



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
74

Folder
4

Core concepts. Planning meetings, Goals Project (Folder 1 of 2),
1994-1997.

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

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-drivenness 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. Principal initiatives include:

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 encourage 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 wrestle with 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.

AN IN-HOUSE INTERPRETATION OF CRITICAL CONCEPTS AND THEMES THAT DEFINE THE GOALS PROJECT GOALS AND EDUCATION

1. No sense of direction, no adequate deliberation. Absent a clear understanding of what one hopes to accomplish via one's educational efforts, it is impossible to make intelligent decisions concerning the design of social environment, the determination and interpretation of content, and the appropriateness of different kinds of curricular choices and pedagogical decisions.

2. What are goals. "What one hopes to accomplish" could plausibly be understood as "one's goals." By "goals" we understand general statements of purpose that identify specific kinds of skills, attitudes, understandings, beliefs, commitments, values, dispositions (and so forth) that are to be imparted, encouraged, or cultivated through the process of education. An educational philosophy is likely to include a number of distinct, though inter-related goals, each of which is tied to the other in a meaningful way.

3. Critical role of goals. Goals play a critical role in the educational process: a) as intimated above, they are an indispensable guide to the design of educational environments and practices, to the determination of curriculum content and objectives, and to the selection and training of personnel; b) goals offer a lens, or organizing principle, for scanning the interests, capacities, understandings, and skills of the students; c) without clear goals, serious evaluation of one's efforts to educate are impossible, and this makes systematic effort as improvement hard to achieve; d) a corollary of c) is that in the absence of clear goals, accountability is not possible.

GOALS IN JEWISH EDUCATION: SOME ROUGH GENERALIZATIONS

Like many - indeed, most - general educating institutions, most Jewish educating institutions fail the test of being, in any serious sense, goals-oriented. In many instances, institutions have not developed a mission-statement that articulates their goals; and even when such a mission-statement does exist that purports to articulate the institution's educational goals, these goals fail to be adequately related to the world of practice. This failure reflects one or more of a number of problems, some of which are articulated below.

1. Vague and decontextualized. They are often so vague as to offer no real guidance to practice. To be helpful, goals have to be clear and concrete enough to offer a sense of direction and to communicate what it would mean to succeed or fail in a meaningful way. The phrase "in a meaningful way" is meant to underscore the importance of thinking about goals in a broad and generous sense. Specifically, the goal of, say, "Hebrew proficiency" must include not just abstract abilities; it must also consider the contexts in which this ability is to be exhibited and the attitudes that should accompany the development of this proficiency. Dewey's comments concerning "collateral learnings" in *EXPERIENCE AND EDUCATION* are germane here -- particularly his concern that students may acquire a given skill in ways that lead them to hate the context in which they learned it and to be despising of the skill itself.

2. Achievement of goals not central to articulation of the educator's task. Many educators are not in any serious way encouraged to approach their teaching assignments with clear goals in mind. They may be told to teach a particular body of subject-matter, e.g. Hebrew, Bible, Israel, Jewish Holidays, but without any specification of what goals are to be achieved via this subject-matter. The result is that how educators approach the subject-matter is often very idiosyncratic and thoughtless. The guiding principle is often "what will keep them interested," rather than "How will the learning experiences I am designing fit into a comprehensive sequence of learning experiences that will move the students towards achievement of particular goals that we think important.

3. Problems of non-identification with goals and/or despair of achieving them. Even when educators are familiar with the institution's goals, and even if the curriculum comes with specific goals (itself a significant achievement!), implementation of the goals is hampered by a variety of typical circumstances: i. the educator does not in any personal way identify with the goal or embody it in his/her life; ii. the educator despairs of the very possibility of realizing the goal, given the cultural and familial environment from which the students come and to which they return and the available time.

4. Symbolic rather than systematic efforts to achieve avowed goals. There is no systematic effort to design the environment and the curriculum so as to accomplish goals that have been identified. By "systematic effort" is meant a thoughtful, careful assessment, informed by honest good judgement and whatever empirical data are at hand, of whether the practices in place or proposed have a reasonable chance of achieving the desired outcomes (in the face of constraining conditions). On the contrary, oftentimes the relationship between avowed goals and educational practice is primarily "symbolic"; that is, the institution feels comfortable if it can show that there is some educational practice which corresponds to the goal in question, but does not ask what constellation of efforts would be required if the goal is to be meaningfully achieved. corollary of this is that there is no serious and honest effort to evaluate the success of our efforts.

5. Too many goals. One of the reasons why any particular goal identified in a mission-statement is not meaningfully achieved is that oftentimes there are too many goals, a circumstances that diffuses any sense of purpose or direction. Institutions would often be better off committing themselves to the attainment of a few clearly articulated goals (or else deciding what is essential and what peripheral), rather than trying to cover the water front.

VISION

Many of the weaknesses identified in the preceding section (points 1 through 5) speak to problems in the relationship between goals and practice. But some of these weaknesses also reflect a more fundamental difficulty, and that is that the goals identified by an educating institution are often not anchored in a coherent, organic vision of the kind of Jewish human

being and the kind of Jewish community it is hoping to cultivate through its educating efforts.

1. A vision of the kind of person one is trying to cultivate does the following:

a) Elements: it identifies the attitudes, understandings, skills, dispositions, beliefs, commitments, knowledge, and so forth that are important;

b) Integration of elements: it explains how these various ingredients hang together and support one another in pattern of life; inevitably this integration identifies the nature of the ideal community of which the individual is a part. That is, there is a social dimension to the envisioned state-of-affairs.

c) Meaningfulness criterion: it makes evident why the kind of life that is represented in b) is "meaningful" in a twofold sense: i) it is a "worthy" way of living Jewishly; and ii) it is experienced as personally meaningful "from the inside", that is, by individuals who in their own life embody this vision.

2. A vision interprets traditional Jewish categories. A vision of a meaningful Jewish existence takes a position on the significance of key concepts like "God", "Torah", "the Jewish People," "Mitzvot," and "the Land of Israel." In the vision these concepts are interpreted, assigned a value, and understood in their inter-relationship.

3. The distinction between fixed visions and process-visions. Typically, we think of a vision as specifying an outlook and way of life, organized around certain fundamental beliefs, concerns, and values. It is, so to speak, a picture of what life at its best is like, a snapshot of a way of life viewed as ideal. But it is also possible for a vision to have a more open-ended, dynamic quality. What might be called a "process-vision" is one that specifies attitudes, skills, and abilities that engage the individual in an ongoing process of constructing and reconstructing his or her relationship to Jewish culture and tradition. A process-vision is not necessarily, as its critics might contend, agnostic about what is important Jewishly. A process-vision might well specify the importance of studying Jewish texts (narrowly or broadly understood) or experimenting with Jewish celebration in one's efforts to develop as a Jew; it might also stress the importance of understanding diverse views that Jews of different kinds and periods have taken on critical issues and the different ways they have lived. Chances are, any process-vision one will encounter will implicitly or explicitly endorse certain bottom-line moral and intellectual virtues. Still, the emphasis (within this framework) is on growth, development and change in one's understanding of an ideal Jewish life -- and the ideal Jewish life is one that allows for and encourages such growth. In general education, Dewey represents a kind of process-vision; in the Educated Jew Project, it is arguable that Menachem Brinker represents such a position.

