it easier for people to
return to Judaism

- eg knowledge of Hebrew

RC - no - barriers have come down bcs orgz comm
has come to the point
general - that's an empirical ^{unatt. bcs hated + as kids} ~~unatt. bcs hated + as kids~~ ^{the point} ~~the point~~ ^{is} ~~is~~

We should look at our calendars to see when we want to talk to Barbara + David -

Ideally I'd like to give them the notes from Fran + Barbara first. If we don't get the notes quickly (1 week) I would not want to wait.

I don't think it matters all that much - it's not as if there were major changes - & It might be good to set up the call anyway so B + D know to read them by a certain date. (David read this version already)

The main thing I took away was to make the call for choosing output indicators stronger - + linking it "close" to what goes on in schools.

There were some important points for Bethamine's paper

- developmental understanding of identity (Fran)
- how the empirical literature deals with issues of operationalization (Ellen)
- Jewish identity as determined by outsiders (Mike)

one other point for your paper - ~~that~~ use of term "high" quality

I could add a 5th rec about a
"theory building" research agenda - From
PT - but - I'm afraid that will
allow the default of no
indicators until that - +

How about if we set a date for
a conversation 2 weeks from now
- if we have the notes, fine, if not,
no G.S. deal

I had some organizational suggestions
about both papers too - about

putting the empirical discussion after
each strand - rather than just
lumping it at the end

Notes on the Discussion of Ellen Goldring's Paper on Indicators: June 4, 1999
Notes written by Barbara Neufeld

Adam began the discussion by asking whether there were any general reactions to the paper. He asked for these prior to beginning to consider the recommendations at the end of the paper. The room remained silent for a short while. Then Richard noted that we had begun the conversation about indicators the previous day, Thursday, when members of the group raised concerns about the use of indicators and their potential to mask some of the important variation that exists among Jewish educational institutions. Others raised concerns about the potential of indicators to lead to standardization in what schools do so that they will conform to the specifications of the indicators.

Ellen asked, given the discussion yesterday, did participants find the paper to be a balanced presentation of the issues associated with indicators. The group agreed that it was a balanced document that raised the potential benefits and shortcomings of developing and using indicators. David indicated that he was greatly relieved when he got to the latter part of the discussion that dealt with the use of qualitative indicators.

The discussion then turned to the question of whether there was too much discussion of input and through-put indicators and insufficient attention to outcome indicators in the "Future Directions" section of the paper that begins on p. 36. The perceived emphasis on inputs suggests too little attention on what the institutions are producing. Fran suggested that there is no attention to the question of what Mandel (or anyone else) is hoping to see as the outcome of the educational institutions' efforts. She discussed, as a strategy, creating some theory and hypotheses about the ways in which the indicators might be linked to the kinds of outcomes the Jewish educational community would welcome.

Ellen put her recommendations into context by reminding us that she was suggesting a way to move forward with the indicators project that would start with the collection of high consensus, low-cost indicator data and that would, simultaneously involve selection of a few other indicators that could provide baseline data and lead to further studies that would test the kinds of hypotheses Fran was suggesting.

David then added that he would use the arts, construed broadly, as indicators of what might be happening within Jewish identity and education. David was not suggesting that the arts were outputs of Jewish education; rather, he was building on Barbara's suggestion that one could learn a great deal that might inform the selection and definition of indicators by studying or looking toward sources such as literature connected to ethnic groups' experience and response to the American homogenizing experience. She suggested books like *Caucasia* and *Mona in the Promised Land* for this purpose. David suggested the importance of some of Philip Roth's more recent works. He noted that artists are shrewd in capturing this kind of experience. Richard commented (perhaps suggesting that we were moving too far afield) that Ellen's paper was about educational institutions rather than the experience of the larger culture. There was some

discussion of the links between the influence of the larger culture and ultimate Jewish identity; about the importance of not completely separating our understanding of schools from our understanding of the larger cultural experience of Jewishness.

Wally then asked Ellen whether, when she says educational institutions, her mind is on schools or on institutions other than schools. He wanted some clarification because it would make a difference in how we thought about indicators. Ellen responded that she took the easy way out, in a way, by focusing on formal institutions of education. Otherwise, she suggested, the work becomes messy. Bounded institutions are easier to deal with when considering indicators. But, she suggested, some indicators cut across formal and informal educational experiences, for example camps and schools. Ellen suggested that indicators of quality in camping and Israel experiences might be similar to those that apply to schools. She thought it might be worthwhile to consider some of the indicators that would fit both kinds of educational experiences. Richard said that it might be useful to re-read the work of LaBelle who wrote about three kinds of educational organizations: formal, non-formal and informal.

