



THE JACOB RADER MARCUS CENTER OF THE
AMERICAN JEWISH ARCHIVES
A DIVISION OF HEBREW UNION COLLEGE – JEWISH INSTITUTE OF RELIGION

MS-831: Jack, Joseph, and Morton Mandel Foundation Records, 1980-2011.

Series F: CIJE Accrual, 1981-2011, undated.
Subseries 2: Dan Pekarsky, 1981-2011, undated.

Box
73

Folder
10

Core Concepts. Goals Project conceptual pieces, 1994-1995.

For more information on this collection, please see the finding aid on the
[American Jewish Archives](http://AmericanJewishArchives.org) website.

A PRELIMINARY PLAN FOR THE INITIATION OF THE GOALS PROJECT

The following is a summary of a deliberation between Shmuel Wygoda and Daniel Marom on the question of how to initiate the goals project:

A) general assumptions:

1. The aim of this project is to develop an environment which will generate efforts at Jewish education which is focused on goals. The promise of such efforts is that they facilitate effective education. The problem is that they demand extensive and continuous investment of resources, time and energy. Consequently, the challenge of this project is to help create the conditions for the development of Jewish education based on goals, while at the same time refraining from raising expectations for quick results.
2. The setting for this project is the CIJE's lead communities. This is because there is an expectation on the part of lay leaders that institutions of Jewish education in these communities will be more effective. According to their understanding, effectiveness requires the capacity to be held accountable for one's goals. Consequently, there is a demand, on the part of these lay leaders, that the institutions of Jewish education in lead communities be able to present their goals and demonstrate if and how they are working towards their attainment.
3. We do not know how many of the educational institutions in lead communities will be capable of responding to this demand. From initial reports on the part of field researchers, meetings with various educators and lay leaders, as well as from a general sense about the state-of-the-art in Jewish education in North America, it appears safe to assume that the majority will need to undertake development in this area. This is quite obviously a very sensitive and explosive issue. No real effort has been made by the CIJE in launching the goals project until an appropriate plan of action has been developed.
4. Since the majority of the educational institutions are affiliated with the training institutions of the Orthodox, Conservative and Reform denominations and the Jewish Community Center Association, we assume that they will want to undertake development in the area of goals with the help of these central agencies. Even if this assumption is mistaken, it must be taken into consideration that these central agencies are the only educational bodies which will have the infrastructure and capacity to provide assistance to institutions of Jewish education in lead communities (or others) - whether it be in formulating goals, in providing in-service training and programs for their attainment, or in suggesting evaluation tests in order to determine whether or not these desired outcomes are indeed being achieved.
5. The training institutions have been given three year grants by the Mandel Associated Foundations in order to enhance their training capacity. Over the last two years, this has not included a major effort at the development of an appropriate response to the foreseen demand by institutions of Jewish education in lead communities for assistance with goals.

On the other hand, the CIJE has related this forseen demand to each of the training institutions (individually and as a group) and has urged them to be prepared for its arrival. Furthermore, each of the training institutions has done some prior work in formulating goals for curricula which they have published for their constituents.

6. The Mandel Institute has undertaken research and development in the area of the goals of Jewish education, particularly in the context of its "Educated Jew" project. This project focuses on the development and formulation of goals on the basis of philosophical approaches to Jewish education. Besides the Institute's staff, a group of scholars and educators have been dealing with these issues in the context of this project for over two years. The project and those who worked on it may be a resource for the training institutions as they reconsider their goals.

7. In addition to its regular staff, the CIJE has recruited Professor Danny Pekarsky in order to work on the goals project. Also, the CIJE's monitoring, evaluation & feedback team, headed by Professor Adam Gamoran, will have a role in overseeing the implementation of this project.

b) aspects and issues in the development of a plan for the initiation of the goals project:

1. It would be impractical to begin discussing the goals project with educational institutions in lead communities before a reasonable amount of work had been done in preparing the training institutions to play their role. The danger here is of raising lay leader expectations too high too fast or of introducing too early the issues raised by the demand for goals among the institutions of Jewish education in lead communities. The first effort should be with the training institutions.

2. Though the training institutions have acknowledged their readiness to play a role in the goals project in lead communities, we do not know the extent to which they understand the nature and scope of this assignment. Since, in some cases, the training institutions have goals statements in their published curricula, they may think that it will be sufficient to simply "cut and paste" these statements into one single document. This may be a useful starting point for the goals project, especially since it would be a positive step forward.

The question which we asked ourselves, however, was whether or not it would be important for the training institutions to consider, before or as they formulate this "cut and paste" document, some of the issues related to the use of such a document in lead communities: how would they explain and justify the goals statements to people working in educational institutions in lead communities? how would they respond if asked to provide programs, materials, and training appropriate for the implementation of these goals? how would they assist in evaluating the extent to which the said goals had indeed been achieved (so that schools can be accountable by lead community lay leaders)?

To be sure, these questions could be raised in response to the training institutions' "cut and paste" documents in the context of a seminar or consultation. However, we do not know whether this would ultimately be the longer of two routes. The fact that the training institutions had already put their goals down on paper could lead them to resist entering into a discussion on the use of their "cut and paste" documents or to avoid reformulating the goals in these documents in light of such a discussion. In essence, having gone one step forward, we may have taken ourselves two steps backward.

The alternative would be to dedicate a first seminar exclusively to the clarification of the goals project assignment. This seminar would introduce aspects and issues relating to the question of how a central agency can:

a) formulate usable goals for educational institutions - i.e. coin their goals in a way which enables an educational institution to develop a coherent program of study (eg. syllabus), can be understood and acted upon by practitioners, and facilitate accountability by providing testable markers for attainment; this presentation could be made by Professor Fox.

b) work with local constituents in setting up a mechanism for the implementation of suggested goals - i.e. send representatives who can help local schools study and develop consensus around suggested goals, reorganize their programs so as to accommodate working with (new) goals, train local staff in educational institutions to implement programs dedicated to the attainment of the suggested goals, provide tests which help determine the degree to which goals are being attained, set up ongoing relationship so as to continue working together in the local pursuit of centrally formulated goals; this presentation could be made by a central figure in American education such as Marshall Smith (whose article on systemic school reform deals precisely with these issues) and/or a representative of Ted Sizer's coalition of essential schools (which has much experience in working with schools all over the U.S. in reorganizing their programs around 9 specific goals).

Following this presentation, it would be possible to open the discussion between the seminar participants, CIJE staff (including Danny Pekar and Adam Gamoran), members of the Mandel Institute staff (including perhaps selected participants in the educated Jew project, eg. Beverley Gribetz), as to its implications for the role of the training institutions in the goals project. The purpose of this discussion would be to develop a clear mandate for a first iteration of goals formulated by the training institutions to be discussed at a second seminar a few months later.

The second seminar would be broken into three parts. In the first part, the training institutions would be called upon to present and discuss their goals documents (the assumption here is that the preparation seminar and the "camper system" suggested in the next point would help generate better documents than the "cut and paste" ones). This would be so that each of the training institutions could learn from each others experience

and reexamine their own goals in the light of alternatives. Following this presentation, we thought it would be appropriate to introduce representatives from the lead communities who would discuss the subject of goals development in local schools from their perspective (these representatives would participate in this session alone). Finally, the last part of this seminar would be devoted to deliberation on how to proceed in the light of the first two sessions. This deliberation would be based on a set of alternative routes for progression, presented by the CIJE.

Three issues relating to this suggestion were also discussed. First, we agreed that excepting the second part of the second seminar, it would be mistaken to involve lead community representatives at these seminars. Our fear was that the introduction of the realities in lead communities from their perspective could cause major digressions in the discussion. The training institutions need "lead time" in which they can honestly consider what they want to offer lead communities before they are put in a position where they actually must deliver (see, however, two paragraphs below as to how this information could be brought into the seminar indirectly).

Second, we could not determine whether or not it would be useful to encourage as wide a participation as possible of the staffs of the training institutions in the first seminar (including potential adjunct staff, such as Jerusalem Fellows, etc.). The reason for this would be that it would minimize the need to reclarify the assignment to others (some of who might actually do the work of formulation or the fieldwork in lead communities) and to create as wide as possible a basis for deliberation within the training institutions. On the other hand, it could be that the message might get across more clearly and honestly in a small group of representatives from the training institutions at the highest level.

Finally, we thought that it would be important as preparation for these seminars (and indeed for the whole project) for background research and deliberation to be done on issues of formulating and using goals in Jewish education and to lead communities in particular. This could be done by the seminar participants not from the training institutions. As for research on goals issues specific to Jewish education, this could be undertaken by the staff of the Mandel Institute (*use* - Shmuel Wygoda [including the experience amassed in the syllabus project]; *formulation* - Daniel Marom). As for research on goals issues related to lead communities, this could be undertaken by CIJE staff, especially a representative from the monitoring, evaluation & feedback team. This research would inform the seminar through the participation of these people.

3. An important element in this plan (regardless of which of the two routes would be implemented) would be the setting up of a "camper system" relationship between the CIJE and the training institutions. As the project gets underway, a representative of the CIJE (perhaps Danny Pekarsky - excluding perhaps for Orthodox) would visit the training institutions from time to time in order to be updated as to the progression of the goals formulation process and to make appropriate suggestions. The role here would be to ensure, as best as possible, that the training institutions are "on track" in undertaking the assignment of preparing to take a role in lead communities. This would help both sides be

better prepared for continuing seminars in which specific aspects and issues relating to goals and their use would be discussed as well as for work in lead communities..

4. Special attention and planning will have to be devoted to goals development by the JCCA (i.e. specific to informal education) and by the Torah U'Mesorah people (whose constituency in Baltimore is large).

5. It is important to consider the question of how the Mandel Associated Foundation's grants to the training institutions can be used an incentive factor for the goals project.

6. At some stage in the goals project, certainly no earlier than during or after the second seminar, it will be important to present the Mandel Institute's educated Jew project to the training institutions and develop plans for them to reexamine their goals in the light of the conceptions and findings which emerged from this project.

GOALS PROJECT TIMELINE STAGE ONE

IMMEDIATE:

1. ARRANGE FOR DANNY PEKARSKY TRIP TO ISRAEL
2. ANNOUNCE SEMINAR TO HIRT, DAVIDSON/HOLTZ/ABRAMSON, LEE
3. CONSULT WITH HIRT, DAVIDSON/HOLTZ/ABRAMSON, LEE ABOUT DATES, PLACE AND PARTICIPANTS IN FIRST SEMINAR
4. SECURE PARTICIPATION OF ALL PARTICIPANTS IN SEMINAR INCLUDING GUEST LECTURERS
5. MAKE LOGISTICAL ARRANGEMENTS FOR SEMINAR
6. CONSIDER POSSIBLE PILOT ACTIVITIES FOR LEAD COMMUNITIES

DECEMBER:

7. CONSULT WITH DANNY PEKARSKY ON THE GOALS PROJECT
8. DEVELOP PROGRAM FOR SEMINAR (see background document)
9. SEND BACKGROUND MATERIALS TO SEMINAR PARTICIPANTS
10. ARRANGE FOR PILOT ACTIVITIES FOR LEAD COMMUNITIES

JANUARY:

11. PREPARE MI STAFF FOR SEMINAR PARTICIPATION (includes research on various curricular goals produced by the denominations)
12. PREPARE CIJE STAFF FOR SEMINAR PARTICIPATION
13. PREPARE GUEST LECTURERS FOR PARTICIPATION
14. PREPARE FOR PILOT ACTIVITIES FOR LEAD COMMUNITIES

FEBRUARY:

14. "CAMPER SYSTEM" MEETINGS IMMEDIATELY PRIOR TO SEMINAR
15. CHECK CONFERENCE ROOM, TAPING FACILITIES, FOOD, ETC.
16. LAST PREPARATIONS BEFORE SEMINAR
17. IMPLEMENT SEMINAR
18. MI STAFF MEETING IN ORDER TO EVALUATE SEMINAR
19. CIJE STAFF MEETING IN ORDER TO EVALUATE SEMINAR
20. "CAMPER SYSTEM" MEETINGS AFTER SEMINAR

MARCH - JUNE

21. ONGOING MONITORING OF GOALS ASSIGNMENT
22. PLANNING OF ISRAEL SEMINAR
23. IMPLEMENTATION OF PILOT ACTIVITIES FOR LEAD COMMUNITIES

DRAFT

THE ROLE OF COMMUNITY-VISION IN THE EFFORT TO IMPROVE JEWISH EDUCATION

Many of the groups CIJE works with have expressed a serious and enduring interest in the theme of 'community-vision' and its relationship to the improvement of Jewish education. CIJE believes that this interest is important, and that, nurtured in the right way, it can contribute to the improvement of Jewish education. Consistent with other priorities, efforts should be made to encourage communities to work towards community-visions that support Jewish education. Several dimensions of such an effort are listed below.

First, rather than assuming that there is little that does or can hold together a diverse Jewish community, an effort should be made to identify certain core-elements that may, perhaps differently interpreted, cut across the various constituencies that make up the community. Such core-elements might, for example, include a commitment to serious study, a commitment to the State of Israel, and perhaps a commitment to certain kinds of practices. The identification of such core-elements could arise through a process of research that focuses on what is already being done by different constituencies and/or through a process that encourages serious dialogue among the many constituencies that make up a community. If successfully identified, such core-elements might offer meaningful guidance for the community when it seeks to develop educating institutions designed to serve the totality of the community.

Second, this attempt to identify shared core-elements should represent one part of a larger effort on the part of the major constituencies of the organized community to wrestle seriously with basic questions concerning what they jointly represent as a community -- who are we as a community? what does it mean to be a member of this community? why would one want to be a member of this community? It should not be assumed in advance that in a diverse Jewish community no meaningful and generally shared answers to such questions could be arrived at. Such questions could fruitfully be explored through study of competing perspectives on this problem. A community that engages in such efforts at self-definition establishes a culture and context that encourages local educating institutions to engage in their own efforts to clarify their guiding visions and goals.