2. Why vision is important -- Vision is the anchor for goals. To say that vision is the anchor is to convey a number of important but inter-related points:

a. Goals are not self-justifying; rather, they are justified by showing how they are anchored in a vision of Jewish existence that the critical stakeholders genuinely regard as meaningful. Absent this showing goals exist in a vacuum; they may well seem arbitrary and meaningless.

b. Vision also anchors goals in that it interprets and thus makes more concrete what the goals really signify. "Hebrew proficiency" a la Greenberg, Ahad Ha-Am, Menachem Brinker is not one thing but many: why Hebrew is important, the settings in which it is to be used, the attitudes that surround its use, and so forth are very different. The kind of clarity provided by vision gives direction to the educational enterprise of a kind impossible in the absence of vision.

c. Vision anchors goals in the sense that it explains not only the meaning and relative importance of goals, but also how the elements identified in different goals hang together to constitute a meaningful way of life.

3. What is a vision-driven institution? For reasons stated above, the Goals Project assumes that efforts at Jewish education will be substantially improved if educating institutions become significantly more vision-driven than they now are. A vision-driven institution is one that, down to its very details, Specifically, a vision-driven educating institution features the following formal elements:

a. The existence of a vision in the sense specified above. To say that the vision "exists" is to suggest that the critical stakeholders identify strongly with this vision, that they regard it as worthy and compelling.

b. The goals that guide educational practice can be explained with reference to the guiding vision.

c. The curriculum, as well as the physical and social environment, exhibit commitment to the guiding vision and the particular goals that are derived from it.

d. The educators who do the work of the institution strongly identify with and themselves exemplify the vision that the institution represents and thus approach efforts to actualize the vision whole-heartedly.

e. Because the institution cares deeply whether it is successful in realizing its goals and vision, it looks for gaps between intention and outcome and works hard to remedy them. There is here a tacit commitment to serious assessment and self-improvement -- this being a sign of a really serious commitment to the underlying goals and vision.

4. "Vision-driven" does not necessarily imply "planful" or "designed". Not all vision-driven

institution emerge through systematic efforts to translate a shared vision into a blueprint for an educational institution, which is then translated into practice under real world conditions. In some vision-driven institutions, nobody has thought systematically about what the guiding vision is or about the way to translate that vision into educational terms.

a. Invisible hand institutions. Some such institutions have evolved more organically, spontaneously, and unself-consciously through a variety of cooperating circumstances over a period of time. [Such institutions come into being and exist in a way that is described by many "Conservative" social and educational theorists like Edmund Burke, Michael Oakshott, and Michael Polanyi. These thinkers are often skeptical, if not actually critical, of efforts to systematically articulate and then implant a vision.]

b. Sometimes institutional visions precedes the vision of ideal educational outcomes. Sometimes an institution grows out of someone's vision of what an ideal educational institution looks like (and not out of a vision of the product of the educational process). In such cases as well, while there may be an animating vision of the kind of person and community one is hoping to nurture, it will not necessarily be articulated or readily articulable by the participants.

5. "Visions" and "Visions-in-Use". While the participants in an institution may not be capable of identifying a guiding vision that is at work in the institution, an anthropologically-oriented observer may be capable of doing precisely that. That is, the observer may be able to tie the predictable outcomes of participation in the institution to the body of practices, customs, organizational structure, and norms exhibited in the institution. The delicate balance of institutional life seems to operate, as though and perhaps in fact invisibly, to maintain this state-of-affairs: the outcomes remain the same over long periods of time, and institutional arrangements, down to the very details, tend to support them. Efforts to change these patterns change. In such a case, we might want to speak of a vision-in-use. "Vision-in-use" is a conception of the outcome of the educational process which, were it actively subscribed to, would go a long way towards explaining the patterns of activity and organization and other features of the institution's living reality.

It is possible that when a vision-in-use is articulated, the participants will say, "Yes -- that is exactly what we're after -- except that now you've given voice to it." It is, however, also possible that the vision-in-use articulated by the observer will be disavowed by participants in the institution: "This is not at all what we're after," they might say. a) It is possible that this denial is an act of Sartreian "bad faith;" that is, they don't want to own up to the vision that they are in fact committed to. b) Another possibility is that they have simply failed up to now to understand the impact of the educational arrangements they have created and that they are truly disturbed by what they have discovered.

Suppose now that, disturbed by what they have learned, they set about trying to improve

things but that these changes come to nought. It is an open question which of the two possibilities discussed above this state-of-affairs would support. Concrete study into the particulars of the case would probably be necessary to make a determination as between these - or perhaps other - possibilities.

TOWARDS COHERENT, SHARED, AND COMPELLING VISIONS

Jewish educating institutions typically serve an extraordinarily diverse clientele. Many of those who are tied to an institution have not ever engaged in trying to clarify their own visions of a meaningful Jewish existence, and to the extent that they have, what they discover is that there is great diversity of views amongst them. If vision-driven institutions are to become more prominent features of our educational landscape, the problem of how to generate shared vision must be addressed. Two very general approaches to the problem will be articulated: A. Trying to transcend diversity; B. Structural reforms that make it unnecessary to try to dissolve diversity.

A. Towards Shared Vision where none has heretofore existed.

1. Most generally, assume for the moment an institution featuring at least the impression of significant diversity of outlook among the critical stakeholders. Through what kind of process can a group of individuals be brought together under the umbrella of a vision that will be both shared and compelling? A multitude of overlapping questions cluster around this general issue. For example:

1. Assuming that there is more than one process that lead to this achievement, are there reasons to encourage one or some among them and not others?

2. What is the role of professional, lay, and denominational leadership in this process?

3. To what extent, if at all, should some variant of the "democratic process" guide or define the outcome?

4. Is it the leadership's job:

a. to guide the rank-and-file towards an appreciation of a vision they judge appropriate?,

b. to help draw out from their constituencies a vision that reflects "where they are and want to be", that is, to work towards the development of a vision that integrates the visions of the key stakeholders?

c. to encourage a process that guides the membership towards disciplined, content-based reflection concerning what they want to be educating towards?

5. In what way does serious study enter into the process of working towards a shared vision? Must it be insisted on?

6. To what extent and in what ways should some variant of the democratic process enter into the process of developing a shared vision?

7. Who are the key stakeholders that must buy into a vision – and at what stages – if an institution is to have a meaningful chance of becoming more vision-driven?

8. Is it possible that the attempt to define an institutional vision -- of the kind of institution we'd like to see – should sometimes precede the attempt to define a guiding vision of the kind of person and community we want to cultivate?

9. To what extent will appropriate answers to these various questions depend on a variety of local circumstances, e.g., the nature of the leadership, the attitudes of the constituency, the history and culture of the institution, the desire of denomination leaders to be involved, etc.?

10. Through what process can members of an institution be brought to appreciate the importance of working towards vision-drivenness and to agree to make the effort?

11. Through what set of activities/processes should the stakeholders of an educating institution take stock of the institution's present state-of-affairs -- its structures, its impact, its vision-in-use, etc., and how can participation in such activities and processes encourage the effort to move towards vision-drivenness?