Barry commented that he liked the point Ellen made about the quality of goals found in institutions. Ellen had noted that organizations may have goals, but those goals may be stupid goals. This, it seems, we need to be careful in an indicators project and in other work, to make sure we learn about the quality associated with the indicators.

David then said that he was surprised that there was no mention of Israel in either paper (Bethamie's or Ellen's) and wondered whether some aspect of Israel should be included in the discussion. Similarly, there was no discussion of the hidden curriculum of schooling that is always an important influence on outcomes. Shouldn't these components of education and identity be part of the discussion? Adam noted that when talking to Israeli educators about what's Jewish in that nation's secular schools, they stressed that it was the study of Israel. But, he agreed, it is missing in our discussion and probably belongs someplace.

Fran then outlined three points that could further the discussion of indicators and how they might be linked to outputs that matter to the Mandel Foundation.

1. On the input side: We do not know what people want from Jewish education. There has been no market survey and it would be worth doing because it could help create what people actually want. How people understand the institutions in their communities and how that influences their choices about whether to participate in them or whether to choose one over another would be useful information. Understanding the community's understanding of its institutions and what they want from them would be preparatory work to setting up a research agenda that could lead to indicators that had real meaning.

2. Fran hasn't found any discussion of what kids think of their Jewish education when they are in it. There is no consumer data, in other words. This seems wrong

given that the system is voluntary and we could lose the market and not know why.

3. There isn't any intervention theory that speaks to the dosage issue of educational impact. How much treatment is enough? We need to develop a theory that says, "this much education will get you this much and this kind of outcome."

4. We could measure what children learn and could build a theory about the impact of learning on identity.

Ellen responded to the last two points by saying that we do know that more hours of Hebrew will lead to more learning, but there's a political context that makes this kind of study quite difficult. She said that we could get into extreme complications by trying to measure content because institutions have very different ideas about, for example, how much Hebrew is enough. People feel attacked when hearing about the natural variation that occurs in this area for example. They feel they are being criticized if they are not doing what is deemed significant and effective. Highlighting these differences could, therefore, be problematic within the Jewish education community.

AMERICAN JEWISH

Ellen's comment led to some discussion about the possibility of improving Jewish education and the meaningfulness of indicators of quality institutions if the indicators could not focus on content. Barbara described her experience at a PEJE consultancy at which participants, also, did not want to touch the questions of measuring the Jewish content of the curriculum. They preferred to focus on long-term outcomes, such as intermarriage, that could not be tightly linked to the curriculum and instruction found in the schools. The group seemed to agree that this was a problem and that, perhaps, the Mandel Foundation should think carefully about how to move into the arena of the content of Jewish education and why that ought to be part of an indicator system.

Gail talked about how the importance of algebra in general education is now a given. Is there really a value to knowing algebra or is it, rather, that it has become symbolically important because it has become attached to the image of an educated person. Is there, she wondered, a way to make Torah more important by making a parallel kind of argument about its importance? Rich responded to Gail about why there wasn't a good parallel with general education, but I missed the gist of these remarks. (Readers: feel free to add them here.) Sharon noted that what is clear is that certain components of schooling, algebra for one, help get you into the next level of schooling. Thus, they are important. Can we create some kind of similar structure for Jewish education?

Rich then noted that it's a leap of faith to choose a Jewish school and for parents to choose the Jewish education component. What do we know, he asked, about why they do it? Wally commented that he hoped we weren't going to be in the business of helping Jewish parents choose Jewish schools so that their children didn't have to go to school with African-American students. If this is the reason for the choice of a Jewish school, then the content of the Jewish curriculum will never be very compelling.