Third, a key element in an adequate community vision needs to be a commitment to do whatever is necessary to encourage and support the efforts of its constituent educating institutions to clarify and more effectively realize their own visions of the kinds of Jewish human beings that they hope to nurture through the process education.

Fourth, communities that imagine a future in which they are

{DECEMBER 1994}

made up of a family of educating institutions, each one animated by a powerful vision of its own and each one attracting constituencies that are sympathetic to the vision, must think carefully about the kinds of policies and structures that are in the long-run likely to bring about this future.

CIJE'S GOALS PROJECT

WHAT IS THE GOALS PROJECT?

The Goals Project of the Council on Initiatives in Jewish Education grows out of the conviction that effectiveness in Jewish, as in general, education depends substantially on whether educating institutions are vision-driven. To describe a Jewish educating institution as vision-driven is to say that it is animated by a vision or conception of the kind of Jewish human being and the kind of Jewish community it is trying to bring into being. Guided by the belief that Jewish educating institutions need to become significantly more vision-driven than they typically are, the Goals Project is an effort to encourage vision-driveness in Jewish education. It will do so in two ways: first, through efforts to foster an appreciation among relevant constituencies of the importance of being vision-driven; and second, through strategies designed to encourage educating institutions to develop their underlying visions and to identify and actualize the educational implications of these visions.

RATIONALE

To make good educational sense, an institution's decisions concerning what educational goals to pursue, as well as how to interpret and prioritize them, need to be anchored in, and justified by, a coherent vision of what it is trying to achieve. That is, its efforts need to be guided by compelling answers to the following questions: what kind of a Jewish person, featuring what constellation of beliefs, knowledge, attitudes, skills, commitments, and dispositions, should we be cultivating? And what form of Jewish community, defined by what purposes, ethos, patterns of activity, customs, norms, and forms of human relationship, are we trying to encourage? An adequate guiding vision does not offer a laundry-list of miscellaneous characteristics to be cultivated in students but exhibits how they fit together to compose a picture of a meaningful form of Jewish existence. Absent such a vision, not only are basic decisions concerning educational goals hard to reasonably make, so too are decisions concerning other important matters, including the organization of the physical and social environment, appropriate forms of pedagogy, and the skills desirable in educators. In addition, the absence of a vision of the kind of human beings and community it is hoping to cultivate deprives an educational institution of an important basis for evaluating the success of its efforts.

The effort to develop a substantive vision that is compelling to the relevant stakeholders and whose educational implications have been worked out in a meaningful way is a labor-intensive, intellectually and Jewishly demanding activity; nor are there any guarantees of success. But it must also be stressed that the potential rewards for the participants in the process, both as individuals and as representatives of their institutions, can be very significant.

THE GOALS PROJECT'S RESOURCES AND AGENDA

In its efforts to encourage Jewish educating institutions to become vision-driven, CIJE benefits from the resources and the ongoing support of the Mandel Institute for the Advanced Study and Development of Jewish Education. Of special value to the Goals Project is the Mandel Institute's Educated Jew Project, which explores a number of significant conceptions of an educated Jew and then examines the implications of these conceptions for the goals and organization of Jewish education. The Educated Jew Project has developed through significant contributions by some extraordinary Jewish thinkers and educational theorists, including Professors Israel Scheffler and Isadore Twersky of Harvard University, Professors Menachem Brinker, Moshe Greenberg and Michael Rosenak of the Hebrew University, and Professor Seymour Fox, Rabbi Shmuel Wygoda, and Daniel Marom of the Mandel Institute. The contributions of such individuals to CIJE'S Goals Project has been and will continue to be invaluable.

In collaboration with the staff of the Mandel Institute and the Educated Jew Project, the Goals Project is launching a number of initiatives designed to encourage vision-drivenness in Jewish educating institutions. The principal initiatives include the following:

1. Development of a library of materials concerning the importance and the process of becoming vision driven. This library will be made available to interested communities and educating institutions.

2. A Summer Seminar on Goals in Jerusalem for lay and professional leaders from Lead Communities and elsewhere. The seminar is designed to foster an appreciation for the critical role that vision plays in education and to think through critical issues that must be addressed if Jewish educating institutions are to become more vision-driven. Participants are expected to launch local efforts in this arena on their return home.

3. Local seminars in Lead Communities (and beyond). CIJE will sponsor a series of seminars in each Lead Community next year for representatives of local educating institutions. These seminars are designed to encourage these institutions to understand and wrestle with the issues that need to be addressed in order to begin the process of becoming, or becoming more, vision-driven.

CONCLUDING COMMENTS

CIJE does not believe that becoming vision-driven is easy or that it is sufficient to remedy the ills of Jewish educating institutions. But it is convinced that it is indispensable to success, and it welcomes your participation in the effort to encourage more careful attention to vision and goals among educating institutions in Lead Communities and elsewhere.



GOALS SEMINAR

This summer's Seminar on Goals, developed in collaboration with the Mandel Institute for the Advanced Study and Development of Jewish Education*, brings to Israel lay and professional leaders in Jewish education, primarily but not exclusively from Lead Communities, for a period of intensive study and planning.

This seminar is one of several activities organized by CIJE to foster a climate and initiatives that will encourage Jewish educating institutions to become vision-driven. To describe a Jewish educating institution as vision-driven is to say that it is animated by a vision or conception of the kind of Jewish human being and the kind of Jewish community toward which it is educating. A vision-driven institution is one that is clear about its answers to the following questions: "What kind of Jewish person, featuring what constellation of beliefs, knowledge, attitudes, skills, and commitments, are we trying to cultivate? What form of Jewish community, characterized by what sense of purpose, ethos, norms, customs, characteristic activities, and forms of relationship, are we trying to encourage?" Equally important, a vision-driven educating institution is one that has found meaningful ways of embodying its answers to these questions in its daily workings.

The Seminar on Goals is designed to foster a thoughtful appreciation for the role that animating visions and the goals associated with them should, but usually do not, play in Jewish education, and to think through critical

* The staff and resources of the Mandel Institute for the Advanced Study and Development of Jewish Education have been central to the development of the Goals Project and the Summer Seminar. Through its Educated Jew Project, the Institute has engaged the thinking of some extraordinary Jewish thinkers and educational theorists in exploring the questions at the heart of the Goals Project. To date, these thinkers have included Professors Israel Scheffler and Isadore Twersky of Harvard University, Professors Menachem Brinker, Moshe Greenberg, and Michael Rosenak of the Hebrew University, and Professor Seymour Fox, Rabbi Shmuel Wygoda, and Daniel Marom of the Mandel Institute.

issues that must be addressed if Jewish educating institutions are to become more vision-driven. The seminar is offered with the expectation that on their return to their local communities, participants will collaborate with CIJE in its efforts to encourage local initiatives in this important area.

Topics include:

- a. What visions are, why they are important, and how they give coherence and direction to the educational process;
- b. The challenge, at the local, institutional level, of identifying a vision that is shared, compelling, and concrete enough to guide practice;
- c. The process of developing goals and educational practices that are informed by a designated vision;
- d. Plans and strategies for engaging communal and institutional stakeholders back home in efforts to develop vision-driven educating institutions.

WHERE and WHEN?

The Goals Seminar will take place in Jerusalem. It will start Sunday, July 10, 1994 at 9:00 am and will end Thursday, July 14, 1994 at 8:00 pm. The seminar will include daily morning and afternoon sessions as well as at least two evening sessions. Participants are expected to attend all sessions of the seminar.

ACCOMMODATIONS

Accommodations will be at Mishkenot Sha'ananim in the picturesque neighborhood of Yemin Moshe. Mishkenot Sha'ananim is Jerusalem's official guest house. At its completion in 1860, it was the most important building outside the Old City walls and marked the beginnings of modern Jerusalem. Although it has gone through restorations and renovations, the original structure still remains, which creates an atmosphere of simplicity, elegance and charm. We are very fortunate to be able to host our seminar in this unique establishment and to give you the opportunity to learn in a house whose guests include world-famous writers, philosophers, artists, and musicians from around the world.

From: Bill Robinson ("74104.3335@CompuServe.COM")
To: Dan Pekarsky
Date: Friday, June 17, 1994 11:29 am
Subject: Requested thought-piece on vision-driven communities

To: Dan Pekarsky
CC: MEF Staff

From: Bill Robinson

Re: Requested thought-piece on what a vision-driven community may look like

The idea of a vision-driven community (similar to the idea of a vision-driven institution) suggests a coherent and reflective relationship existing between vision and practice - between a community's shared educational goals and the programs that exist in a community to support those goals. Yet, in the case of a community (unlike that of a single educational institution) certain aspects of this relationship and how it could be developed are neither straightforward nor obvious. Three sets of questions are indicative.

1. What kind of vision could a community share? Could it be concrete enough to be compelling and programmatically useful? At the same time, could it be vague enough to allow for a variety of institutional visions to exist under its umbrella?
2. How could a shared community vision be created? By what means could a community vision and the institutional practices within a community be linked in a coherent and reflective manner?
3. If this process could occur, what would it accomplish?

I do not claim to have definitive answers to any of these questions. Instead, I will provide some suggestive ideas that hopefully will create a basis for continued discussion.

A Community Vision -

The following are some suggestive, possible elements from which a community vision could be composed. These elements seem to walk that fine line between being both concrete and all-inclusive.

Our community could be a place, in which:

- a. learning is occurring at every hour of the day;
- b. learning involves wrestling with the values of modern

society and the teachings of Jewish tradition;

- c. this struggle takes place from a variety of perspectives within the community (i.e., across the denominational range);
- d. every child graduates knowing where s/he stands in relation to Jewish history and the variety of Jewish approaches to modernity;
- e. people from all denominations feel part of the same community, through cross-denominational interactions occurring on a continual basis;
- f. every person obtains the abilities to continue learning throughout their lives (i.e., knowledge of Hebrew, textual skills);
- g. each person learns in a variety of settings (e.g., formal schooling, camp, youth programs, havurot).

Creating Vision and Linking Vision to Programming -

As with a vision-driven institution, there may be many ways in which a community starts the process of becoming vision-driven. Three models suggest themselves immediately:

- a. Federation, through a lay-dominated council, creates a vision and secures the "buy-in" of institutional, lay and professional, leadership;
- b. community-wide institutionally-based councils (i.e., day school council, synagogue educational directors council) begin to develop shared visions based on that which is common to their institutions;
- c. a communal body, with all stakeholders represented, engages in visioning activities.

Of course, in actuality a community may combine these elements and/or employ other alternative processes.

What Could Be Accomplished? -

The key question in all this may be, "Toward what end are vision-driven communities to be developed?". I proffer four possible outcomes which suggest the importance of creating vision-driven communities.

- a. Financial and resource allocation decisions are made by the Federation and the central agency in accordance with criteria aimed at developing programs in the community which support the objectives derived from a community vision.

- b. Programming begins to cross institutional and denominational boundaries, bringing together learners from a variety of settings.
- c. The community becomes mobilized through this process and increased funding for education develops.
- d. Institutions begin to re-think their own visions and programming, as they respond to changing external conditions (that increase cooperation and competition among institutions).

Taking Stock -

Finally, paralleling our discussion in Madison on the relationship of the Goals Project and MEF's planned Institutional Profiles, as a first step in becoming vision-driven, a community could begin by taking stock of itself. A few suggestive questions for this process are as follows.

- a. # of learners in each program;
- b. the levels of proficiency of the learners along the relevant dimensions of their respective institution;
- c. the visions and objectives of each institution;
- d. # of learners participating in more than one program;
- e. the coherency between Federation's educational beliefs, lay (communal and institutional) beliefs, and (institutional-based) professionals' beliefs;
- f. what are the community goals that already have been identified and what programs in the community exist to support those goals.

I hope this will provoke continued thought and discussion. It seems to me, that the idea of developing vision-driven communities is central to the visions of the Commission on Jewish Education in North America and the mission of CIJE.

CC: Adam Gamoran

VISION AND EDUCATIONAL PRACTICE -- PART ONE

I

I am very interested in the goals project and am thrilled to have the chance to participate with a number of you in it. I believe that attention to goals - to goals that are rooted in educational visions, which in turn are rooted in a moral-religious vision - is long over-due and can prove very helpful. At the same time, I want to voice some concerns. A fear I sometimes have is that the lead-communities will engage in some activities spawned by the goals project, activities which may prove intellectually and otherwise very challenging, but that they will come away without seeing any significant connection between these activities and their educational work. It would be unfortunate if they came away feeling that reflection on visions and goals can be very rewarding in a personal sense but that its connection to work in the field is at best obscure. For this reason I think it crucial that we ourselves not underestimate the difficulty of arriving at a meaningful vision and of then using that vision as a guide to educational practice. Drawing attention to this difficulty is intended not to demoralize but to help us avoid an undesirable outcome through more careful design of our work with the lead communities.

II

There would appear to be nothing more sound than to insist on the need for a compelling vision to guide the work of the educator. Without some clear understanding of what it is one is hoping - at the level of the individual, the community, or the institution - to bring into being, how can one proceed to allocate resources and to make other basic decisions? A vision of where one wants to go, of what one wants to achieve, can - if it is really shared by the participants and not too abstract - be energizing and directive in very important ways. There are, however, three problems that need to be acknowledged upfront.

The first is that the absence of a compelling vision that wins the allegiance of leaders in the field of Jewish education is not an accident. It reflects the uneasiness, the uncertainty, of the Jewish community as a whole which continues to try to define for itself meaningful ways of living Jewishly while participating in the very inviting secular culture that surrounds and, in many respects, has formed it. To arrive at a vision that is at once meaningful and compelling is not an easy achievement. It's not that religious thinkers have not articulated visions from among which one might choose, but that, for most people, these visions have not, or not yet, proved compelling guides to life.

The implication of this for us is that we need to be careful not to assume that "the vision thing" is easily taken care of. Although it would in itself be a significant achievement, it is probably not enough for lay and professional leaders to read a

denominational mission statement or the kind of vision propounded by a Moshe Greenberg and to say, "This sounds good; I can identify with this." There also needs to be a high level of personal identification, intellectual and emotional, with the ideal that is propounded -- the kind of identification that reveals itself in the individual's speech and conduct. It would be naive for us to think that it is easy to catalyze this kind of identification.