B. STRUCTURAL REFORM AS A SOLUTION TO THE PROBLEM OF GENERATING SHARED VISION

The immediately preceding section pointed to different strategies by which an institution lacking a coherent and compelling guiding vision might move – or be moved – towards one. Briefly and crudely summarized, the three strategies suggested involved: a) through a carefully devised process, a vision predesignated by the leadership comes to be shared by the critical stakeholders; b) an effort is made to elicit from the key stakeholders what their own visions are and then to develop a vision which integrates their respective visions into a coherent whole; and c) a process that involves the interplay between efforts to clarify one's own vision and efforts to understand and struggle with the articulated visions of thoughtful individuals who have wrestled with this

problem in a penetrating way over a long period of time, e.g. Greenberg, Brinker, Twersky. The actual process may lean in one direction or another but may involve elements of all three strategies.

Here I'd like to suggest an altogether different approach to this problem – an approach that works from the assumption that it may be very difficult if not impossible to move people holding diverse views towards a shared and compelling vision of what they would hope to accomplish. The intuitive idea at the heart of the two proposals summarized below is that it may be easier to create structures that will encourage individuals who share a common vision to self-select into a congenial educational environment than it is to develop a shared vision among people who may begin light-years away from each other.

PROPOSAL 1: This proposal is modelled on magnet-school programs and choice-plans found in general education. In community X, a decision is made to dissolve the existing educational system which assigns children to educating institutions based on congregational affiliation. Instead, the community self-consciously establish a number of educating institutions, each informed by a different guiding vision. One institution might heavily emphasize text study as the heart of Jewish existence; another might emphasize social action, yet a third might make spirituality its core theme, etc. Parents, who have heretofore been expected to send their children to their congregation's educational institution, would be told that by virtue of their membership in the congregation they are eligible to attend any one of the educating institutions in the system. Their job is to pick an institution whose guiding vision they identify with. Through a process of self-selection different institutions tend to attract a population of individuals who share values, outlook, and aspirations. Under this system, parents wishing to enroll their child in a particular vision-driven institution would need to apply, and they might well be asked to agree to various ground-rules and expectations as a condition of admission. In such a system, we would not have to create shared visions; rather, individuals already sharing a vision would, through the operation of the system, be brought together under one roof.

PROPOSAL 2: A congregation announces that within its existing educational system – say, a congregational school – it is about to open a smaller and very selective "school within a school." All members of the congregation are eligible to enroll their children in the school-within-the-school, with the qualification that they must understand the vision animating the experimental institution and agree to its ground-rules and expectations.

Like Proposal 1, the arrangements identified in Proposal 2 operate to draw in a select group of families who understand and identify with the guiding vision of the educating institution – in this case "the school within the school". The advantage of this strategy enjoys, as compared with the first, is that it does not require elaborate structural changes on the order of dissolving the institution of the congregational school.

FROM VISION TO EDUCATIONAL DESIGN

1. Having a vision does not guarantee the ability to create a vision-driven institution.

Having a vision of a meaningful Jewish existence, even one that is shared and compelling, is no guarantee that one will be able to develop educational institutions that ably express and guide students in the direction of this vision. Indeed, although it sometimes happens that a single individual is adept both at articulating a powerful vision and at developing educational arrangements that nurture that vision into being, there is no reason to think that typically these very different skills go hand in hand.

2. No unique translation. There is no unique translation of a vision into educational terms. It is not just that the elements of the vision will inevitably be somewhat differently interpreted, but that the translation into goals and educational practices necessarily relies on a variety of beliefs concerning human nature and education, e.g., the way, and the conditions under which, human beings learn and grow. Different beliefs concerning such matters will give rise to very different educational arrangements, even if one begins with the same vision of the ideal to be striven for.

3. Dimensions of the translation. To translate a vision into practice involves attention not only to curriculum and pedagogy but also to the organization of the social and physical environment -- to what some describe as "the culture" of the institution.

3. The how question. Through what kinds of processes and expertise can a vision, once agreed on, be meaningfully translated into goals, and from goals into the design of curriculum, institutional norms, patterns of physical organization, etc.? Where is the appropriate expertise to be found?

4. Variations in one's conception of the process of translation. While, as noted above, one's translation may vary depending on one's interpretation of the vision and one's assumptions about human nature, human growth, and human learning, translations may also vary because people understand the process of translation itself in very different terms. For example, one school of thought may insist that one begin with vision, then move in linear fashion to goals, and then to objectives, and then to concrete learning experiences spread over X number of years. Regardless of the wisdom of that approach, it is worth noting that there are others. For example, Dewey's approach would probably be to use the guiding vision as an observational and planning tool. Meeting up with a new group of children, the educator interprets their impulses, behaviors, understandings and skills through the lens of the vision. Keeping the vision clearly in mind, the educator struggles, in true progressive fashion, to guide the young into activities that they will find exciting but that will help to develop understandings, desires, and dispositions that will incline the individual towards the world that the vision represents. Impulses and desires that might heretofore have been viewed as distractions from the educational process are now suddenly viewed as wrestling with some critical questions.

QUESTIONS FOR THE GOALS PROJECT THAT CHALLENGE ITS CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK AND ASSUMPTIONS

1. "Our pressing need today is not for conceptions or visions of the ideal product of a Jewish education. Rather, our principal need is to provide children and adults in our communities with

experiences that bring home to them the life-transforming power of Jewish customs, understandings, and activities, so that they will develop a thirst for more and deeper such experiences. What we need is to catalyze a drive to seriously explore the resources of Judaism -- not a vision of the end of that exploration. Our energies should therefore focus on activities like Shabbatonim, Israel experiences, and text-study encounters that will awaken in adults and children alike a thirst for Jewish growth."

2. Do we really need an underlying "vision" in which our educational goals are anchored? Might it not be possible and enough for an educating institution to develop a clear and coherent set of guiding goals which are not wedded to any particular conception of "the Good Life" (Jewishly speaking)?

Moreover, given the diversity of outlook among stakeholders within even most individual institutions, isn't it more realistic to think that we could generate widespread support for a set of general goals than for an over-arching vision of the kind of person we want to nurture? Perhaps we should be encouraging institutions to identify and commit themselves seriously to a small number of core-goals and give up the effort to develop an anchoring vision.

3. "Our problem is not 'vision', but something else. Many educating institutions do have visions (i.e. conceptions of where they want to head, of the kind of person they want to cultivate). Their problem is not an absence of vision but that the conditions of life make it impossible to realize this vision (for example, the culture that surround the children day-in-day-out, the time available for Jewish education, the attitudes of their parents, the unavailability of educators who have any commitment to the institution's vision). These problems - not "the vision-thing" -- are what we need to address.

GUIDES¹ SEMINAR
Providence, 7/28/97

BACKGROUND

The CIJE/Mandel Institute Goals Seminar, organized in cooperation with CAPE in July of 1996, was designed to deepen the educational thinking of individuals embarking on the development of significant educating institutions in North America, as well as to create human capacity for critical work going on under the auspices of the Goals Project. Since and as a result of that seminar, there have been several significant developments: 1) Danny Gordis and Robert Wexler, the President of the University of Judaism, have turned to CIJE for continuing help in the design and articulation of their new Rabbinical School; 2) Danny Lehmann and Daniel Pekarsky have been engaged in an effort to launch an ongoing seminar devoted to the exploration of fundamental issues pertaining to the nature and aspirations of community high schools; 3) Devora Steinmetz has begun working with Daniel Pekarsky on a publication project aiming to articulate the development and character of Beit Rabban as a vision-driven institution; and 4) Alvan Kaunfer has served as a facilitator for the Rhode Island Jewish community in its efforts to formulate a vision for Jewish education that will inform its priority-setting activities. In addition to the developments, a sub-group of the larger group met in December of 1996 to discuss a case presented by Daniel Pekarsky which concerned a synagogue-change process going on in Milwaukee.