There were some comments about the kinds of conversations that do go on in day schools and, perhaps in supplemental schools, about the content of the curriculum. Some participants argued that there is, indeed, quite a lot of conversation about content. However, it is not often about the "dose" question because these schools face terrific time constraints. They try to figure out how much they can do given the time available. Barbara added that there are real limits to what schools can do and that there are a variety of reasons parents send their children to Jewish schools. Some choose these schools to make sure that their children are with other Jewish children. When this is the case, the particular content of the Jewish curriculum might not matter since it is ethnic proximity that the parents are buying with the expectation that the schools will get their children into select colleges where they will become professionals who will live in communities with other professionals, many of whom will be Jewish for reasons discussed in Bethamie's paper. Despite this possibility, there is good reason to learn what schools are accomplishing in their Jewish curriculum if we have a hypothesis that says that more Jewish education is linked to greater Jewish literacy, identity and practice.

Barry asked: do we want to have an idea of what schools actually are accomplishing; what students are learning? He said he did not know what to do about camps if we were interested in what students were learning in those educational settings. Ellen answered that there is reason to measure what institutions say they are doing by using their explicit goals and objectives. She noted that Ramah camps and JCCs have goals and could be helped to measure progress toward them. Barry said, Ok, so what is the link between all that's learned at camp and school that adds to the ultimate Jewish identity?

Rich drew an analogy to this kind of study of what camps and schools are doing to some of the early Follow-Through studies which tested the schools' accomplishments against what they said they were doing. Despite the fact that the schools said they were doing quite different things, analyses across programs revealed considerable similarity. Given the similarities in actual programs and practices, it was possible to understand the impact of program components across programs. It might be that such an approach to understanding Jewish educational institutions and their impact on learners would lead to a similar finding and enable us to understand both what happens in a program and what difference it makes to ultimate outcomes.

Mike said that he recalled that the discussion so far got started with some comments about the politically sensitive nature of some of the issues that might be studied (such as amount of Hebrew instruction). He suggested that a way to deal with this might be to build a system somewhat like the one that currently accredits public schools. Those systems require a self-study as well as an external review. They involve considering the schools' state in light of its own goals and mission as well as in light of external standards. This mixed model involves insiders and outsiders and schools have an important role in the self-analysis of their own data. Maybe Jewish education is at the baby stage of self-assessment and could develop something like this kind of system. Mike reported that the system works reasonably well in the public sector.

Rich commented that he thought it would be very difficult to create a parallel system in the Jewish

world given that the system in the public sector includes "must-do's" for the schools. It would be hard to create those and get Jewish schools to agree to them. David suggested that he was quite wary of creating such a system. He's not convinced that it works well in the public sector plus it appears to stifle individuality and creativity. Mike suggested that he had participated in such reviews and that they required people from within an institution to have conversations that they otherwise would never have had. Wally commented that there can be a place for external review and cited Flexner and his look at medical education.

Adam then asked whether there were any other particular thoughts on Ellen's recommendations. He doubted that we had given them sufficient, explicit attention. Ellen seemed to think that we had focused on them enough.

Wally added that the idea of indicators can be very top down and carry with it a stamp of approval that is not always a good thing. He suggested an alternative model of assessment, one he thought was developed by someone in the sociology of medicine who might be at Dartmouth. In this model, data might be collected, for example, on how different communities respond to different diseases (ie. the rate of hysterectomies in different communities). Then the communities can consider the data and decide how to respond on the local level. Wally said that these kinds of data are used by doctors who may think about how to proceed given the data. Might it be possible to develop something along these lines by starting with data that are non-controversial -- number of hours of Hebrew, number of kids in summer camp -- and share this information with the community. Then, one could ask the community what they think is important about Jewish education and get some other indicators to pursue.

Fran stressed that she would talk about the content in schools that enables people to return to Jewish participation later in life. In other words, are there some early learnings that open the gates to further involvement, for example, being able to read Hebrew in order to participate in services. Wally suggest that we think about what is necessary knowledge for an adult to have to feel competent. Rich said that Fran might be violating her developmental model (described in her discussion of Bethamie's paper, I hope) by making this suggestion. He concluded that what keeps people out is that they hated the Hebrew that they had. Further, he thinks that the barriers to re-entry and rapidly coming down. Fran responded by saying then that we ought to ask kids why they are turned off by the Jewish education they get and figure out how to make it better.