Let us, however, suppose that the leadership of an institution has succeeded at defining such a vision for itself -- a vision of the kinds of human beings, of the kind of a community it would like to bring into being; and let us assume that identification with this ideal is strong and enthusiastic. Let us also assume that "the leadership" in question includes not only the rabbinic and lay leaders but also the educational director. For them all to identify in the profound way that I have in mind with a particular social/individual ideal would, of course, be an extraordinarily important achievement. But it is only the first step. If we are not to oversimplify the movement from vision to reality - that is, to a suitably transformed reality! - we must keep in mind at least the following points:

- 1) it takes extraordinary talent to take a vision and translate it meaningfully into an educational design that adequately mirrors and reflects the vision;

- 2) there are probably several distinct models -- which we should be trying to identify (in a way that parallels the Scheffler piece on different ways of understanding the relationship between theory and practice) -- of what the relationship between vision and educational practice optimally is.

- 3) The translation of a vision into educational design requires a host of assumptions concerning the nature of human growth and learning, the power and limits of various social settings, etc. If we are strong on vision but weak on these kinds of matters, our likelihood of success is doubtful.

In other words, we should not be naive about the ease with which, even conceptually, an institution can be shaped to the requirements of a particular vision.

I say in the preceding sentence "even conceptually" because we have yet to encounter more practical, or sociological, obstacles that can sabotage the effort to translate vision into reality. Let us suppose that a committed and remarkably able educational leader, supported by his or her lay and professional leadership, succeeded in translating a vision of a meaningful Jewish existence into a powerful educational vision, a well-developed conception of what an educational institution animated by this Jewish vision would look like. The sad truth is that many such educational conceptions that have been very thoughtfully developed fail miserably when actually

implemented. And the reason is that it is at this point that a host of "real world" considerations come into play that are often ignored, or treated cavalierly, in the design phase. I will elaborate in Part Two.

VISION AND EDUCATIONAL PRACTICE -- PART TWO

However well-thought-out the Jewish vision and the educational vision that expresses it, their actual educating power depends on some critical matters:

1) Are the front-line teachers/educators themselves personally and strongly identified with the vision of Jewish existence and of education that presumably frames their efforts? Given the realities in the field today, one often cannot make this assumption. The solution would seem to be some kind of "in-service" education; but here again, we need to avoid being naive concerning what a few in-service sessions can actually accomplish in the way of generating genuine commitment to a shared vision?

2) Is the educational director a person who, in addition to a commitment to a vision, brings a high level of educational talent and a sense of presence to his or her work with front-line educators, parents and children? If the institution's educational leader does not possess these characteristics, implementation is likely to founder.

3) What are the values, the beliefs, the concerns - the human outlook - of the community from which the clientele for the educational program will come? The best laid plans of mice and men often go awry because of a failure to take into account this crucial matter -- namely, the readiness of the clientele for the kind of educational institution and program that have been developed on their behalf. If the gap is substantial between what the educational vision assumes about the nature and the background of the "students" and who they really are, success is highly unlikely. [A curriculum put together by the Educational Development Corporation might be conceptually very well-thought-out, given the assumptions of the developers. But it doesn't follow that the curriculum will be universally effective: even if it's effective in Newton, Mass. (say, because the developers' understanding of what students are like is based on the kinds of students one would encounter in Newton), it doesn't follow that it would work with the kinds of students one would meet up with in Roxbury or Lewiston, Maine.]

What happens all-too-often is this: a teacher - perhaps an old-timer who has over time developed a fairly stable style of teaching, or a new teacher, probably with not a great deal of experience or Judaic knowledge - is informed that the school has developed a new curriculum that is rooted in the institution's larger sense of mission. The teacher is asked to participate in a few in-service sessions, designed to familiarize him or her with

the institutional mission and the curriculum that flows from it. Whether at the end of this process the teacher identifies with this enterprise at all, much less in the necessary strong sense, is doubtful. When this teacher finally meets up with the students, he or she finds it very hard to engage the students with the curriculum: the students are bored, they are antsy, they are beginning to act up. Pretty soon, with or without announcing it to the powers-that-be, the teacher abandons the curriculum in favor of "what works" -- where "what works" is defined by what engages the students' energies, or (short of this) by what keeps them under control. "Keeping them under control and interested" become the criterion for success and the basis for determining appropriate learning experiences. So much for the guiding moral and curricular vision!

How might this problem be addressed? One solution might be to make clear to all relevant leaders - lay, rabbinic, and educational - that the vision/educational program that is to be implemented only has a chance if certain conditions obtain -- for example, an insistence that all educational personnel be "brought on board in a more than perfunctory way, as well as a willingness to re-shape the approach being recommended so that it has a chance of meshing with the particular client-population. Note, though, that the capacity to effect such adaptation requires considerable effort and talent on the part of educational leaders and front-line staff.

A second strategy might be to address this problem at an earlier stage. Recognizing that the cultural outlook of the students and their families is light-years away from that represented by the vision that is to be passed on in a meaningful way, perhaps those charged with institutional and curricular design must ask themselves: what is necessary, in the way of preparatory experiences, that might close this gap? Plato, for one, recognized that our ability to learn certain things depends in no small measure on the readiness of the soul, a readiness that grows out of prior socializing experiences. The point should not be lost on Jewish educators. They need to be asking: What background of beliefs, knowledge, and attitudes will ready a student for an education that is organized around, say, Greenberg's ideas? And, how is this background to be achieved? Educational design that is worth anything must offer practical guidance in addressing such problems.

Yet a third possibility is to think in very different ways about the relationship between vision and educational practice. As I have suggested on other occasions, I believe Dewey offers some interesting possibilities to consider in this domain. But time precludes proceeding further at this minute.

VISION -- Part Three: a few addenda

As I have mentioned to a few of you recently, I have been reading Peter Senge's book entitled THE FIFTH DISCIPLINE, which I am finding quite helpful in thinking about issues having to do with vision and planning. A few simple but important points stressed by Senge may be worth repeating:

1. The vision cannot be the vision of an elite which is then passed on in the form of marching orders to the troops who are to implement it. It is crucial that "the troops" -- the front line educators -- themselves strongly identify with the vision, that they regard it as their vision. This leads directly to Point 2.

2. To be powerful, to be a real tool for change, the vision must really capture the imagination, the minds and hearts, of those whose work is to be guided by it.

3. An effective vision is concrete enough to be captured in an image. Not "the best space program" in the world, but "a man on the moon by the end of the decade": the latter but not the former is likely to give real guidance and to inspire commitment.

4. Having a vision, even a shared vision, does not amount to much if it is not accompanied by a) a willingness to think boldly about the kinds of changes in institutional structure and program that may be necessary to realize the vision, and b) a corresponding willingness to revise existing practices, sometimes in dramatic ways.

VISION4 --SOME MISCELLANEOUS THOUGHTS

1. At the CIJE meetings in Cleveland, Mort Mandel spoke in a very helpful way about what he described as a "total vision" for the CIJE. He suggested that over the next few months we draft the report we would like to be able to write 10 years from now concerning what we've accomplished during our first ten years. What are the outcomes we would like to see.

[There was universal sympathy for this suggestion, and attention then focused on the kinds of outcomes we might want to be looking at: some of them concerned what I've elsewhere described as the achievement of instrumental goals (for example, having the right kinds of personnel in strategic positions around the country; local communities and their constituent institutions are guided by mission statements that have emerged out of a serious process of development); another possibility was to have a number of success-stories to point to -- of institutions that had through the CIJE process "turned things around" in a meaningful way. There was also discussion of making an impact on troubling demographic trends. After discussion of this last point, we concluded that though it would be very difficult to assess the impact of CIJE interventions on demographic trends in any measurable way, nonetheless, this was an important background-theme that we needed to be concerned with.]

In any event, Mort Mandel's notion of total-vision and his strategy for developing it seems to me very interesting -- and probably of value for the Goals Project as it works with Lead Communities and their institutions. Further discussion with him about this approach could prove very helpful.

2. FROM VISION TO PRACTICE.

A number of times I have alluded to the importance of articulating more than one model of the relationship between vision and educational practice -- that is, more than one answer to the question: How does one translate a vision into educational practice? I don't feel as clear about all of this as I'd like to be, but I'd like to suggest a few different takes on this (which may well be mutually compatible:

Take 1: SEQUENTIAL IMPLEMENTATION

The Vision is translated into goals, and the goals into objectives, broken down across the several years of schooling/education, with attention to the kinds of readiness-experiences that are necessary at each stage. It is critical that this attention to readiness-experiences take into account attitudinal/affective issues as well those that have to do with

cognition and knowledge base. In thinking about the translation, it may well also be necessary to find ways of engaging the family the enterprise and in building-in various forms of experiential-learnings.

Take 2: THE WHOLE IS REFLECTED IN THE PARTS/THE MEDIUM IS THE MESSAGE

While #2 is not necessarily inconsistent with #1, its focus is very different. The notion is that the core of the vision find expression as a living reality in the totality of the educational institution's day-to-day functioning, down to its very details. The way things are done, the way the environment is organized, the kinds of people who populate the environment, the kinds of activities organized for parents, etc. -- all should quietly testify to the presence and power of the vision as the organizing principle of the institution. In this model the vision suffuses the whole life of the institution, rather than being understood as, or just as, an educational outcome to be achieved. Long before it is fully grasped by the students, they are absorbing it through mere immersion in the environment. The idea here is, I think, as old as Plato's ideas about institutional design in the REPUBLIC.

Take 3: VISION AS END-IN-VIEW. This third approach I associate with Dewey, particularly in writings like THE CHILD AND THE CURRICULUM. Dewey is very fearful of fixed ends, yet views ends-in-view as very useful tools in helping to organize present resources. The intuitive notion is that imagine end, or the vision, functions as a lens through which one looks at present resources, energies, wantings, opportunities, etc. It is a tool for interpreting the student's existing repertoire of understandings, interests, competencies, and interests, as well as for guiding the process along. Time precludes fleshing this out right now, but this needs to be done soon.

Author Movement	
Vision	
Beliefs Re: Human Nature and Growth	
Goals	
Curriculum, Content and Emphases	

Author Movement	
Pedagogy	
Educator Characteristics	
Physical Environment	
Social Norms, Social Organization, and Ethos	
Other Ways Vision May Be Embedded	

From: Dan Pekarsky (PEKARSKY)
To: Barry
Date: Tuesday, March 1, 1994 3:20 pm
Subject: Atlanta Meeting

Below is a succinct summary of the main points to be made in connection with the Goals Project in Atlanta. The sequence followed in the summary is roughly the sequence of the actual presentation.

I. Introductory

In the introductory discussion, I will briefly articulate CIJE's view that Vision and Goals, properly understood and used, play an indispensable role in the educational process, and that the Goals Project is designed to encourage Jewish communities and educating institutions to become engaged with issues of vision and goals. The remainder of the presentation is intended to do three things: a. to explain what CIJE means by vision and goals, why it believes it crucial for educating institutions to attend to them in a serious way; b) to explain the ways in which the Goal Project will attempt to catalyze efforts in this area; and c) to map out and explain upcoming activities designed to move forward with this project, beginning with the Summer Seminar in Israel.

II. What do we mean by visions and goals, and why are they important?

This discussion will begin by distinguishing between substantive educational goals and instrumental goals, and it will then focus on substantive goals. I will then note the importance of anchoring substantive educational goals in a vision of a meaningful Jewish existence.

The ways in which having such a vision can guide the educational process will be stressed (with emphasis on the contribution of vision to a) educational decision-making in the areas of goal-setting, curriculum design, personnel training, etc.; b) to assessment; and c) to the creation of a motivated and motivating social climate).

I will illustrate the way in which one's vision can guide educational decision-making using one or more concrete examples, possibly from general education, e.g. "the kitchen" and the "kitchen staff" in a traditional school, in Summerhill, and in a Dewey School.

I will contrast what education looks like in a vision-driven institution with what it looks like in a typical Jewish educational setting (hodge-podge informed by inadequate guiding principles like "Keep them interested; keep them coming; keep them quiet," or "They should feel at home in a synagogue.," etc.

I will stress that having a vision and goals in a meaningful

sense goes well beyond having a mission-statement, and I will explain this point by referring to the ways in which mission-statements tend to be very vague and/or not widely or strongly identified with (or even known) and/or not used as a real guide to practice.

I will go on to emphasize the difficulty of the enterprise: 1. the desire to come up with a vision, 2. the process of identifying a compelling vision, 3. generating broad-based support for the vision, 4. translating the vision into meaningful educational terms (goals and structures), and 5. actual implementation under real-world conditions ----all of these, 1-5, are difficult to accomplish. They take thought, commitment, energy and time. Only individuals and institutions that recognize the importance of vision to the enterprise will be expected to undertake this effort.

These points will round out the discussion of vision and goals. I am aware that I will not yet have distinguished between communal and institutional goals (and why we will be focusing on the institutional goals in the Goals Project). This could come either near the beginning (where I distinguish substantive from instrumental goals) or in the discussion of the Goals Project itself (which is the next item).

III. What is the Goals Project?

A. Against the background of II., I will identify the Goals Project as a CIJE initiative designed to create a climate in Lead Communities (and elsewhere) that encourages and supports serious attention to the development and actualization of visions and goals.

B. CLARIFICATIONS The Goals Project is 1) not the Educated Jew Project; 2) primarily concerned with visions and goals at the level of institutions (and views communities as agencies of stimulating appropriate involvement at institutional levels); 3) concerned with substantive as distinct from instrumental goals.

C-E (below) go on to describe the key elements in the Goals Project.

C. The Goals Project will develop a body of materials that can be used to educate relevant individuals and organizations concerning the importance of educational visions and goals and concerning the ways in which institutions can begin articulating a vision and using it to guide educational practice.