Alvan Kaunfer was unable to attend the December meeting in NY, and we agreed at that time that we would re-convene the group in 1997 around his Rhode Island case. In preparation for this second meeting, Alvan prepared an illuminating written account of the case which was sent out to participants along with a letter detailing some of the issues we hoped to take up prior to the scheduled July 28 meeting. In preparation for our study of the case and for the Jewish study with which the meeting was to begin, we also included Ahad Ha-Am's essay "Moses", Elliott Dorff's essay entitled "Pluralism", and Mike Rosenak's essay on communal goals for Jewish education. In addition to studying Alvan's case, on the agenda for this meeting was a serious discussion of this group's purposes and possible future.

Attending the meeting were Karen Barth, Amy Gerstein, Alvan Kaunfer, Daniel Pekarsky, Nessa Rapoport, and Linda Thall. Invited but unable to come was David Purpel, who had recently participated in CIJE's Professors Seminar. The meeting took

¹ "GUIDES" stands for "Guiding Ideas Study group". See the text and the accompanying GUIDES-proposal for an explanation of this name.

place in the Kaunfer home in Providence from 10 to 5 pm on 7/28/97.

INTRODUCTION TO THE DAY

In introducing the day, Dan Pekarsky indicated its three major components: a) an opportunity to study a text together; b) an examination of Alvan's case; and c) a discussion of this group's character and future. In introducing the study-session, he emphasized that the activity of Jewish study should not be regarded as ritualistic or pro forma; rather, it has the potential to create a shared culture and sense of community that enriches our work together, as well as to deepen our discussion of critical educational issues through the introduction of rich concepts, insights, and questions. At Alvan's suggestion our study session focused on Ahad Ha'Am's essay, "Moses".

CONSIDERING AHAD HA'AM'S 'MOSES'

Led by Alvan, this discussion focused primarily on Ahad Ha'Am's characterization of "the Prophet" (in the person of Moses) as leader, a characterization that emphasized 1) the Prophet's identity as a person of truth, 2) his "extremism" on behalf of his vision: his wholehearted and uncompromising dedication to a vision, carried deep within his soul, of what ought to be and must be; and 3) the Prophet's need of a priestly figure -- an Aaron, a person of words -- to mediate between himself as bearer of the vision and the "the situation down on the ground". For the very same characteristics that render the Prophet Prophetic in the sense specified in 1) and 2) render him less adept at interpreting and adapting to the needs of the moment.

Our discussion of this article brought out on a number of themes, identified below.

'Truthfulness'. The Prophet is a person of truth in a double-sense. It's not just that he or she sees things as they are, unbiased by subjective feeling, but also that he/she cannot but speak the truth (as he/she sees it) to others (and even to God). It is this inability or unwillingness to tailor his/her presentation of the truth to the audience and the context that necessitates the partnership with the Priest, who is described as "a man of words."

But what does it mean for the Prophet to see things as they are? Two (not necessarily incompatible) views were articulated. On one interpretation to see things as they really are is to be brutally honest with oneself (and others) about what one sees, not letting one's fantasies, fears, hopes, or just lazy thinking contaminate one's assessment of the situation in which we find ourselves. In this context, reference was made to Senge's

insistence that efforts to bridge the distance between what is and the vision to which we aspire depend on a willingness to carefully and dispassionately study what he calls 'current reality' [To cite an example from out of our later discussion, in looking at the relationship between the vision a community articulates and existing social and educational arrangements, the Prophet type is the one who does not let us get away with facile efforts to see the vision as already embodied in the present, when in fact it is not; any such claim, this figure insists, needs to be grounded in strong evidence.]

On a second interpretation, "to see things as they are" is not only a matter of being dispassionate but of seeing things **as illuminated by the vision**, a vision which offers one insight into the present which is otherwise unattainable. Thus, the vision functions as a kind of lens through which the present situation and the challenges of the community are interpreted. This interpretation was accompanied by the suggestion that the first one seems to assume that it is possible to see current reality unencumbered by what the observer brings, and this led to some discussion of the following point: granted that the observer's understandings and commitments inevitably enter into what he/she sees, can't one nonetheless meaningfully distinguish (as interpretation #1 insists) between seeing things in a distorted and in an undistorted way?

Prophet and priest. There was considerable interest in the idea that the challenges of leadership require two different "types", both Prophet and Priest, and there was some discussion of how best to understand their relationship in the process a community's growth. Does a community need different types at different stages in its development? Do they represent two dimensions of leadership that are constantly in interaction? Should we understand Prophet and Priest as two different roles in the life of a community -- or, as one member of the group suggested, should we understand Prophet and Priest psychologically, as elements of the Self found within the leader?

In any event, there seemed to be agreement that both leadership elements were important to a community's growth -- that the visionary without the capacity to adapt the vision to the needs of the moment risked being too out of touch with the community to be able to guide its development, and that the Priestly type who is always attentive to the mood and desires of the people being addressed is in danger of losing a meaningful connection to the kind of larger vision that the Prophet represents.

Two kinds of genius? There was in this context a challenge to what some felt to be an explicit or implicit hierarchy in Ahad-Ha'am's outlook: the Prophet is the genius, the Priest is the (mere) implementer. It was suggested that **the priest is also**

a genius -- a genius of implementation. To this it was added that it is inaccurate to describe the work of the priest as a "watering down" of the vision (compromising it) in the face of a recalcitrant reality; rather, implementation can be understood as an imaginative interpretation of vision that takes into account not just the vision but the situation in which it is to be embedded. [It is, of course, possible to acknowledge both possibilities -- that is, that in the process of implementation, visions are sometimes but not always or inevitably interpreted in 'watered down' ways. How to draw this distinction may be worth exploring.]

The problem of 'readiness'. Although time-constraints precluded serious discussion, our conversation pointed to a second dimension of the Ahad Ha-Am essay that is relevant to efforts to encourage transformational change in an institution (or community, or individual) -- namely, the problem of readiness for change. Here we took note of Ahad Ha-Am's discussion of the traditional view that the Israelites that had come out of Egypt were not ready to wholeheartedly commit themselves to and embody the vision that was put before them: neither the experience of great miracles leaving Egypt, nor powerful moments at the foot of Mount Sinai, nor even efforts at "training and education" seemed capable of overcoming in an enduring way the outlook and the values acquired as slaves in Egypt. Hence the need for the forty years in the desert, for a generation that had not known slavery. There is a sense in which "Moses" offers a pessimistic view of the ability of a group of people to transcend the outlook or culture within which they have been raised; hence the need to cultivate a new generation -- or to turn one's back on pathological existing institutions and try to create new ones.