Note Taker's comment:

I noticed during the discussion on Thursday and on Friday that most of the comments about the indicator project were cautions about doing it. This may be a function of the general orientation toward critique, but it may also indicate a real concern about whether this project a) is worthwhile given all of the work that could be done in Jewish education and b) might be dangerous to the progress of Jewish education. In my view, one that I discussed with Gail and with Barry on Saturday during lunch, what Jewish education should learn from general education is that it should not embark on an indicator project. There is nothing from its progress in general

education to recommend it. To the extent that such an endeavor was successful, it might push schools in educational directions that no one would sanction. David and Sharon were sitting in on this discussion and (in my view) took the same position. I think it is essential for the Mandel Foundation to consider whether it really ought to move forward with this enterprise. As a professor's group, we never addressed this question because we were to address the papers written as though the project was a foregone conclusion. Such a conversation, I think, should take place before further decisions are made.



From: Bena Medjuck <bmedjuck@mandelny.org>
To: "Moti Bar-Or (E-mail)" <baror@netmedia.net.il>,
"Richard Cohen (E-mail)" <sfukushi@ucla.edu>,
"Gail Dorph (E-mail)" <gzdorph@mandelny.org>,
"Sharon Feiman-Nemser (E-mail)" <snemser@pilot.msu.edu>,
"Walter Feinberg (E-mail)" <wfeinber@uiuc.edu>,
"Adam Gamoran (E-mail)" <gamoran@ssc.wisc.edu>
To: "Ellen Goldring (E-mail)" <ellen.b.goldring@vanderbilt.edu>,
"Barry Holtz (E-mail)" <bholtz@mandelny.org>,
"Elie Holzer (E-mail)" <eholzer@mandelny.org>,
"Fran Jacobs (E-mail)" <fjacobs@emerald.tufts.edu>,
"Mike Milstein (E-mail)" <milstein@unm.edu>,
"Barbara Neufeld (E-mail)" <bneufeld@edmatters.com>
To: "David Purpel (E-mail)" <purpeld@dewey.uncg.edu>,
"Leah Strigler (E-mail)" <lstrigler@mandelny.org>
Subject: Roster correction
Date: Mon, 14 Jun 1999 09:33:58 -0400

Dear Professors,
It was great meeting you all in LA last week!
Here are corrections to Barbara Neufeld's address on the roster we distributed at the seminar.
If anyone else noticed mistakes in the roster, please let me know!

Barbara Neufeld
Education Matters, Inc.
50 Church Street
Cambridge, MA 02138
Phone: 617-234-4353
Fax: 617-492-7822
bneufeld@edmatters.com
(Note correction of the e-mail address and deletion of the P.O. Box and one phone number)

Hope you all got home safely (and promptly)!
B'shalom,
Bena

Bena E. Medjuck
Program Assistant
Mandel Foundation
15 East 26th Street, Suite 1817
New York, NY 10010-1579
Phone: (212) 532-2360 ext. 12
Fax: (212) 532-2646
E-mail: bmedjuck@mandelny.org



TUFTS UNIVERSITY

Eliot-Pearson Department of Child Development

Date: 6/16/99

Priority

Urgent

Regular

Overnight

PLEASE DIRECT FAX TO:

NAME: ADAM GAMORAN
ADDRESS:
FAX#: 608-265-5389NUMBER OF PAGES INCLUDING TRANSMITTAL SHEET: 4FROM: Kran Jacobs

CONFIRMATION OF RECEIPT REQUESTED: YES

NO

NOTES: Adam -
Let me know if you want
some my research

If you do not receive all of the pages or if any part is illegible, please
call us at (617) 627 3355

Thank you.

**NOTES FROM PROFESSORS' GROUP DISCUSSION OF BETHAMIE
HOROWITZ'S JEWISH IDENTITY PAPER: JUNE 4, 1999**

I. Before the discussion began, Adam Gamoran introduced the Indicators Project (IP), and sketched out the purposes for initiating it. These include:

- To provide a general picture of Jewish Education in North America and how the situation is likely to change over time -- both in terms of inputs and outputs;
- To draw attention to issues of Jewish education (a political use for the indicators);
- To develop tools to be used in more focused evaluations and studies (though not to evaluate specific projects at this point). That is, the IP should have a pay-off for evaluation and research efforts down the road.

II. To date, the following IP activities have been undertaken or are recommended:

- Extant data sets of possible interest have been identified. These include both secular data sets (e.g., GSS; Schools and Staffing Survey; National Survey of Youth) and Jewish data sets (e.g., NJPS, 1990; new data to come on the NJPS, 2000);
- AG, EG, and Mandel-ers have begun to think about new data that would be useful;
- It may be time to set about to develop priorities for new indicators. For example, we know there is nothing now available on Jewish knowledge or literacy, and nothing at all on high quality Jewish institutions. On the other hand there has been lots of work on Jewish identity, but the data available are not wholly satisfying. We need to figure out where to focus efforts to generate new indicators.