D. The Goals Project will work to educate lay and professional leaders at both communal and institutional levels concerning the ways in which serious, sustained attention to vision and goals can contribute mightily to the practice and outcomes of Jewish education. The Goals Project will try to encourage them to launch initiatives in this area.

E. The Goals Project will launch and use its resources to support a Coalition of Vision-Driven Institutions. The Coalition will be made up of interested institutions that show evidence of being committed to becoming vision-driven and who meet other standards that are necessary if the effort has a chance of succeeding.

IV. ON THE HORIZON: FIRST STEPS

A. LIBRARY OF MATERIALS: Efforts to develop a library of materials are already beginning.

B. SUMMER SEMINAR IN ISRAEL.

The Summer Seminar in Israel is designed to educate lay and professional leaders in Lead Communities and in other interested communities concerning the vital importance of vision and goals to the development of effective educational institutions.

Participants will have the opportunity to wrestle with a number of powerful but very different visions of a meaningful Jewish existence and to examine how a commitment to one of them facilitates and guides educational decision-making at a variety of levels.

END OF PART I -- PART II FOLLOWS.

CC: GAIL, PEKARSKY

From: Dan Pekarsky (PEKARSKY)
To: Barry
Date: Tuesday, March 1, 1994 3:50 pm
Subject: Atlanta-Part II

Participants in the Summer Seminar will also have the opportunity to examine the cluster of significant issues that must be addressed by an institution once it has made a preliminary decision that it wants to move in the direction of being vision-driven. Strategies for addressing these issues will also be discussed.

Among the outcomes anticipated from participation in the Summer Seminar are the following: a) a thoughtful, knowledge-based commitment to the idea that being vision-driven is very important; b) a richer understanding of the ways in which having a guiding vision can facilitate the development of a quality educational institution; c) an understanding of the issues that need to be addressed in trying to translate a vision into goals and goals into curriculum and educational structures (under real world conditions); d) an understanding of the critical importance of generating broad-based support for a proposed vision; e) Some ideas concerning how to enlist the interest of local educating institutions in struggling with issues of vision -- and, in particular, in signing up for the seminars to be held next year in local communities.

C. CIJE-SPONSORED SET OF SEMINARS CONCERNING VISION AND GOALS IN LEAD COMMUNITIES (and beyond):

The agenda for these seminars will be described in ways that parallel the Summer Seminar in Jerusalem. There will, however, be an emphasis on 1. encouraging participants from local educating institutions to begin the process of clarifying their animating vision, and 2. the possibility of participating (down the road) in the Coalition of Vision Driven Institutions.

Lay and professional leaders from all educating institutions in the Lead Communities will be invited to participate in these seminars. No special requirements, other than an agreement to participate on a regular basis, need be met in order to participate.

Two outcomes are foreseen: 1. that a climate will be created through these seminars that will encourage local institutions to become significantly more serious about issues relating to vision and goals; and 2. that one or more institutions participating in these seminars might prove interested in and appropriate for participation in the Coalition the following year.

Just as (a point I didn't make above) the summer seminar in Jerusalem will be open to participants from other than the Lead Communities, so too in the case of the local set of seminars. If one of the communities that participates in the summer seminar expresses an interest, we will try to find a way to accomodate

them -- possibly through an intensive week-long seminar, rather than through seminars spread out throughout the year.

D. THE COALITION OF VISION-DRIVEN INSTITUTIONS

In the spirit of Alan's caution about promising more than we can deliver, I will not say very much about the coalition, except that 1. it will probably start small; 2. that participating institutions will need to meet certain standards; 3. that among these standards is the availability of a person appointed by the institution or the community to guide the process and to work with CIJE; 4. that participation in the Coalition will be open to institutions outside of Lead Communities; 5. while institutions in Lead Communities cannot be guaranteed positions in the coalition, they can be assured that if choices need to be made between equally worthy institutions, Lead Community institutions will have priority; 6. that it is up to the lay and professional leadership of the community (especially participants in the Israel Seminar) to generate a clientele for next year's seminars. If there is not interest, there will be no seminars.

V. QUESTIONS/REACTIONS, ETC.

I just looked at my watch and realize that I have to go. I must apologize for not having a chance to review this document for spelling or content. But in the interests of getting feedback, I thought it best to send it on. There are certain points, I realize, that need to be clarified (even if the general substance seems ok): for example, who from within Lead communities should be encouraged to come to Jerusalem, given that the seminars will be held in local communities next year?

I'm assuming we'll be in touch Thursday 7 a.m. my time in my office. If there's anything I should be thinking about before then, let me know. All the best.

From: MANDEL ("MANDEL@vms.huji.ac.il")
To: PEKARSKY@soemadison.wisc.edu
Date: Tuesday, February 1, 1994 6:08 am
Subject: Re: vision-part2rvs

Dear Danny:

Bravo on your document. It is written beautifully and I think it will open up the discussion well, both for the the CIJE lay and staff. I gave copies to Shmuel and to SF and Annette, just before they went out of town. If it hasn't been already, Shmuel's summary of the proposal will be faxed over to you as soon as he comes back from miluim (what is your fax number?)

A few minor points for your consideration:

1. In relation to the general statement on the project:

a) It may be important to openly state that what we are calling vision is not the same as formulating a mission statement or the popular activity called "visioning." I do not mean that you have to spell out the whole story for the readers, but only to warn them that what we are talking about goes beyond these well known but inappropriate forms of planning. This could latch on to your suggestion that vision involves answering questions such as "What is a meaningful Jewish existence?" or can be a separate point in the caveats.

b) It could be important to stress that developing vision is not only an exercise in clarification and planning but also in culture-building in educational institutions. The promise of effectiveness as derived from vision relates equally to this aspect as it does to the others.

2. In the caveats, don't points #1 and #2 go together?

3. Regarding point #3 in the caveats:

a) The formulation "beliefs not contained in the original vision" may be misleading. The point here is that moving from vision to practice involves lots of extrapolative inquiry, delineation, clarification, and perhaps consultation with experts. This is a lengthy painstaking process which demands time and commitment.

b) Though it is indeed unnecessary to spell out the whole theory of moving from theory to practice, don't the people who read this have to know enough about the nature of this process in order to be able to appreciate the proportion of the efforts involved in the proposals later suggested? Also, this discussion appropriately raises the question of the recruitment and training of the "exxon" group of educators for the implementation of a number of these proposals (a point which you pick up later).

3. The last part of point #3 of the clarifications is unclear grammatically.

4. In point #2 of the clarifications, it may be useful to add a third possibility for the question of substantive vs. instrumental goals: the creating of a tension - or as I called it a "resonance"- between the two. The formulation is unimportant here. What seems to me to be important is the idea that one of the goals of the goals project is to create this tension. Furthermore, and this is a corollary of the tension point, it should perhaps be stressed that the move from philosophy to practice is an ongoing and endless one.

5. In point #2b of the strategies for working with individual institutions, it should perhaps be stressed that the rationale is not only that working with one school is do-able, but that if one truly succeeds the impact can be much greater than mediocre success in a number of institutions. Also, it provides an opportunity for learning by doing, before moving on to bigger and



better efforts. The same applies to point #5 about pilot projects.

6. Point #3b on to LC leadership could mention the possibility of helping a LC derive substantive goals by undertaking a study of what is of common interest all across the board in lead community schools.

? l.j.

7. At some place in point #4 relating to the denominations, it might be useful to add that the assignment of getting the denominations to be proactive about seeing their visions through in constituent schools would involve a consideration of questions of how, not only questions of what. I.e., how would they motivate schools to work with centrally formulated goals? How and who would they undertake in-service training around centrally formulated goals? etc.

X

8. Regarding the agenda:

a) Perhaps joined to the word "discussion" should be some sense of weighing the pros and cons of each proposal. In order to facilitate this, it could be important to present an analysis of each of the proposals in terms of the very criteria which you suggest at the beginning of your discussion on the proposals in the document (what will bear fruit? what resources will be required and are available to us? what is the appropriate time frame?).

b) You may want to consider adding to point #3: "decide on who and how the decision on the goals project will be communicated to LC's." My sense is that there is impatience and expectation to hear something on this on the part of some of the leadership which has already heard about the project.

Take Care,

Daniel Marom

P.S. I have started to do some library searching for descriptions of vision

driven practice. I have specifically looked for the crazies like Plato, Aristotle, Pestalozzi, Tolstoy, Neill, Dewey, Ahad Ha'am, Rosensweig, Buber, who actually developed and wrote about institutions which were expressions of their philosophies. Who would you add to this list?

SOME BASIC POINTS CONCERNING THE GOALS PROJECT

I want to start with a summary of some basic points, some of them fairly mundane, that we (or some combination of a "we" that includes Seymour, Danny Marom, Shmuel, Alan, Gail, Barry, and myself) have been discussing recently. The comments are based, in part, on my review of a tape of conversations that went on in Jerusalem in October, and in part on conversations that took place in Milwaukee in mid-November.

1. In thinking about goals, three different levels that seem pertinent with any given lead community have been distinguished: a) the institutional level: the goals (or educational vision - see #2 below) that a congregations, schools, JCCs, etc. choose for themselves individually; b) the denominational level: the goals, or vision, that informs the work of all institutions in a community affiliated with a particular denomination; c) the community-level: the goals/vision that the community as a whole, made up of institutions representing a variety of educational and religious ideals, can subscribe to. The three levels are all potentially important; they are also very different, and may require very different approaches on the part of CIJE. These differences need to be taken seriously, with attention to their implications for the kinds of aspirations and approaches that seem realistic and fruitful at each level.

2. The common language that defines work of the Goals Project needs a lot of refinement. The paper written by Shmuel V. and Danny M. entitled "The Theory of the Goals Project" represents an excellent start in this direction in its attempt to discriminate between conceptions, principles, goals, and objectives; but there is room for this effort to go still further. For example,

a. one hears a lot of references in our conversations about "visioning" and "visions": Is "a vision" the same as "a conception"?

b. When we speak of a conception or a vision, are we speaking about an individual ideal (as in "the educated Jew"), about a social ideal (what the Jewish community, or an enclave within the larger community should look like), or about an educational ideal (what a desirable educational environment would look like)? We are probably interested in all of the above, but the way we talk often fails to make clear which of these things we're discussing.

3. In John Rawls' book A THEORY OF JUSTICE, he distinguishes between "primary goods" and other social goods: while many good things depend on the character of an individual's particular life-plan, there are certain good things -- which he calls "primary goods" -- that an individual will want no matter what his or her particular life-plan might be. The relevant point for us is that while there are a variety of goals that will differ for

institutions and denominations, it is safe to say that there are certain goals - what I would tentatively call "instrumental goals" - that a community or an institution could agree on in principle even prior to having fully clarified their educational ideals. Examples might include: increasing the numbers of educators who are engaged in formal Jewish study and in other professionally related study; increasing the number of students who continue their studies into the high school years; increasing the percentage of individuals who attend Day Schools; increasing the number who spend a summer or a year in Israel; increasing the number of children and adolescents who attend Jewish summer camps; increasing the number of full-time professional educators working in the community, etc.

Such goals are "instrumental" in that they don't identify any particular substantive outcome, but at the same time are instrumental, or would contribute to, most substantive outcomes we could identify. Needless to say, how we understand the desired substantive outcomes will operate to interpret some of these instrumental goals; still, it may be possible to begin identifying and developing strategies to achieve some of these instrumental goals in advance of working through some of the difficult substantive issues at institutional and communal levels. Simultaneously as CIJE works with institutions and communities to develop substantive conceptions, it may be sensible to encourage a parallel process aimed at encouraging them to specify attainable and meaningful instrumental goals.

4. One of the interesting suggestions to emerge from the Jerusalem meetings was that perhaps, initially, CIJE should not attempt to work with all institutions in a lead community around goal-setting. Perhaps it would be wiser to start out working with a few. This led me to wonder (as I mentioned in our November meeting in Milwaukee) whether perhaps CIJE should invite interested institutions and agencies to become part of something like a Coalition of Essential Institutions: In return for an up-front commitment to participate with CIJE and other institutional partners in a serious vision/goals-setting process, these institutions would receive a variety of CIJE supports that might include a) participation of their lay and professional leadership in appropriate educational opportunities, with both a local and an Israel-component; b) active and individualized help in developing the institutional process through which the institution's leadership and membership could discover, refine, and consider the educational implications of their educational ideal; c) a certificate, on completion of the process, indicating that the institution had completed this kind of a rigorous goal-setting process. The effect of this approach, assuming that the expectations made of participating institutions are both serious and upfront, is that it would select for serious institutions, ready to invest time, effort, and money in the process of goal-setting in return for what CIJE has to offer.

5. The Jerusalem meetings took note of the fact that in helping institutions develop their educational and Jewish visions, local institutions had a number of resources to draw on. These included:

a) their existing mission-statements, which represent not a resting-point but a good starting-point for discussion and inquiry; b) denominational documents dealing with such matters, which also may serve as a useful starting-point for deliberation; c) "the educated Jew" project and the various resources (human and written) associated with it; and d) "other" -- for example, the availability of CIJE staff to offer help of various kinds (along the lines suggested in Wygoda's and Marom's piece entitled "First Thoughts in Wake of a Goals Project Simulation).

6. There has been a lot of discussion concerning a possible seminar this summer in Jerusalem for Lead Community representatives. There remains some uncertainty in mind concerning matters, including: a) the substance of the seminar; b) the clientele: top lay and/or professional leadership -- or more inclusive. A recent conversation with Gail led me to believe that, increasingly, the thought has been to focus on lay leadership from each of the three lead communities (along with the project's chief educational officer). According to Gail, this initial venture would in effect be a pilot for other seminars that could be held, in Israel or elsewhere, with other appropriate constituencies. Is this a shared understanding at this point? Clearly, the substance and aims of the seminar need to be framed with attention to the clientele.