THE PROVIDENCE CASE

Relationship to the "Moses" article. Alvan pointed out some natural bridges between our discussion of the "Moses" essay and some of the central concerns growing out of his work with the Rhode Island Jewish community. Ahad Ha-Am's Moses exemplifies the kind of "vision with punch" described in his written case, a compelling vision that is typically the product of an individual who passionately represents it -- the kind of vision that may be sacrificed in the search for a consensus aimed at allowing everyone to feel included (Alvan's "consensus" issue). And Alvan's worries about connecting the vision as arrived at by his committee and ratified by the Federation with the one-going development of education in the community (his "connector" issue) are illuminated in significant ways by Ahad Ha-Am's discussion of the relationship and role of Prophet and Priest.

Alvan's formulation of some pertinent issues. Having identified the "consensus" and "connector" issues as the larger concerns that he hoped we would jointly illuminate on this

occasion, Alvan went on to identify other - what he called sub-issues - that he hoped we would address. For example:

choice and pluralism: in relation to the "consensus/inclusivity" issue, he called our attention to the committee's struggle with whether and how much to incorporate the language of **choice** and **pluralism** in its statement of vision.

the problem of breadth: Is the kind of vision produced by the Providence community too broad to elicit enthusiasm and to meaningfully guide priority-setting and other facets of practice (as compared, say, with the more focused vision emphasizing Study and Social Justice articulated by Barry Schrage in Boston)?

Discussion of Alvan's case. There was high praise for Alvan's work and for his write-up of the work in the form of a case. The writing, the exercises he used with the committees he worked with, his success in drawing attention to significant issues pertaining to change efforts informed by powerful ideas -- all of these and other virtues of his work will render this case a very useful teaching and learning tool as we proceed with our work. Below is a summary of some of the major ideas that surfaced in response to participants' reading of the case and to Alvan's presentation.

1. How far does the vision have to go? A point that is of conceptual and potentially of practical significance is concerned with how we understand the scope of vision. A vision could be understood as referring to 1) the ideal outcomes of a Jewish education -- the kind of person and community we hope to cultivate. It could also be understood to refer to 2) the kinds of institutions necessitated by #1. Finally, it could extend beyond 1) and 2) to the inclusion of 3) the kind of infrastructure needed to support and maintain the kinds of values and institutions identified in #s 1 and 2. [While #s 1 and 2 are discussed in DP's piece on vision in Jewish education, attention to #3 pushes that discussion to another level.] All three levels in their inter-relationship are important, and it is of interest to consider how attention to them should be woven into the overall process of envisioning and implementation. [Note that while #s 2 and 3 pertain to the implementation of the ideas envisioned in #1, they are not in themselves stages of implementation; they are closer to ideas about implementation (not unrelated to Seymour Fox's Level 3, or "theory of practice).]

2. The difficulty of maintaining a high energy level. Alvan's process was much more time-consuming than his group had realized it would be, and there may have been a problem of flagging energies along the way. It was suggested that perhaps a less

linear approach, one that allowed participants to regularly wrestle with questions of practice and implementation long before their vision had crystallized, might help sustain their energy; well-conceived, it might also help illuminate the developing vision.

3. How might external inputs² enrich the process of deliberation, and how can they be incorporated in ways that will have this effect and not seem like a distraction from the work of the group? Raised early in the day, we began - but, alas only began - to explore this question more systematically towards the end of the day when we spent some time considering how Menachem Brinker might have approached the questions addressed by the Providence community, and how an encounter with ideas like his might have enriched the deliberations of the group that Alvan worked with. Some of the pertinent issues in need of further discussion are articulated later in this document.

4. What are the purposes of vision and how might attention to these purposes inform the design of the process of deliberation aimed at articulating a guiding vision? It was suggested that it is problematic to assume that there is only kind of a purpose that a vision can legitimately serve; depending on circumstances, it may meet very different kinds of needs. vision serves only one kind of purpose; for it might, depending on the circumstances, satisfy very different needs. Among the purposes and needs that a vision might satisfy in the life of an educating community are the following:

- a) program/curriculum design and evaluation;
- b) resource allocation;
- c) strategic planning;
- d) creating "a big tent" under which the varied members of a community feel they all have a place;
- e) symbolic action: through the vision announcing to ourselves and/or others who we are and what we stand for.

² "External inputs" refers primarily to what we have been calling "intellectual inputs", to pertinent powerful ideas and perspectives drawn from Jewish and other sources. But as was noted in our discussion, an external input might also be experiential (as when a group of rabbis associated with the Synagogue 2000 project were led into a powerful Tfillah-experience which thereafter affected their understanding of their work.

Which of these is judged to be primary in a given situation may carry implications for the design of the process that leads to the vision.

5. How narrow or broad, small or large, should be the group that is involved in working towards the guiding vision? In the context of Alvan's case, a concern was raised about the narrowness of the group involved in crafting the vision that was to guide communal decision-making in education. It was suggested by one participant that **the process of working towards the vision is often more important than the final product;** and that for this reason it might have proved important to expand the circle of individuals involved in formulating the Rhode Island vision. It was suggested in this connection that it may not be too late to meaningfully engage significant additional constituencies in this process.

6. The tacit dimension: priorities and commitments embedded - and discoverable - in existing forms of practice and organization. It was suggested that as part of a community's efforts to discover or refine its guiding vision it may be of value to surface priorities, commitments, and compromises that are embedded in existing practice. It may, for example, be instructive to identify the value-commitments at work in an educating community's budget allocations or in a school's schedule. In the case of some such inquiries - for example, analysis of a schedule, the activity may be relatively unthreatening inasmuch as schedules tend to reflect long-standing practice rather than the ideology or idiosyncrasies of any particular individual or body. In any event, the tension between the commitments and priorities at work in existing practice, on the one hand, and those that a community affirms as central can catalyze significant progress at the levels of guiding vision and/or practice; it can facilitate testing an avowed vision (or a community's commitment to it) and can lead to thoughtful revision at the level of practice.

7. Avoiding self-deception or smugness: insisting on evidence and on the attitude of a trustworthy physician. It was suggested that in looking at the relationship between the avowed vision and existing practice, there may be a tendency in the direction of self-deception, a tendency "to see" the vision at work in practice even when the relationship between the two is at best tenuous. To counteract this tendency, it was urged that exercises aimed at discovering the commitments and values embedded in practice include an evidence criterion -- an insistence that claims about what is embedded in practice and about the relationship between vision and practice be accompanied by the evidence for these claims.

It was suggested that an educating community needs the kind of truth-telling that one would hope for in a physician: an

honest account of one's true situation, but one framed in a way that will contribute to the client's ability to respond healthily to the information. Once again, this discussion brought us back to the Ahad Ha'Am's discussion of the place of truth in the priest-prophet equation.

8. The role of disequilibrium in the process of deliberation. The role of the guide, or coach, as a gadfly is a subject that was discussed at some length about two years ago in a CIJE/Mandel Institute consultation with Professor Israel Scheffler. This subject entered into our discussions as well. By confronting participants with the gap between what they say they are committed to and the values embedded in practice, by raising irksome but important questions about what they claim to believe, etc., the guide tries to foster among the participants a more thoughtful understanding of what they are committed to and its implications.

9. How much responsibility should the guide take for sustaining the process of deliberation and change? In the context of our discussion of a period in the Providence-process where the participants seemed to be tiring out, it was observed that at various points in a change-process, energies flag and momentum seems to slow and may be altogether lost. What is the guide's role in this situation? More specifically, under what circumstances (if ever), should he/she take on a measure of responsibility for keeping the process going, and under what circumstances and for what reasons is it appropriate for the guide to allow the process to take its own natural course without heroic efforts on his/her part to sustain it?