III. The two papers the Professors' Group discussed were meant to stimulate the next phase of this thinking and planning. AG and EG intended to provide analyses and discussion points not only to foster continued planning, but also to make decisions about which indicators to pursue.

IV. Members' reactions to BH's Jewish identity paper

- Overall, members found the paper very informative, useful, and interesting. It provoked a spirited conversation (which is somewhat difficult to recreate here).

- (Walter) Is Jewish identity (JI) exclusive from a "dual identity?" Can one not be Jewish and also Moslem or Catholic? Does one have to choose?
[Researchers, theorists in ethnicity and ethnic identity would tend to say "yes;" social psychologists would tend to disagree. Kelman would agree; there isn't any consensus...] How do those rules get established and by whom?
- (David) The paper is atheoretical. Defining Jewish identity is seen as a methodological issue, not a cultural (or political) one. What is missing here is consideration of *race*. Jews are often not seen as Jews but as Whites. How would this discussion affect our decision about indicators?
- (Richard) Jewish identity might be defined differently by different groups. For example, there is *self-definition*, then there is *JI according to the range of Jewish organizations*, and then there is *JI as defined by the "outside" community (non-Jews, non-Jewish organizations and associations)*.
- (Walter) If we began to treat the issue as contested, rather than already defined, then the task would be to ascertain what is contested and who the contestants are.
- (Bethamie) I'd love to see that kind of mapping happen.
- (Fran) There is likely a developmental trajectory of JI, which wasn't discussed much in the paper.
- (Bethamie) There is reference to "connections and journeys" in the paper. That's an attempt to understand the data in a developmental way. Clearly not all the NY Jews surveyed in the study took a direct course (@60% didn't??)
- (Ellen/Adam) In non-Jewish world, how are these concepts measured? What was left out of the list of recommendations in the Indicators paper that could speak to this issue?
- (Barbara) People in the rest of the world have a political identity; in America we are all struggling to define this -- it's in process. Let's be very careful not to overstate what we can learn from the inquiry methods we have here; and how much we want to base our interventions on this information.
- (David) Research can't be done "objectively;" that's a mistaken idea. One indicator might be the contributions that Jews make to American life -- Jews as Jews contributing to democracy, social justice, social causes.
- (Barry) "Jews as Jews" is the issue. We know that Jews as people make contributions in these realms. Are they doing it as Jews or not? Do others see them as making contributions as Jews or not?
- (Adam) Yes, who is being externally identified as a Jew -- an interesting question.
- (Adam) What have we left out of this discussion? What are priorities (to measure)? What are the linkages between education and identity? How does this discussion pertain to the IP?
- (Mike) Bethamie provided a number of hypotheses. Why not start there -- test them for a period of time.
- (Gail) We don't want to focus too narrowly -- limit our definition by what is already available.
- (Barry) But Jewishness is about practice, about self-identification; about identifying with a historical peoplehood.
- (Ellen) What do we want (in terms of JI)? What are the goals?
- (Barry) We want people to think more consciously of themselves as Jews.

- (Adam) We also want to make a statement about the *content* of that identity -- that it involves a commitment to learning, literacy, community, sense of Jewishness.
- (Richard) First it seems that we have to understand the construct of JI before we choose indicators.
- (Elie) It is interesting to ask about how non-Jews think of us (what they makes us Jewish).

We did not arrive at any consensus about how to use the material in Bethamie's paper to arrive at a list of indicators of Jewish identity, or even at a research agenda that would precede the selection of indicators. There did seem to be agreement that the more common measures of JI, e.g., the intermarriage rate, are only of limited value in getting at many of the dimensions of identity raised in BH's paper and in our discussion. In addition, there was a call for greater clarity about the assumed relationship between Jewish identity and Jewish education. Is it an input or an output? What are reasonable expectations about the extent to which it is produced, enhanced, muted, by Jewish educational institutions? Is there a threshold of JI that a child needs in order to get any effect from Jewish education altogether? There is clearly enough material here to use for the next discussion of this topic!