7. In our Milwaukee conversations, I tried to articulate some very preliminary thoughts concerning what an Israel-Seminar might look like. I imagined a seminar of approximate 8 to 10 days. It included the following components:

a) Opportunities to study and reflect on different visions of Jewish existence, as represented in "the Educated Jew" positions and others that may seem pertinent. This section would include the active participation of Greenberg, Brinker, et. al., as well as discussion of how these visions differ from and resemble denominational visions and the personal visions of the participants.

b) Opportunities to think through the relationship between visions of Jewish existence and educational practice. The piece by Wygoda and Marom, dealing with the move from conception to principles to goals to objectives, is relevant here; so too is a piece like Dewey's THE CHILD AND THE CURRICULUM.

c) Opportunities for the representatives of each lead community to meet together, either alone or with appropriate CIJE staff to do two things: i. to begin a process of developing vision/goals for their own community, and ii. plotting out the "next steps" in this process for their community.

d) Perhaps there should also be an opportunity for the participants to engage in some serious text study as part of each day's activities.

8. At various points we have discussed the advisability of a paper that articulates what a thriving educational environment set some time in the future would actually look like -- something along the lines of what the Carnegie Commission developed in A NATION PREPARED. In the spirit of "one picture is worth a thousand words," I still think something like this would be very valuable -- particularly if (but even if it does not) exhibit the relationship between a particular conception of "an educated Jew" and concrete educational arrangements.

9. A book by Peter Senge of MIT dealing with the need for corporations to become "learning organizations" has recently come to my attention. There are some interesting ideas there, perhaps relevant to us. Are any of you familiar with it?

GOALS FOR JEWISH EDUCATION IN LEAD COMMUNITIES

The Commission on Jewish Education in North America did not deal with the issue of goals for Jewish education in order to achieve consensus. However, the Commission knew that it would be impossible to avoid the issue of goals for Jewish education, when the recommendations of the Commission would be implemented.

With work in Lead Communities underway, the issue of goals can no longer be delayed for several reasons;

- 1) It is difficult to introduce change without deciding what it is that one wants to achieve.
- 2) Researchers such as Marshall Smith, Sara Lightfoot and David Cohen have effectively argued that impact in education is dependent on a clear vision of goals.
- 3) The evaluation project in Lead Communities cannot be successfully undertaken without a clear articulation of goals.

Goals should be articulated for each of the institutions that are involved in education in the Lead Communities and for the community as a whole. At present there are very few cases where institutions or communities have undertaken a serious and systematic consideration of goals. It is necessary to determine the status of this effort in the Lead Communities. There may be individual institutions (e.g. schools, JCCs) that have undertaken or completed a serious systematic consideration of their goals. It is important to learn from their experience and to ascertain whether an attempt has been made to develop curriculum and teaching methods coherent with their goals. In the case of those institutions where little has been done in this area, it is crucial that the institutions be encouraged and helped to undertake a process that will lead to the articulation of goals.

The CIJE should serve as catalyst in this area. It should serve as a broker between the institutions that are to begin such a process and the various resources that exist in the Jewish world — scholars, thinkers and institutions that have deliberated and developed expertise in this area. The institutions of higher Jewish learning in North America (Y.U., J.T.S.A. and H.U.C.), the Melton Centre at the Hebrew University and the Mandel Institute in Jerusalem have all been concerned and have worked on the issue of goals for Jewish education. Furthermore, these institutions have been alerted to the fact that the institutions in the Lead Communities will need assistance in this area. They have expressed an interest in the project and a willingness to assist.

The Mandel Institute has particularly concentrated efforts in this area through its project on alternative conceptions of "The Educated Jew." The scholars involved in this project are: Professors Moshe Greenberg, Menahem Brinker, Isadore Twersky, Michael Rosenak, Israel Scheffler, Seymour Fox and Daniel Marom. Accompanied by a group of talented educators and social scientists, they have completed several important essays offering alternative approaches to the goals of Jewish education as well as indications of how these goals should be applied to educational settings and practice. These scholars would be willing to work with the institutions of higher Jewish learning and thus enrich their contribution to this effort in Lead Communities.

It is therefore suggested that the CIJE advance this undertaking in the following ways:

1. Encourage the institutions in Lead Communities to consider the importance of undertaking a process that will lead to an articulation of goals.
2. Continue the work that has begun with the institutions of higher Jewish learning so that they will be prepared and ready to undertake community-based consultations.
3. Offer seminars whose participants would include Lead Community representatives where the issues related to undertaking a program to develop goals would be discussed. At such seminars the institutions of higher Jewish learning and the Mandel Institute could offer help and expertise.

The issue of goals for a Lead Community as a whole, as well as the question of the relationships of the denominations to each other and to the community as a whole will be dealt with in a subsequent memorandum.

Seymour Fox & Daniel Marom

FIRST THOUGHTS IN WAKE OF A GOALS PROJECT SIMULATION

SHMUEL WYGODA/DANIEL MAROM

After simulating a discussion between the Milwaukee Jewish Day School (Liberal) and the MI/CLJE on the basis of the fourth draft of its. "HEBREW/JUDAICA MISSION STATEMENT (3/9/93)" (appended to this document), we have arrived at the following set of first thoughts on the goals defining process in lead communities::

1. The process of defining or redefining goals involves thorough and painstaking delineation of general aims into operative and evaluable directives (eg, the goal of commitment to Medinat Yisrael" would have to be refined in terms of what attitudes, behaviors, and skills are specifically meant by "commitment" and by what aspects of modern Israel are specifically meant by "Medinat Yisrael." Whether because of its demand for institutional integrity and arduous effort work or because of its implications for the reorganization of everyday life in the school, this process can be very threatening.

2. The goals defining process demands facilitation by an outside expert/s. The facilitator/s role would be to guide the process through asking questions, making distinctions and posing suggestions until it has produced goals statements which are

- agreed upon by the various players in the school's leadership (lay, administrative, pro, parents, etc.)
- are capable of being implemented by the school's staff (with appropriate in-service training if necessary and available)
- can be evaluated.

Then agreement is also necessary

Though the facilitator/s would have to "translate" the concerns and understandings of each of the players in the goals defining process, it would not be the facilitator/s's role to shape school policy in any way. Similarly, though the need for clarity would necessarily involve inquiry into issues of priority and value, the facilitator/s would not attempt to raise the level of discourse on goals to the level sought out in the papers on the educated Jew.

// Raising goal questions would/could raise level of discourse!

3. A school's statement of general aims (as in the appended Milwaukee Jewish Day School "mission statement") can be a useful starting point if it reflects, even in a very general way, something of an authentic vision. Honest nuances in such a document can be "exploded" into a series of specific questions, clarifications, and differentiations which are necessary for the definition of goals (eg. the goal of preparing students for "possessing and valuing a Jewish lifestyle" makes many assumptions about what a school must present to students as a viable way of Jewish living, about how these must be presented, and about what it means for a student to learn about each one of these lifestyles and to choose one of them for him/herself). When such a statement is available, it may provide a less threatening basis for the

goals defining process than when there is no statement at all. In cases in which even this kind of mission statement is unavailable, one would have to think about how to generate its production or suggest that the process begin on the basis of a "content analysis" (an extrapolation of goals statements from an analysis of its existing programs and practice).

4. The question of how to initiate the goals defining process in schools in lead communities is very sensitive and complex. We do not know how many of the 60 - 80 schools in lead communities (early childhood, day, and supplementary), would want to undergo such a process. Since the process can be threatening, it may safely be assumed that many schools will not be immediately open to the idea. Though pressure from lay leaders and force management could create the basis for such a process, one must also consider the possibility that those who implement a vision will not do so with great energy and conviction, even if the "guillotine" of accountability is hanging over their heads, unless they believe in the school's vision and see themselves as having some role in its conception. Furthermore, we have no idea of how many outside experts are available for such a process (certainly not enough to work with all the schools in a lead community at once) nor do we know how much time would be necessary in order to achieve appropriate results.

It may be that the resources of the MI-CIJE would be well invested, at least at first, into an intensive goals defining undertaking with one or two schools in each lead community. The advantage of this approach is that the MI-CIJE could choose to work with schools whose desire to enter into a goals defining process is assured from the outset. In addition, it would be possible to consider recruiting those schools into the process which, when seen entering the process, would provide an incentive for other schools to do the same. Yet another advantage is that the smaller undertaking could provide the MI-CIJE with valuable experience in preparation for the larger goals project in and across lead communities (this could possibly make the smaller undertaking appropriate for the pilot project stage).

5. Linked to the issue of initiating the goals defining process is that of the specific players which would have to be involved. As was stated above, being involved in the process can be an important factor in empowering and energizing players for the implementation process. This would logically lead to the conclusion that it would be important to include as broad a base as possible in the process. On the other hand, besides the great burden that a broad base places on efficiency, the sources of authority in the decision making process and the internal politics will be different in each school. This could obviously have great impact on the question of who it would be necessary, advisable, or optional to include in the goals defining process. One possibility of dealing with this issue would be to work with a committee of representatives of each of the constituents in a school (lay, administrative, pro, parents, etc.) in producing draft formulations of goals and then with each representative and his/her constituent in suggesting emendations. This could also work the other way around - first goals formulations could be done with each of the constituents and their representatives separately and then emandations could be done by a committee of all the representatives. In both cases, it is reasonable to assume that there would be a series of rounds or movements made between the two groups in order to reach a final formulation of the school's goals.

A related question for many of the schools will be the role of the central offices of the respective denominations. Even in cases in which a denomination had developed its own definition of goals - with or without the facilitation of the MI-CIJE - it is difficult to assume that local schools would not want to go through their own goals defining process. Some schools may, of course, feel comfortable using denominational goals statements as a framework within which they could taper and reformulate their own goals. Others may be more open to considering goals formulated by the central denominational offices when those offices offer immediate support for the implementation of those goals through curricula and in-service training. But since the goals defining process is itself a factor in creating energy, efficiency, and accountability in a school, even in these cases effort would have to be invested in locally in order to ensure that the various players in a school understand, desire and are capable of implementing centrally formulated goals. It would therefore be necessary to consider how, in each case, a fruitful working relationship could be negotiated between the central denominational offices and their local constituents in lead communities.

In considering this issue, it could be important to keep in mind that the denominations may choose to embark on a long-winded search for educational goals on the basis of the conceptions developed in the MI's educated Jew project. In cases in which this indeed transpires, it would be possible for the central denominational offices to raise the standards and level of discourse on goals among their constituents. Assuming that a fruitful relationship with the central denominational offices had been built in to the goals defining process in schools in lead communities, this would provide a solid basis for such a development in lead communities - one which could indeed provide a model for other communities.

The question of outside expertise is, of course, also pertinent to the question of who sits around the table in the goals defining process. It is important here to distinguish between the task of facilitating the formulation of clear goals and suggesting ideas or programs in order to implement these goals. Since goals set a theoretical basis for ideas and programs, and the latter should be evaluated in light of the former, it is critical to separate these two activities. As was stated above, it is difficult to assume that the MI-CIJE has enough staff available to work with all of the schools in lead communities at the same time. Even in working with small number of schools, all of which would agree to working with an outsider, the question of how to work together needs attention. Possibilities range from long term, on-site, "hands-on" cooperation on site to fax relationships. The question of whether or not it would be possible to train local experts for this assignment may be worth considering.

Develop

6. In order to proceed, we suggest that this document be discussed with AH and SF in preparation for the discussion of the goals project at the coming CIJE seminars.

Profound conceptions = Vision?

DRAFT

THE THEORY OF THE GOALS PROJECT

1. THE GOALS PROJECT is based on a specific understanding of the way education can work effectively. According to this understanding, education should draw upon profound CONCEPTIONS of human and societal excellence deeply embedded within a culture.

??
??

This is not to suggest that these CONCEPTIONS become the subject matter which should be taught in the classroom. It is the understanding which is provided by these conceptions which is necessary for educational undertakings. These conceptions should provide answers to questions such as "in what way do humans learn?", "what is the nature of the understanding which the learning experience aims to generate?" and "how will those who have successfully learned behave towards others in their society?". These, in turn, would become PRINCIPLES by which educational programs could be planned, implemented and evaluated.

Implicat
these
conceptions

An analogy from the field of psychoanalysis may be useful. A psychoanalyst does not discuss Freud's theory of personality in the midst of a session with his patient, but he needs to be thoroughly proficient with this theory in order to be able to provide therapy. With education, however, the scope of this inquiry is very broad. Its practice requires a grasp not only of the student, but of many other elements such as the subject matter, the teacher, and the milieu in which learning takes place.

Not
very
apt
analogy

The process of drawing upon these conceptions involves thorough and long-winded deliberation and discourse. It requires a negotiation between those who have great familiarity with and deep understanding of the CONCEPTIONS of human and societal excellence and those who are aware of the nature and scope of PRINCIPLES necessary for educational practice. Together, they would work towards a reformulation of the conceptions in terms which can guide educational planning.

If, for example, a CONCEPTION claims that an excellent society is one which allows for a pluralism of viewpoints within its definition of unity, an educator may ask "what would be the attitudes which this conception would see as being necessary for individuals in such a society in order for it to function properly?" The question clearly seeks to explicate the CONCEPTION from a sympathetic point of view. Yet, behind it lay a concern for what is pertinent to education. Once the CONCEPTION delineates the necessary attitudes - for example, that one must be able to empathize with conflicting viewpoints as one considers one's own - the educator has a guideline which can help him consider what and how to teach.

What characterizes a PRINCIPLE for education is that it provides knowledge both in terms of desired motifs and values and in terms of the desired response from the learner. Each of these aspects will be defined on different levels. Desired motifs and values may be formulated in terms of one's relation to oneself, to others, to society, to God, etc. and desired responses may be formulated in terms of cognition, emotion, action, both short and long term, etc. In order to move from a general CONCEPTION to a usable set of PRINCIPLES for education, these varying levels have to be considered. One way of doing this would be to create a grid - a series of desired motifs and values would appear on one axis and the various levels of desired learner responses would appear on the other. PRINCIPLES would then be delineated at each meeting point between the two grids (see example of Melton Faculty Seminar grid - appendix #1).