10. The significance of "choice" and "pluralism" language. Early in our discussion it was suggested that the prominence of "choice" and "pluralism" language in the Providence deliberation process represents a way of purchasing a sense of inclusivity among a very diverse population of Jews. Later in our deliberation, a different hypothesis was proposed: namely, that choice and pluralism represent traditional American values to which American Jews, like many other Americans, are strongly committed. On this view, the prominence of these categories reflects much more than a strategy that allows everyone to feel included; it also testifies to strongly held American values that are affirmed by the deliberators.

11. From vision to practice: the need for intermediate steps. In Providence, the process has not yet gone to the level of seriously wrestling with the practical educational implications of the vision-statement the deliberation-team arrived at. But it was noted by one member of our group that it would be a mistake to think that programmatic implications and community policy could be derived directly from this kind of a vision. There is, it was suggested, a need for developing a comprehensive strategy

(a strategy that would itself rely on a host of empirical and other assumptions that go well beyond the content of the vision) that would mediate between the vision and practice. [Though not referred to in this context, this point calls to mind Seymour Fox's discussion of "the five levels", which highlights the complex and textured character of the relationship between vision and practice.

12. The leader's vision...or discovering the community's vision, or....

In our initial discussion, there was a tendency to contrast two different approaches to vision: **either** a charismatic leader (a Moses) brings a vision to the people **or** a skilled facilitator helps the community to identify its own shared vision. In the course of our conversation, some other ideas surfaced. It was suggested that one of the challenges and tasks of a community's guide is to find a language through which to articulate this community's heretofore inarticulable understandings and values. Since these understandings and values can probably be articulated in more than one way, the guide's responsibility (for choosing a language that will be fruitful) is an awesome one.

Beyond and after playing an active role in helping the community unearth and find a language for its guiding vision, it may be the role of the guide to help this community deepen the vision by challenging it (e.g., by raising questions concerning ambiguous phrases, by offering different interpretations of key phrases, or by introducing difficult counter-examples).

THE PLACE OF POWERFUL IDEAS, GROUNDED IN JEWISH SOURCES, IN THE PROCESS OF DELIBERATION AND CHANGE

As suggested above, early on a question was raised concerning how to infuse the community's deliberations concerning a guiding vision with powerful Jewish ideas. While some attention was paid to this issue late in the day, it requires much more sustained discussion. As a way of setting the stage for such a discussion (perhaps at our next meeting), you will find below a formulation of some of the issues in need of attention and a summary of a few points made in our discussion.

The challenges we face are a direct consequence of one of our most basic convictions. CIJE strongly affirms that the process of educational deliberation needs to include serious struggle with questions of basic purpose and aspiration; and that this struggle will be enriched through the encounter with insights and perspectives found in Jewish thought. One challenge that grows out of this conviction is to identify ideas that will enrich deliberation in this way; a second challenge (perhaps that of the Priest rather than the Prophet) is to formulate those

ideas in forms that will engage potential audiences for these ideas; a third challenge is to find ways of introducing these intellectual inputs into an individual's or a group's process of deliberation. Serious work needs to be done in all of these areas.

In relation to Alvan's case, the following questions come to mind:

- 1) what external intellectual inputs did Alvan try to introduce into the process he led, and for what reasons?
- 2) how and when did he try to introduce these inputs, and with what effects?
- 3) might there have been other fruitful ways through which to infuse the process with pertinent external inputs?

These matters require further discussion, both in general and in relation to Alvan's case. It has been suggested by one member of the group that we revisit this cluster of issues when we next gather, and this remains a possibility to consider. In the meantime, the following point from our discussion are worth remembering.

While there is a tendency, even among ourselves, to think of the introduction of external intellectual inputs as taking place through an explicit encounter with Jewish texts or a précis of such texts, this is not the only, or necessarily the best, way to think about how Jewish ideas might be encountered. Consider in this connection the case of psychoanalytic therapy, in which the patient may learn all about projection, the super-ego, sublimation, and the unconscious without ever having read Freud. How does this happen? Through the therapist's questions, interpretations, and, on occasion, elucidation of concepts and insights that are at the heart of psychoanalytic theory. Offered succinctly at the right time and in the right way, such inputs can powerfully influence the patient's thinking and self-understanding.

Analogous considerations apply to guides helping clients (communities or educating institutions) strive for vision-sensitive educational practice. The guide's questions, formulations, metaphors, analogies, and interpretations at critical points in the process can introduce important new ideas and concepts in ways that powerfully affect the deliberation of participants. If, for example, the client is wrestling with the aims of Jewish education, instead of urging the participants to read certain seminal articles, it might be more fruitful for the guide to offer short but graphic summaries of the ideas found in

these essays (with careful attention to the needs of the moment).

If the guide is to play this kind of role, it is essential that he/she be steeped in the appropriate forms of knowledge **and** that he/she have the ability to access and use this knowledge at the right time and in the right (not heavy-handed) way to enrich the participants' deliberations.

DISCUSSION OF 'GUIDES'

This discussion focused on the possible wisdom of developing a serious and on-going group whose members would 1) serve as guides to communities, agencies, and institutions (and to CIJE itself) in their efforts to develop informing visions through a process that takes ideas (not limited to but especially ideas grounded in Jewish thought) seriously; and/or 2) develop materials of various kinds (e.g. theoretical pieces, portraits of vision-driven institutions, case-studies, cases, etc.) that would support and enrich the work described under #1. The proposal for **"GUIDES" (an acronym for "Guiding Ideas Study Group")** was handed out to participants at our meeting and served as the springboard to our discussion; this proposal explains why "guiding ideas" replaces the term "goals" in this document and tries to specify how GUIDES will function. No attempt is made to summarize that document, only to identify issues surfaced in the course of our conversation. As a prelude to this, it is important to note that members of the group that met in Providence reacted with enthusiasm to the possibility that we would constitute ourselves as an on-going group.

Purpose and character of the proposed group. In an effort to clarify how this group fits into CIJE and how, if at all, it differs from the Consulting Firm Without Walls, questions were raised concerning the basic purposes and character of GUIDES. The following points were offered in response:

a. GUIDES offers its members support and advice in their efforts to help Jewish educating institutions and the infrastructure that supports them to develop vision-guided practice through a process that takes ideas seriously.

b. The existence of GUIDES offers an opportunity to develop and expand a body of lore concerning how best to think about and to organize, in different settings and contexts, processes of deliberation and change that give a central role to informed and sustained reflection concerning basic purposes and aspirations. This lore will include a developing body of concepts, insights, powerful examples, cases, case-studies, and theoretical formulations. These materials will provide us with springboards to our own continuing learning;

they can also be used as tools in our teaching, in efforts at "seeding the culture", and in work with educating institutions that are struggling with their visional commitments..

c. GUIDES will offer its members an opportunity for growth that is simultaneously professional, personal, and Jewish. Jewish study figures prominently in the life of this group. Its centrality is predicated on the assumption that the insights, ways of thinking, and questions that emerge from the encounter with well-chosen Jewish sources will inform our thinking about the work that brings us together in powerful ways; and also on the assumption that the activity of learning together will contribute to the emergence of a kind of community and culture that will make our work richer and more personally meaningful.

d. While CIJE expects that members in the Consulting Firm Without Walls will be on-board with CIJE's beliefs concerning the centrality of ideas in the process of developing profound forms of Jewish educational practice, what will distinguish GUIDES is that the relationship between ideas and practice is at the heart of its members' professional and learning agenda.