This, however, would only be the first stage of "drawing upon" the CONCEPTIONS. In order to be able to guide practice, PRINCIPLES need to be "translated" into educational GOALS. If, for example, the PRINCIPLE is that the learner's capacity to empathize with conflicting viewpoints is necessary for good citizenship in a pluralist society, then the task of educators would then be to formulate this into educational GOALS such as:

- history will be understood by students in terms of an unfolding and open-ended drama; rather than viewing the past with hindsight, they will experience the limited foreknowledge of the various protagonists in each situation and learn to respect their different responses to similar dilemmas;

- student participation in classroom discussion on current events should generate their capacity to defend positions with which they do not agree and/or to change positions in the middle of a debate.

These GOALS statements are attempts to embody PRINCIPLES in a language which is useful in educational contexts. One could imagine the development of a grid here as well. The first principles would be set up along one axis and the various subject matter areas (eg. Bible, Talmud, Hebrew language and literature, Jewish history, Jewish thought, etc.) would be set up along the other (for an example, see appendix #2). From here, one could derive a first theoretical picture of an educational strategy or approach.

Vague

desired motifs?

However, in and of themselves, GOALS statements will not be sufficient to guide practice. This involves a third stage in which educational GOALS would be "translated" into specific OBJECTIVES and PROGRAMS.

The movement from GOALS to specific PROGRAMS and OBJECTIVES is complex. On a macrocosmic level it involves the development of a larger SYLLABUS which organizes the sum total of subject matter to be learned in an educational institution in terms of the GOALS to which it has committed itself. Once GOALS are formulated and ranked, educators would attempt to "translate" them into a program of study which specifies which subject matter areas and which topics within each subject matter area would be learned by students from the time they begin studying until their graduation (grade 1, grade 2, etc.; for examples, see appendix #3). In essence, by examining both the development of study within each subject matter area and the relative weight and interrelation of the various subject matter areas within each year, one should be able to see how educators intend to achieve their GOALS in practice.

This is section that Dewey wants result.

Keeping with the above examples of GOALS, one could imagine that the history component of the SYLLABUS would be broken down along the lines of a series of dilemmas. For the period of the Second Temple it could be the dilemma of whether or not the Judeans should revolt against the Romans, and for the modern period it could be the dilemma of whether to stay in Eastern Europe or immigrate to America or Israel in the period preceeding the second world war. And if the study of these dilemmas was apportioned relatively less learning time than discussions on current events, one could learn from this that the educational planners thought that the second GOAL was more likely to achieve the PRINCIPLE than the first (i.e. that discussion of current events in which students are asked to defend positions with which they do not agree will be more effective in developing the capacity to empathize with conflicting viewpoints than learning history as a responses to a series of dilemmas).

On a microcosmic level, the movement from GOALS to PROGRAMS and OBJECTIVES is highly explicit. Here the educational planner suggests means of achieving the said GOALS in relationship to more specific sub-topics and/or texts (not just "the story of Genesis" but the emphases within this story and the specific verses which need to be studied in order to focus upon them). This would involve a complex deliberative process in which considerations concerning issues such as the nature of the subject matter, the psychology of the student, the professional level of the

in general, on these particular students

teacher, and the specific conditions in which the learning experience takes place are taken into account.

Keeping again with the above example of **GOALS**, one could imagine a program for the teaching of Second Temple history which would suggest just how the dilemma of whether or not the Judeans should revolt against the Romans should be presented so that the student will come out feeling empathy for the various positions. For example, it could provide the teacher with:

a) specific **OBJECTIVES** for teaching texts which represent each of the positions in a way which will lead to empathy (eg. the student will understand that Josephus' position was that the revolution would be useless because he had faith that the Romans would be more tolerant of the Judeans' religious sensitivities);

b) the texts which represent each of the positions in a format which is reproduceable for students - and the textbook discussions which enable appropriate background understanding (eg. War of the Jews, book 5, chapter 9; Encyclopedia Judaica, volume 10, pages 1150-1155);

c) a series of suggested interpretive exercises or experiences which could be utilized by the teacher in order to achieve the said **OBJECTIVES** through the study of the specific texts and/or textbooks (eg. a mock trial of Josephus);

d) a series of suggested **EVALUATIVE TECHNIQUES** by which the teacher can determine whether or not the students have indeed empathized with each of the positions (eg. assess a student's assessment of a non-empathetic position on Josephus);

Altogether, these would represent one attempt to formulate goals in terms which are immediately operative in an educational setting.

Optimally, the movement from **GOALS** to **PROGRAMS** and **OBJECTIVES** would be summarized in the form of an extended or "annotated" **SYLLABUS**. Each topic and sub-topic would be accompanied by a list of specific **OBJECTIVES** and **PROGRAMS**. (see various examples from the syllabus project in appendix #4). An annotated **SYLLABUS** which covers all the years of study would be a basic working document for an educational institution

A significant investment of energy and resources into the TRAINING of educators would be necessary in order to implement the plan set out by such a document. Even if we assume that educators identify with the deeper CONCEPTION and which stands behind this document (this assumption has been made all along since the educators will be members of the culture from which the original CONCEPTION was chosen; in some cases, however, there could be a need to ensure consensus from the outset), it would be necessary for them to have some level of faith in and understanding of the PRINCIPLES and GOALS which guide its OBJECTIVES and PROGRAMS in order for them to undertake the implementation process.

Strong
assu

It is one thing to be given a PROGRAM on the dilemma of whether or not the Judeans should have rebelled against the Romans. It is quite another to be told to implement it in a way which arouses empathy for conflicting positions. Even if all the OBJECTIVES in the program are designed to facilitate the achievement of larger EDUCATIONAL goals, the actual moment of teaching will demand more than the obedience of a robot. In essence, in order to achieve optimal effectiveness, educators would need to be trained to be "applicators" rather than simply "doers." This would most likely involve a continuous rather than a "one-time" form of TRAINING.

Similarly, the concern for effectiveness would necessitate the involvement of EVALUATION in the implementation process from the outset. The role of evaluators would be twofold. One the one hand they would monitor the implementation process by constantly seeing to it that practice aims to carry out the OBJECTIVES and GOALS which it is designed to achieve. Is the teacher navigating the classroom discussion in a way which leads students to empathize with positions with which they do not agree or is s/he himself taking sides?

On the other hand, the evaluators' role is critical even when practice is carried out appropriately. They would still have to determine whether or not the desired GOALS were being achieved through the implementation process. Perhaps the teaching of history as alternative responses to dilemmas does not enhance the learner's capacity to empathize with positions with which he does not agree? In such cases, he may discover either that the GOALS demand a different set of OBJECTIVES and PROGRAMS (eg. a different version of how to teach the dilemma of whether or not to revolt against the Romans), or that the GOALS themselves are unfeasible or misconceived (eg. one cannot rid oneself of hindsight in the study of history, therefore it is impossible to empathize with those who chose to stay in Europe before the holocaust).

More
the
applicators
→ also
Commitment

2

In order to undertake this kind of EVALUATION, however, the evaluators must be aware of the PRINCIPLES from which the goals have been translated. If GOALS can be deemed to be unfeasible, they must be able to determine if the problem lay on the level of translating the PRINCIPLES into GOALS (teaching history through dilemmas does not lead to the development of empathy for positions with which one does not agree), or whether it lay in the PRINCIPLES themselves (it is not appropriate to expect that one can empathize with a position with which one does not agree). In either of these cases, there would be a need to try to make the whole process more efficient by reformulation of the original CONCEPTION and/or PRINCIPLE and then "retranslation" of these to the level of OBJECTIVES and PROGRAMS.

It is precisely this kind of EVALUATION which can provide educators with an opportunity to be accountable for practice, to determine whether or not they are being effective, whether or not they are choosing the appropriate means for their aims. Yet this kind of evaluation is contingent upon the clear formulation of the GOALS of education (i.e. they reflect PRINCIPLES derived from CONCEPTIONS of human and societal excellence embedded within a culture), and upon a systematic attempt to carry them out (i.e. goals are translated into appropriate OBJECTIVES and PROGRAMS).

2) The Mandel Institute has launched a project dedicated to the development of Jewish educational systems on the basis of the above definition of education. This project will be available as a resource for THE GOALS PROJECT.

Initial research undertaken by the Mandel Institute revealed a lack of development in the area of GOALS for Jewish education. Despite the fact that Jewish religion and culture is flourishing with CONCEPTIONS of human and societal excellence, few real attempts have been made to "translate" these to PRINCIPLES and GOALS for Jewish education.

Hence, over the last two years, the project has involved a deliberation among scholars and educators in an attempt to develop three alternative approaches to the GOALS of Jewish education. These are based on three Jewish CONCEPTIONS of human and societal excellence: an orthodox CONCEPTION, presented by Professor Isadore Twersky, a classical conservative CONCEPTION, presented by Professor Moshe Greenberg, and a Zionist-secularist CONCEPTION, presented by Professor Menachem Brinker.

These scholars were asked to answer the question, "what would be the values, attitudes, knowledge and other attributes which you would see as characterizing a graduate of a successful Jewish education based on your CONCEPTION?" In short, describe your version of "the educated Jew" (this became the name of the project). Through deliberation with educators, an attempt was made to arrive at a set of educational PRINCIPLES for each presentation. Having done this, educators then attempted to translate each of these sets of PRINCIPLES into statements of GOALS for Jewish education.

One of the outcomes of this undertaking will be a publication (forthcoming in the next few months). In addition to the three statements on "the educated Jew" and their "translation" into statements of GOALS for Jewish education, the publication will include a chapter which discusses the definition of education described above and the rationale which lays behind its claim to greater effectiveness. As well, it will include a series of related discussions dealing with "minimal goals for all systems of Jewish education" (generated by a paper delivered by Professor Michael Rosenak) and "the debate on the educated person over the last three decades and its implications for the discussion on the educated Jew" (by Professor Israel Scheffler, based on his research at the Harvard University Philosophy of Education Research Center). Finally, the publication will include a bibliography of writings suggesting PRINCIPLES or GOALS for Jewish education.

Another outcome of this undertaking will be that it will provide an opportunity to learn about how others could go about developing GOALS for Jewish education. To be sure, the three statements of GOALS for Jewish education which were developed in this project will be the basis for experiments in implementation. However, since the project is dedicated to developing the knowledge and the conditions which will enable systems of Jewish education all over the world to develop their own GOALS, energy has been invested in order to formulate a general statement on methods and procedures involved in the development of GOALS for education.

3) THE GOALS PROJECT is an attempt to apply the definition of education described above (point #1) to the field of Jewish education, specifically in lead communities in North America.

In most Jewish educational insitutions in these communities, practice is not based on an systematic attempt to implement clearly formulated GOALS. The Mandel Institute's experience with a project for the development of a SYLLABUS for systems of Jewish education has revealed that most

Jewish schools do even not have comprehensive SYLLABI which guide their work, annotated or otherwise. Practice is determined either by the talents of individual teachers (whose training - if they have had any - is unrelated to the implementation of the PROGRAMS which they teach) or by the availability of textbooks and other educational tools (irrespective of those who use them).

Ideally, lead communities would be defined as places in which all Jewish educational institutions were involved in the thorough development and systematic implementation of their GOALS. At the same time, excitement over having been chosen as lead communities has led to a growing expectation for immediate action leading to more effective Jewish education. Lay leaders who have hitherto been wary of entering into the domain of Jewish education - precisely because of this unsystematic mode of operation - are now playing a central role in the lead communities project. Hence, a primary concern of theirs is for a minimal level of accountability on the part of the practitioners of Jewish education in the communities. As they see it, educational institutions in lead communities must be immediately defined by a mode of operation which involves basic planning, implementation and evaluation - i.e. they must work with GOALS.

This demand for immediate work with GOALS presents a problem for those who would see effectiveness as an outcome of the form of education described above. In essence, it is asking educators to work with GOALS and OBJECTIVES which, though they may be operative, are not based on long-winded deliberative processes (moving from CONCEPTIONS of human and societal excellence to PRINCIPLES for education and from these to GOALS) which lend such work the promise of effectiveness.

Problematic as this may be in terms of the total picture presented above, the expectation here is so great that it would be almost impossible to circumvent this demand on the part of lay leaders without losing their support and enthusiasm. It would also be dangerous to ask them to delay immediate action in favour of a drawn out philosophical process.

As a result, THE GOALS PROJECT would have to be implemented on a number of levels at the same time. The first level is related to the lay leaders' demand for immediate action in the development of a mode of education based on GOALS. The aim here would be to bring practitioners to the point at which they become in search of the GOALS for their institutions.

Not
substantive
clear to
me:
what
are they
doing
at
here?

In many cases, practitioners will claim that their institutional mission or vision statements are statements of their GOALS. Keeping with the definition of GOALS given above, this would not be sufficient. What would have to be conveyed is that:

- GOALS must be formulated in terms which guide everyday practice (eg. in terms of the aims of teaching a specific subject matter area);

- GOALS must be broken down into a plan of action (eg. a SYLLABUS);

- GOALS must be translated into specific OBJECTIVES and PROGRAMS for each activity which is implemented in the institution;

- practice must be evaluated in light of the institutions GOALS.

It is foreseen that in most cases, educational institutions in lead communities will realize that they do not have a clear sense of their goals and that, since the majority of them are denominational, they would turn to their central offices for guidance. The national CIJE has forewarned the training institutions of the various denominations of this probable development. In order to facilitate an effective consultation between these central agencies and their local affiliates in lead communities, it would be suggested that they make an effort to summarize the GOALS which they have seen as appropriate for their constituencies.

This would most probably involve the extraction of GOALS statements which can be found in some of these agencies' published curricula. There could also be a need for some reformulation and ranking of these GOALS (and perhaps the development of new GOALS in specific areas). It would also be reasonable to assume that in order to act upon these GOALS, local institutions in lead communities will be in need of appropriate in-service TRAINING seminars and corresponding OBJECTIVES and PROGRAMS from the denominational training institutions.

The involvement of the national agencies would not reduce the need for a great investment of energy and resources on the local level in order to meet the lay leaders' demand for work based on GOALS. The development of SYLLABI, for example, would have to take into account local conditions, personnel, etc. It would be necessary for the CIJE, both national and local, to create the conditions which will make this work possible (eg. create special forums for

Also
goals
must
be
had
Vision
in
mind

local educators to invest extra-time in planning, training, etc.; bring in outside consultants, syllabus experts, and trainers in appropriate subject matter areas, etc.). In addition, by arranging local community-wide conferences for educators who are dealing with similar issues in GOALS development, the CIJE would be enabling them to learn from each other's experiences (this is another example of how community-wide processes can create a greater input into Jewish education; also, the Mandel Institute's research on common minimal GOALS for Jewish education could be useful at such a conference). Similarly, it would be necessary for the CIJE's monitoring, evaluation & feedback team to consider its role in facilitating the EVALUATION of practice in the local educational institutions in terms of their GOALS.

A second level of THE GOALS PROJECT would be undertaken while this first level would be implemented. This level is related to the concern for the development of GOALS on the basis of thorough and long-winded deliberation (moving from CONCEPTIONS of human and societal excellence to PRINCIPLES and GOALS for education). It is on this level that the Mandel Institute's project on "the educated Jew" would be available as a resource.

The bulk of the effort on this level would be with the central agencies of the denominations (this does not exclude efforts to work with the Jewish Community Center Association or directly with non-affiliated and/or community institutions in lead communities). As they would be working to provide GOALS to their constituents in lead communities, the denominations would also be encouraged by the CIJE to undertake more thorough efforts at developing their GOALS for Jewish education. This effort could be enhanced by intensive seminars on any or all of the three statements of GOALS for Jewish education developed at the Mandel Institute and/or by consultation with the Institute's staff on appropriate methods and procedures for developing their own statements of GOALS.

In the final analysis, the aim of THE GOALS PROJECT would be for this second level to have a bearing on the work of the local constituents of the denominations in lead communities. Having set up a primary infrastructure for working with GOALS, educational institutions in lead communities would eventually be ready for and capable of considering work with the more thoroughly and deeply formulated statements of GOALS derived from the work of the denominations on the second level.

see the Rosner piece
goals

Dump Psychol. a do
"Long-winded"

"Approvers"/Implementer

- must identify Stress

Profound concept = Vision - what is
it?

Wieder/Maran

include!!

- ① Useful distinctions; could be clearer & used more consistently
Vision - Purpose - goal - object
- ② "Syllabus" & Dawey
- ③ Vision ^{conception} needs more emphasis!! (+ more clarity)
- ④ Research - manual goals text

Good piece on outside consultant
(first essay)

FIRST THOUGHTS IN WAKE OF A GOALS PROJECT SIMULATION

SHMUEL WYGODA/DANIEL MAROM

After simulating a discussion between the Milwaukee Jewish Day School (Liberal) and the MI/CIJE on the basis of the fourth draft of its. "HEBREW/JUDAICA MISSION STATEMENT (3/9/93)" (appended to this document), we have arrived at the following set of first thoughts on the goals defining process in lead communities::

1. The process of defining or redefining goals involves thorough and painstaking delineation of general aims into operative and evaluable directives (eg, the goal of commitment to Medinat Yisrael" would have to be refined in terms of what attitudes, behaviors, and skills are specifically meant by "commitment" and by what aspects of modern Israel are specifically meant by "Medinat Yisrael." Whether because of its demand for institutional integrity and arduous effort work or because of its implications for the reorganization of everyday life in the school, this process can be very threatening.

2. The goals defining process demands facilitation by an outside expert/s. The facilitator/s role would be to guide the process through asking questions, making distinctions and posing suggestions until it has produced goals statements which are

- agreed upon by the various players in the school's leadership (lay, administrative, pro, parents, etc.)

- are capable of being implemented by the school's staff (with appropriate in-service training if necessary and available)

- can be evaluated.

Though the facilitator/s would have to "translate" the concerns and understandings of each of the players in the goals defining process, it would not be the facilitator/s's role to shape school policy in any way. Similarly, though the need for clarity would necessarily involve inquiry into issues of priority and value, the facilitator/s would not attempt to raise the level of discourse on goals to the level sought out in the papers on the educated Jew.

3. A school's statement of general aims (as in the appended Milwaukee Jewish Day School "mission statement) can be a useful starting point if it reflects, even in a very general way, something of an authentic vision. Honest nuances in such a document can be "exploded" into a series of specific questions, clarifications, and differentiations which are necessary for the definition of goals (eg. the goal of preparing students for "possessing and valuing a Jewish lifestyle" makes many assumptions about what a school must present to students as a viable way of Jewish living, about how these must

sugg
form
sepa
repr
roun
form

be presented, and about what it means for a student to learn about each one of these lifestyles and to choose one of them for him/herself). When such a statement is available, it may provide a less threatening basis for the goals defining process than when there is no statement at all. In cases in which even this kind of mission statement is unavailable, one would have to think about how to generate its production or suggest that the process begin on the basis of a "content analysis" (an extrapolation of goals statements from an analysis of its existing programs and practice).

the r
own
to a
proc
state
goal
denc
impl
goal
in a
ensu
impl
how
cent

4. The question of how to initiate the goals defining process in schools in lead communities is very sensitive and complex. We do not know how many of the 60 - 80 schools in lead communities (early childhood, day, and supplementary), would want to undergo such a process. Since the process can be threatening, it may safely be assumed that many schools will not be immediately open to the idea. Though pressure from lay leaders and force management could create the basis for such a process, one must also consider the possibility that those who implement a vision will not do so with great energy and conviction, even if the "guillotine" of accountability is hanging over their heads, unless they believe in the school's vision and see themselves as having some role in its conception. Furthermore, we have no idea of how many outside experts are available for such a process (certainly not enough to work with all the schools in a lead community at once) nor do we know how much time would be necessary in order to achieve appropriate results.

denc
the l
whic
to r
Assu
built
a so
prov

It may be that the resources of the MI-CIJE would be well invested, at least at first, into an intensive goals defining undertaking with one or two schools in each lead community. The advantage of this approach is that the MI-CIJE could choose to work with schools whose desire to enter into a goals defining process is assured from the outset. In addition, it would be possible to consider recruiting those schools into the process which, when seen entering the process, would provide an incentive for other schools to do the same. Yet another advantage is that the smaller undertaking could provide the MI-CIJE with valuable experience in preparation for the larger goals project in and across lead communities (this could possibly make the smaller undertaking appropriate for the pilot project stage).

1
sits
betw
prog
idea
criti
that
com
whic
need
site
loca

5. Linked to the issue of initiating the goals defining process is that of the specific players which would have to be involved. As was stated above, being involved in the process can be an important factor in empowering and energizing players for the implementation process. This would logically lead to the conclusion that it would be important to include as broad a base as possible in the process. On the other hand, besides the great burden that a broad base places on efficiency, the sources of authority in the decision making process and the internal politics will be different in each school. This could obviously have great impact on the question of who it would be necessary, advisable, or optional to include in the goals defining process. One possibility of dealing with this issue would be to work with a committee of representatives of each of the constituents in a school (lay, administrative, pro, parents, etc.) in producing draft formulations of goals and then with each representative and his/her constituent in

6. In order to proceed, we suggest that this document be discussed with AH and SF in preparation for the discussion of the goals project at the coming CIJE seminars.

Milwaukee Jewish Day School
(~~Liberal~~ Liberal)

HEBREW/JUDAICA MISSION STATEMENT

Draft #4: 3/9/93

The mission of MJDS is to prepare ^{Students}~~graduates~~ to be educated participants in the Jewish community, possessing and valuing a Jewish lifestyle and the ability to engage in independent Jewish study. Through active and intensive study of source materials, students will become knowledgeable participants in Jewish life.

MJDS aspires to foster in each child a positive Jewish identity and a love and commitment to God, Israel and the Jewish people. The program emphasizes the richness and worth of religious pluralism and instills respect and appreciation for different outlooks and practices within Judaism. It will stress the need to accept and embrace all Jews as equal participants in the Jewish community.

Judaic and general studies curricula are substantially integrated, enabling students to express their Jewishness in their daily lives.

PROGRAM GOALS

draft #3: 3/9/93

Graduates of MJDS will have attained the following goals:

In the Area of J. Knowledge.

1. knowledge and understanding of the full range of Jewish beliefs and observances.
2. knowledge of and familiarity with Jewish sources.
3. understanding of the development of Jewish tradition.
4. knowledge of Jewish history.

In the area of Jewish skills:

1. the ability to speak, read, write and understand the Hebrew language.
2. the ability to participate in and lead synagogue worship (tefillah).
3. the ability to participate in and lead home and holiday celebrations.
4. the ability to study Jewish sources independently.

In the area of Jewish attitudes:

1. commitment to gemilut chasadim (acts of loving kindness).
2. commitment to Klal Yisrael (Jewish community).
3. commitment to Medinat Yisrael (the modern State of Israel).
4. positive feelings about Jewish life, celebration, and learning.

[ca JANUARY 1994]

DRAFT

THE THEORY OF THE GOALS PROJECT

1. **THE GOALS PROJECT** is based on a specific understanding of the way education can work effectively. According to this understanding, education should draw upon profound **CONCEPTIONS** of human and societal excellence deeply embedded within a culture.

This is not to suggest that these **CONCEPTIONS** become the subject matter which should be taught in the classroom. It is the understanding which is provided by these conceptions which is necessary for educational undertakings. These conceptions should provide answers to questions such as "in what way do humans learn?", "what is the nature of the understanding which the learning experience aims to generate?" and "how will those who have successfully learned behave towards others in their society?". These, in turn, would become **PRINCIPLES** by which educational programs could be planned, implemented and evaluated.

An analogy from the field of psychoanalysis may be useful. A psychoanalyst does not discuss Freud's theory of personality in the midst of a session with his patient, but he needs to be thoroughly proficient with this theory in order to be able to provide therapy. With education, however, the scope of this inquiry is very broad. Its practice requires a grasp not only of the student, but of many other elements such as the subject matter, the teacher, and the milieu in which learning takes place.

The process of drawing upon these conceptions involves thorough and long-winded deliberation and discourse. It requires a negotiation between those who have great familiarity with and deep understanding of the **CONCEPTIONS** of human and societal excellence and those who are aware of the nature and scope of **PRINCIPLES** necessary for educational practice. Together, they would work towards a reformulation of the conceptions in terms which can guide educational planning.

If, for example, a **CONCEPTION** claims that an excellent society is one which allows for a pluralism of viewpoints within its definition of unity, an educator may ask "what would be the attitudes which this conception would see as being necessary for individuals in such a society in order for it to function properly?" The question clearly seeks to explicate the **CONCEPTION** from a sympathetic point of view. Yet, behind it lay a concern for what is pertinent to education. Once the **CONCEPTION** delineates the necessary attitudes - for example, that one must be able to empathize with conflicting viewpoints as one considers one's own - the educator has a guideline which can help him consider what and how to teach.

What characterizes a **PRINCIPLE** for education is that it provides knowledge both in terms of desired motifs and values and in terms of the desired response from the learner. Each of these aspects will be defined on different levels. Desired motifs and values may be formulated in terms of one's relation to oneself, to others, to society, to God, etc. and desired responses may be formulated in terms of cognition, emotion, action, both short and long term, etc. In order to move from a general **CONCEPTION** to a usable set of **PRINCIPLES** for education, these varying levels have to be considered. One way of doing this would be to create a grid - a series of desired motifs and values would appear on one axis and the various levels of desired learner responses would appear on the other. **PRINCIPLES** would then be delineated at each meeting point between the two grids (see example of Melton Faculty Seminar grid - appendix #1).

This, however, would only be the first stage of "drawing upon" the **CONCEPTIONS**. In order to be able to guide practice, **PRINCIPLES** need to be "translated" into educational **GOALS**. If, for example, the **PRINCIPLE** is that the learner's capacity to empathize with conflicting viewpoints is necessary for good citizenship in a pluralist society, then the task of educators would then be to formulate this into educational **GOALS** such as:

- history will be understood by students in terms of an unfolding and open-ended drama; rather than viewing the past with hindsight, they will experience the limited foreknowledge of the various protagonists in each situation and learn to respect their different responses to similar dilemmas;
- student participation in classroom discussion on current events should generate their capacity to defend positions with which they do not agree and/or to change positions in the middle of a debate.

These **GOALS** statements are attempts to embody **PRINCIPLES** in a language which is useful in educational contexts. One could imagine the development of a grid here as well. The first principles would be set up along one axis and the various subject matter areas (eg. Bible, Talmud, Hebrew language and literature, Jewish history, Jewish thought, etc.) would be set up along the other (for an example, see appendix #2). From here, one could derive a first theoretical picture of an educational strategy or approach.

However, in and of themselves, **GOALS** statements will not be sufficient to guide practice. This involves a third stage in which educational **GOALS** would be "translated" into specific **OBJECTIVES** and **PROGRAMS**.

The movement from **GOALS** to specific **PROGRAMS** and **OBJECTIVES** is complex. On a macrocosmic level it involves the development of a larger **SYLLABUS** which organizes the sum total of subject matter to be learned in an educational institution in terms of the **GOALS** to which it has committed itself. Once **GOALS** are formulated and ranked, educators would attempt to "translate" them into a program of study which specifies which subject matter areas and which topics within each subject matter area would be learned by students from the time they begin studying until their graduation (grade 1, grade 2, etc.; for examples, see appendix #3). In essence, by examining both the development of study within each subject matter area and the relative weight and interrelation of the various subject matter areas within each year, one should be able to see how educators intend to achieve their **GOALS** in practice.

Keeping with the above examples of **GOALS**, one could imagine that the history component of the **SYLLABUS** would be broken down along the lines of a series of dilemmas. For the period of the Second Temple it could be the dilemma of whether or not the Judeans should revolt against the Romans, and for the modern period it could be the dilemma of whether to stay in Eastern Europe or immigrate to America or Israel in the period preceding the second world war. And if the study of these dilemmas was apportioned relatively less learning time than discussions on current events, one could learn from this that the educational planners thought that the second **GOAL** was more likely to achieve the **PRINCIPLE** than the first (i.e. that discussion of current events in which students are asked to defend positions with which they do not agree will be more effective in developing the capacity to empathize with conflicting viewpoints than learning history as a responses to a series of dilemmas).