The place of ideas in Jewish educational reform: three dimensions. Ideas being central to the work of CIJE and to GUIDES, it is important to note that our oft-repeated claim that ideas are central to the work of Jewish education is actually a summary of, or a generalization from, a number of distinct beliefs about the importance of ideas, including the following:

a. Judaism is rich with powerful ideas about human existence in its various dimensions, ideas with the capacity to engage mind and heart and to transform the way we understand ourselves and the world. Unfortunately, such ideas rarely enter into Jewish education as we know it. **It is essential that Jewish education be transformed in such a way that its clients will regularly encounter powerful Jewish ideas in honest and powerful ways.**

b. Too often educating institutions and the infrastructure that supports them operate without clear basic purposes that are capable of eliciting the support and enthusiasm of their constituencies; and even when lip-service (or more) is paid to a particular vision or guiding idea, it rarely suffuses the life of the educating institution or agency in a more than superficial way. **It is essential that Jewish educating institutions come to be informed by guiding ideas, or**

visions, that identify their central purposes and that suffuse day-to-day practice across contexts.

c. The process of clarifying or discovering an institution's, or our own, guiding vision is enriched through the encounter with powerful Jewish ideas that are pertinent to the questions under consideration. As examples, the attempt to develop a community-vision will be enriched through the encounter with variant Jewish conceptions of what it means to be a community; the attempt to clarify our vision of an educated Jewish human being will benefit from the encounter with philosophically different Jewish views of Jewish existence; and the attempt to develop an Evaluation Institute that will assess the work of Jewish educating institutions will do well to struggle with ethical and other issues pertaining to evaluation, confidentiality, etc. that are discoverable in Jewish sources.

While our work has sometimes suffered from a failure to distinguish between these related but different ways in which ideas figure prominently in our work, the GUIDES proposal, like the Goals Project that has given rise to it, assumes that GUIDES will be concerned with all three of them.

This formulation of the place of ideas in the work of GUIDES and CIJE brought forth a revised formulation. In contrast to the suggestion that Jewish thought has the capacity to elevate the level of discourse that informs deliberation concerning basic purposes, **it was urged that we make the stronger statement that attention to Jewish ideas and perspective is indispensable in that it offers unique, otherwise unattainable, questions, insights, understandings, and solutions.**

Place of GUIDES in CIJE's work. As suggested above, there was considerable discussion concerning the place of GUIDES in CIJE'S work, discussion triggered by Karen's concern that, as described in the proposal, it seems very similar to the Consulting Firm Without Walls. A number of different ways of thinking about the place of GUIDES in CIJE were entertained:

a) An area of specialization within the change-process?

If the Consulting Firm Without Walls is broken into sub-groups interested in different phases of the change-process, GUIDES would come to represent one such sub-group -- namely, a sub-group concerned with the place of ideas and vision in the change-process.

b) Levels of involvement. One could imagine the Consulting Firm Without Walls as made up of individuals with different levels of involvement. Least involved would be a group of human resources who would consult

to different projects; more involved is a group that, in addition to its consulting work, attends a serious annual conference; most involved is GUIDES, a small group which meets a number of times during the year and which plays a central role in defining the agenda and content for the annual conference. It is, in one person's words, the R&D for the Consulting Firm Without Walls; it is to the Consulting Firm Without Walls what a hothouse is to a garden.

c) Where should GUIDES BE LOCATED -- CFWW OR "CORE"?

Much of our discussion seemed to assume that GUIDES would be located in the Consulting Firm Without Walls. As we proceeded, the suggestion was made that GUIDES be located in CORE, an altogether different domain, and that CIJE's regular staff actively participate in its periodic Study Group sessions that focus on the relationship between ideas and practice in Jewish education.

There seemed to be considerable support developing for the idea that GUIDES should be located in CORE.

Membership in GUIDES. Who, over and above, the small group that gathered in Providence should be invited to participate in GUIDES? The sense of the group was that the group should be kept small enough to allow for the kind of intense discussion, free of posturing, that has been a hallmark of our work.

This said, some felt that we would be enriched by including in the group some of the institution-based people (like Gordis, Steinmetz, and Lehmann) who had participated in the Jerusalem Goals Seminar in the summer of 1996. As an alternative, it was suggested that such individuals could be invited on one or more occasions to bring a case to the group which would serve as the focus of our discussion on a particular occasion; if the case is well-chosen, both the group and the individual bringing it would profit from such an opportunity.

Some attention focused on particular individuals who might contribute to the group. It was noted that in the aftermath of the recent Professors Seminar David Purpel was invited to participate in the Providence Seminar; and DP suggested that someone like Phil Miller (the Judaica Director of the St. Louis JCC), who brings an interest in informal education along with an open but very traditional outlook) might be a welcome addition to the group. Since most of those present didn't know these individuals, it was hard for them to react, but no concerns were expressed about incorporating either of them.

Issues for the group to consider. In the course of our discussion of GUIDES, suggestions were made concerning some

themes that the group might focus on in subsequent meetings. For example:

Leadership vs. grassroots: when - and why - should the one be emphasized over the other in the development of a community's life? And what does Jewish thought have to say about this problem?

Ahavat Yisrael [the love owed to all Jews] vs. Reproaching Jews who 'go wrong'

Americanism and Judaism: the relationship between our identity as Americans and our identity as Jews.

END OF MEETING

It was agreed at the end of our discussion that we should wait until after CIJE's upcoming staff and steering committee meetings before determining our next gathering date. The sense of the group was that we had made a lot of progress, and we concluded by expressing our gratitude to Alvan and Marcia Kaunfer for their hospitality.

GOALS PROJECT CONSULTATION

July 1995

Below you will find DP's attempt to articulate major decisions we made at our Sunday meeting based on our work over the last few days. In reviewing the material, please try to do the following:

1. Read it critically with an eye to catching any omissions or misrepresentations or any other problems.

2. Review it for overall soundness. Two criteria come to mind:
 - a. On reflection, does the proposed agenda and set of activities make good sense? Is there anything important that we should be doing missing? Or are some of the things listed not worth doing?

b. Time!

The question is not just whether there is enough time to do all these things -- but whether there is enough time to do them all meaningfully. **I am particularly concerned that the "kitchen-work" not get pushed aside in favor of the other activities. It may be that we will need to review the proposed set of activities with this concern in mind.**

If at all possible, feedback concerning these and other pertinent matters should be pooled by the beginning of next week.