On a microcosmic level, the movement from **GOALS** to **PROGRAMS** and **OBJECTIVES** is highly explicit. Here the educational planner suggests means of achieving the said **GOALS** in relationship to more specific sub-topics and/or texts (not just "the story of Genesis" but the emphases within this story and the specific verses which need to be studied in order to focus upon them). This would involve a complex deliberative process in which considerations concerning issues such as the nature of the subject matter, the psychology of the student, the professional level of the

teacher, and the specific conditions in which the learning experience takes place are taken into account.

Keeping again with the above example of **GOALS**, one could imagine a program for the teaching of Second Temple history which would suggest just how the dilemma of whether or not the Judeans should revolt against the Romans should be presented so that the student will come out feeling empathy for the various positions. For example, it could provide the teacher with:

a) specific **OBJECTIVES** for teaching texts which represent each of the positions in a way which will lead to empathy (eg. the student will understand that Josephus' position was that the revolution would be useless because he had faith that the Romans would be more tolerant of the Judeans' religious sensitivities);

b) the texts which represent each of the positions in a format which is reproduceable for students - and the textbook discussions which enable appropriate background understanding (eg. War of the Jews, book 5, chapter 9; Encyclopedia Judaica, volume 10, pages 1150-1155);

c) a series of suggested interpretive exercises or experiences which could be utilized by the teacher in order to achieve the said **OBJECTIVES** through the study of the specific texts and/or textbooks (eg. a mock trial of Josephus);

d) a series of suggested **EVALUATIVE TECHNIQUES** by which the teacher can determine whether or not the students have indeed empathized with each of the positions (eg. assess a student's assessment of a non-empathetic position on Josephus);

Altogether, these would represent one attempt to formulate goals in terms which are immediately operative in an educational setting.

Optimally, the movement from **GOALS** to **PROGRAMS** and **OBJECTIVES** would be summarized in the form of an extended or "annotated" **SYLLABUS**. Each topic and sub-topic would be accompanied by a list of specific **OBJECTIVES** and **PROGRAMS**. (see various examples from the syllabus project in appendix #4). An annotated **SYLLABUS** which covers all the years of study would be a basic working document for an educational institution

A significant investment of energy and resources into the **TRAINING** of educators would be necessary in order to implement the plan set out by such a document. Even if we assume that educators identify with the deeper **CONCEPTION** and which stands behind this document (this assumption has been made all along since the educators will be members of the culture from which the original **CONCEPTION** was chosen; in some cases, however, there could be a need to ensure consensus from the outset), it would be necessary for them to have some level of faith in and understanding of the **PRINCIPLES** and **GOALS** which guide its **OBJECTIVES** and **PROGRAMS** in order for them to undertake the implementation process.

It is one thing to be given a **PROGRAM** on the dilemma of whether or not the Judeans should have rebelled against the Romans. It is quite another to be told to implement it in a way which arouses empathy for conflicting positions. Even if all the **OBJECTIVES** in the program are designed to facilitate the achievement of larger **EDUCATIONAL** goals, the actual moment of teaching will demand more than the obedience of a robot. In essence, in order to achieve optimal effectiveness, educators would need to be trained to be "applicators" rather than simply "doers." This would most likely involve a continuous rather than a "one-time" form of **TRAINING**.

Similarly, the concern for effectiveness would necessitate the involvement of **EVALUATION** in the implementation process from the outset. The role of evaluators would be twofold. One the one hand they would monitor the implementation process by constantly seeing to it that practice aims to carry out the **OBJECTIVES** and **GOALS** which it is designed to achieve. Is the teacher navigating the classroom discussion in a way which leads students to empathize with positions with which they do not agree or is s/he himself taking sides?

On the other hand, the evaluators' role is critical even when practice is carried out appropriately. They would still have to determine whether or not the desired **GOALS** were being achieved through the implementation process. Perhaps the teaching of history as alternative responses to dilemmas does not enhance the learner's capacity to empathize with positions with which he does not agree? In such cases, he may discover either that the **GOALS** demand a different set of **OBJECTIVES** and **PROGRAMS** (eg. a different version of how to teach the dilemma of whether or not to revolt against the Romans), or that the **GOALS** themselves are unfeasible or misconceived (eg. one cannot rid oneself of hindsight in the study of history, therefore it is impossible to empathize with those who chose to stay in Europe before the holocaust).

In order to undertake this kind of **EVALUATION**, however, the evaluators must be aware of the **PRINCIPLES** from which the goals have been translated. If **GOALS** can be deemed to be unfeasible, they must be able to determine if the problem lay on the level of translating the **PRINCIPLES** into **GOALS** (teaching history through dilemmas does not lead to the development of empathy for positions with which one does not agree), or whether it lay in the **PRINCIPLES** themselves (it is not appropriate to expect that one can empathize with a position with which one does not agree). In either of these cases, there would be a need to try to make the whole process more efficient by reformulation of the original **CONCEPTION** and/or **PRINCIPLE** and then "retranslation" of these to the level of **OBJECTIVES** and **PROGRAMS**.

It is precisely this kind of **EVALUATION** which can provide educators with an opportunity to be accountable for practice, to determine whether or not they are being effective, whether or not they are choosing the appropriate means for their aims. Yet this kind of evaluation is contingent upon the clear formulation of the **GOALS** of education (i.e. they reflect **PRINCIPLES** derived from **CONCEPTIONS** of human and societal excellence embedded within a culture), and upon a systematic attempt to carry them out (i.e. goals are translated into appropriate **OBJECTIVES** and **PROGRAMS**).

2) The Mandel Institute has launched a project dedicated to the development of Jewish educational systems on the basis of the above definition of education. This project will be available as a resource for **THE GOALS PROJECT**.

Initial research undertaken by the Mandel Institute revealed a lack of development in the area of **GOALS** for Jewish education. Despite the fact that Jewish religion and culture is flourishing with **CONCEPTIONS** of human and societal excellence, few real attempts have been made to "translate" these to **PRINCIPLES** and **GOALS** for Jewish education.

Hence, over the last two years, the project has involved a deliberation among scholars and educators in an attempt to develop three alternative approaches to the **GOALS** of Jewish education. These are based on three Jewish **CONCEPTIONS** of human and societal excellence: an orthodox **CONCEPTION**, presented by Professor Isadore Twersky, a classical conservative **CONCEPTION**, presented by Professor Moshe Greenberg, and a Zionist-secularist **CONCEPTION**, presented by Professor Menachem Brinker.

These scholars were asked to answer the question, "what would be the values, attitudes, knowledge and other attributes which you would see as characterizing a graduate of a successful Jewish education based on your **CONCEPTION?**" In short, describe your version of "the educated Jew" (this became the name of the project). Through deliberation with educators, an attempt was made to arrive at a set of educational **PRINCIPLES** for each presentation. Having done this, educators then attempted to translate each of these sets of **PRINCIPLES** into statements of **GOALS** for Jewish education.

One of the outcomes of this undertaking will be a publication (forthcoming in the next few months). In addition to the three statements on "the educated Jew" and their "translation" into statements of **GOALS** for Jewish education, the publication will include a chapter which discusses the definition of education described above and the rationale which lays behind its claim to greater effectiveness. As well, it will include a series of related discussions dealing with "minimal goals for all systems of Jewish education" (generated by a paper delivered by Professor Michael Rosenak) and "the debate on the educated person over the last three decades and its implications for the discussion on the educated Jew" (by Professor Israel Scheffler, based on his research at the Harvard University Philosophy of Education Research Center). Finally, the publication will include a bibliography of writings suggesting **PRINCIPLES** or **GOALS** for Jewish education.

Another outcome of this undertaking will be that it will provide an opportunity to learn about how others could go about developing **GOALS** for Jewish education. To be sure, the three statements of **GOALS** for Jewish education which were developed in this project will be the basis for experiments in implementation. However, since the project is dedicated to developing the knowledge and the conditions which will enable systems of Jewish education all over the world to develop their own **GOALS**, energy has been invested in order to formulate a general statement on methods and procedures involved in the development of **GOALS** for education.

3) **THE GOALS PROJECT** is an attempt to apply the definition of education described above (point #1) to the field of Jewish education, specifically in lead communities in North America.

In most Jewish educational insitutions in these communities, practice is not based on an systematic attempt to implement clearly formulated **GOALS**. The Mandel Institute's experience with a project for the development of a **SYLLABUS** for systems of Jewish education has revealed that most

Jewish schools do even not have comprehensive SYLLABI which guides their work, annotated or otherwise. Practice is determined either by the talents of individual teachers (whose training - if they have had any - is unrelated to the implementation of the PROGRAMS which they teach) or by the availability of textbooks and other educational tools (irrespective of those who use them).

Ideally, lead communities would be defined as places in which all Jewish educational institutions were involved in the thorough development and systematic implementation of their GOALS. At the same time, excitement over having been chosen as lead communities has led to a growing expectation for immediate action leading to more effective Jewish education. Lay leaders who have hitherto been wary of entering into the domain of Jewish education - precisely because of this unsystematic mode of operation - are now playing a central role in the lead communities project. Hence, a primary concern of theirs is for a minimal level of accountability on the part of the practitioners of Jewish education in the communities. As they see it, educational institutions in lead communities must be immediately defined by a mode of operation which involves basic planning, implementation and evaluation - i.e. they must work with GOALS.

This demand for immediate work with GOALS presents a problem for those who would see effectiveness as an outcome of the form of education described above. In essence, it is asking educators to work with GOALS and OBJECTIVES which, though they may be operative, are not based on long-winded deliberative processes (moving from CONCEPTIONS of human and societal excellence to PRINCIPLES for education and from these to GOALS) which lend such work the promise of effectiveness.

Problematic as this may be in terms of the total picture presented above, the expectation here is so great that it would be almost impossible to circumvent this demand on the part of lay leaders without losing their support and enthusiasm. It would also be dangerous to ask them to delay immediate action in favour of a drawn out philosophical process.

As a result, THE GOALS PROJECT would have to be implemented on a number of levels at the same time. The first level is related to the lay leaders' demand for immediate action in the development of a mode of education based on GOALS. The aim here would be to bring practitioners to the point at which they become in search of the GOALS for their institutions.

In many cases, practitioners will claim that their institutional mission or vision statements are statements of their **GOALS**. Keeping with the definition of **GOALS** given above, this would not be sufficient. What would have to be conveyed is that:

- **GOALS** must be formulated in terms which guide everyday practice (eg. in terms of the aims of teaching a specific subject matter area);
- **GOALS** must be broken down into a plan of action (eg. a **SYLLABUS**);
- **GOALS** must be translated into specific **OBJECTIVES** and **PROGRAMS** for each activity which is implemented in the institution;
- practice must be evaluated in light of the institutions **GOALS**.

It is foreseen that in most cases, educational institutions in lead communities will realize that they do not have a clear sense of their goals and that, since the majority of them are denominational, they would turn to their central offices for guidance. The national CIJE has forewarned the training institutions of the various denominations of this probable development. In order to facilitate an effective consultation between these central agencies and their local affiliates in lead communities, it would be suggested that they make an effort to summarize the **GOALS** which they have seen as appropriate for their constituencies.

This would most probably involve the extraction of **GOALS** statements which can be found in some of these agencies' published curricula. There could also be a need for some reformulation and ranking of these **GOALS** (and perhaps the development of new **GOALS** in specific areas). It would also be reasonable to assume that in order to act upon these **GOALS**, local institutions in lead communities will be in need of appropriate in-service **TRAINING** seminars and corresponding **OBJECTIVES** and **PROGRAMS** from the denominational training institutions.

The involvement of the national agencies would not reduce the need for a great investment of energy and resources on the local level in order to meet the lay leaders' demand for work based on **GOALS**. The development of **SYLLABI**, for example, would have to take into account local conditions, personnel, etc. It would be necessary for the CIJE, both national and local, to create the conditions which will make this work possible (eg. create special forums for

local educators to invest extra-time in planning, training, etc.; bring in outside consultants, syllabus experts, and trainers in appropriate subject matter areas, etc.). In addition, by arranging local community-wide conferences for educators who are dealing with similar issues in GOALS development, the CIJE would be enabling them to learn from each other's experiences (this is another example of how community-wide processes can create a greater input into Jewish education; also, the Mandel Institute's research on common minimal GOALS for Jewish education could be useful at such a conference). Similarly, it would be necessary for the CIJE's monitoring, evaluation & feedback team to consider its role in facilitating the EVALUATION of practice in the local educational institutions in terms of their GOALS.

A second level of THE GOALS PROJECT would be undertaken while this first level would be implemented. This level is related to the concern for the development of GOALS on the basis of thorough and long-winded deliberation (moving from CONCEPTIONS of human and societal excellence to PRINCIPLES and GOALS for education). It is on this level that the Mandel Institute's project on "the educated Jew" would be available as a resource.

The bulk of the effort on this level would be with the central agencies of the denominations (this does not exclude efforts to work with the Jewish Community Center Association or directly with non-affiliated and/or community institutions in lead communities). As they would be working to provide GOALS to their constituents in lead communities, the denominations would also be encouraged by the CIJE to undertake more thorough efforts at developing their GOALS for Jewish education. This effort could be enhanced by intensive seminars on any or all of the three statements of GOALS for Jewish education developed at the Mandel Institute and/or by consultation with the Institute's staff on appropriate methods and procedures for developing their own statements of GOALS.

In the final analysis, the aim of THE GOALS PROJECT would be for this second level to have a bearing on the work of the local constituents of the denominations in lead communities. Having set up a primary infrastructure for working with GOALS, educational institutions in lead communities would eventually be ready for and capable of considering work with the more thoroughly and deeply formulated statements of GOALS derived from the work of the denominations on the second level.

“PROJECT CONTENT FOR JEWISH EDUCATION”