DECISIONS EMERGING OUT OF THE THREE DAYS OF DELIBERATION

Major emphases

1. Seminars, consultations, and workshops organized around the following:

Seeding the culture -- bring lay and professional leaders in the field of Jewish education to a deeper appreciation of CIJE's convictions in this domain, and thus laying the ground for communal and institutional initiatives (e.g., Seminar for leadership from Affiliated Communities; Module in fall principals' seminar and at heart of spring seminar)

Meeting outstanding commitments we've made (e.g., to Baltimore, the JCC, Wexner, and possibly Atlanta and Cleveland)

Thoughtful deliberations designed to better understand the project and decide from among competing directions and projects (e.g., consultation scheduled for January, '96)

Bringing some top-notch people into the work without preconceptions concerning how they will fit in; some of the "kitchen-work" will play a significant role in this seminar (e.g. the seminar scheduled for July, '96)

2. The Kitchen

While work in this area needs to be determined based on a comprehensive plan that still needs to be worked out, we discussed some immediate projects that will need attention:

- a. an inventory of existing resources in different domains.
- b. a paper to be developed by NR and SF that details the ways in which Ramah is a vision-driven institution and what was necessary in the way of inputs for it to become so.

Less immediate but also discussed as possibly important kitchen work (though in need of further consideration) were the following:

- a. building maps of different content-domains.

b. monographs dealing with one or more of the following: i. "The Future As History", looking at a comprehensive and adequate approach to Jewish education in the non-Orthodox world; ii. a Jewish Sarah Lightfoot piece that looks at existing vision-guided institutions; iii) a book modelled on HORACE'S SCHOOL, detailing the process through which a fictional Jewish educating institution becomes more vision-driven.

3. Pilot Projects: Marom will continue his work with Agnon and, if it can be worked out, Pekarsky will work out an arrangement with another institution. (Toren's work with the Schechter School in Cleveland may also be pertinent here.)

Our discussion emphasized the critical importance of careful written documentation of the work that goes on in the pilot projects, as well as analyses of these experiences. Along the way, seminars designed to analyze the work being done and what is being learned would be pertinent.

4. An imperative and immediate need to develop a plan that carefully breaks down #s 1-3 and determines priorities based on their importance and on available time and resources.

Note that #s 1-4 do not include any reference to the immediate identification and education of facilitator- or coach-figures. As I understand it, we have agreed - for reasons that have in part to do with the need to develop the kitchen - to remain temporarily agnostic concerning the desirability of facilitators, our role in identifying and training them, etc. This matter will be re-approached during our January consultation.

WORK PLAN, REMAINDER OF 1995 AND 1996

July - Dec., 1995

1. Further articulate the plan for 1995 and 1996 with attention to the larger conception of the project, and with special emphasis on what's to go on in the kitchen (both short- and long-term). The plan needs to be reviewed carefully both CIJE and Mandel Institute partners to the project.
2. Planning and implementation of seminars we've committed to (Wexner, JCC, Baltimore, and possibly Atlanta)
3. Conceptualize, recruit for, and organize the seminars projected for 1996. These include the January consultation, the principals seminar, the seminar for the leadership of the affiliated communities.
4. Pilot-projects: Work-in-settings and systematic efforts to document and analyze (Pekarsky and Marom)
5. Kitchen-work: To be based on a comprehensive plan to be developed during summer of 1995. The plan will probably include a projected paper by SF and NR dealing with the conditions that made possible the development of Ramah as a vision-driven institution.
6. Module in the fall seminar for principals.

1996

1. January consultation in Jerusalem (CIJE, Mandel Institute and selected additional participants)
2. Outstanding commitment: support and/or guide Cleveland's efforts to clarify its goals for Beth Torah
2. Spring principals' seminar
3. Seminar for representatives of new affiliated communities
4. Israel Seminar in July designed to draw in potential leaders and resources (e.g. Steinberg, Paley, Hirsh, Elaine Cohen, selected rabbis)
5. Continuing kitchen work (based on plan that will soon be developed)
6. Continuing pilot project efforts (along with appropriate documentation, analysis, and discussions based on them)
7. Other activities as determined based on future deliberations, especially the January consultation.

PLEASE DISTRIBUTE THESE MATERIALS AS SOON AS POSSIBLE TO THE
INDIVIDUAL IDENTIFIED. THANKS!

MEMO TO: Alan Hoffmann and Daniel Marom (at the Mandel Institute)

Gail Dorph, Barr Holtz, Nessa Rappaport (CIJE, NY)

Seymour Fox (in Jerusalem or NY)

FROM: Daniel Pekarsky

RE: Summary of our concluding session, along with the principal
decisions made.

If at all possible, please review prior to our conference
call on Monday morning, July 24.

Agenda items for our July 24 meeting include:

1. Reviewing decisions made and work-plan with attention to their accuracy, to their wisdom, to time-constraints and to division of labor. If necessary, prioritize. End with concrete plan of action.
2. Milwaukee update, as well as preparation for August 1 meeting.
3. Cleveland update
4. DP's Israel plan

SUMMARY OF JULY 1995 CONSULTATION, Day 3
Home of Gail Dorph, NYC

INTRODUCTORY

I have already distributed a separate document that summarizes the basic decisions made at this session our, along with a first draft of a work-plan that flows from these decisions. Without repeating everything included in that document, this document tries to summarize issues, concerns, insights, etc. that were articulated at this meeting and that provide the backdrop for the decisions that were made. I've organized the summary around a few major themes that were discussed. (For your convenience, at the end of this summary I have appended a copy of the earlier and previously distributed document that summarizes decisions made.)

FROM COACHES TO FACILITATORS TO GUIDES TO.....

Terminological change. Over the course of our discussions we seem to have moved away from calling the folks who will work with institutions "coaches". The term "facilitator" seemed to replace it, but it's not clear that this is the best term. "Guide" was another term that was suggested, and there may have been another. I will use the term "guide" below, with the qualification that the question of what to call the person in question be revisited. [The Hebrew "moreh derech" has a nice feel to it -- but not the way it's usually translated. Any thoughts about this?]

Characterizing the guide's role, training, etc.: proceed with caution!! We noted that our work over the last several months had given us a lot of insight concerning characteristics that an effective guide would need to possess as well as concerning the nature of the work; and it certainly might be valuable to integrate the varied insights we've acquired in this area in a single document that might be used in further deliberations.

At the same time, the assumption animating our most recent conversations is that a good deal more in the way of pilot-projects and what we have been calling "kitchen-work" needs to be done if we are to move towards an adequate understanding of the guides' work and a reasonable approach to their training. These considerations played a major role in our decision to frame a work-plan that defers a number of basic questions concerning guides and instead emphasizes a) seeding the culture; b) the kitchen; c) pilot projects; and d) efforts to identify, excite, and engage particularly strong educators who might in various ways (in the kitchen, as institutional guides, as consultants to us, as vocal supporters, etc.) forward our work. The sense of the

group is that as our learning proceeds across the year we will re-visit the basic questions concerning the guides; the projected January consultation in Israel may provide an especially hospitable context for this kind of a conversation.

As the preceding paragraph suggests, comments made concerning guides at our meetings should be taken as raising issues and as attempting tentative formulations (to be revisited during the year) rather than as staking out a CIJE position. With this caveat, some central points in our discussion are summarized below.

Who would select the guides, who would train them and who would they work for? Much of our conversation built on (and then began to depart from) a model that ran something like this:

1. Based on pilot-projects, work going on in the kitchen, and seminars that build on these, CIJE would develop and publicize a profile of the kind of person it felt would make an adequate guide, a profile emphasizing personal characteristics, desired background, etc.
2. using this profile, local institutions (or perhaps communities wanting to groom one person to work with more than one institution) would identify individuals they felt would make good guides and would present them to CIJE as candidates for training.
3. From candidacy to admission - an uncertain matter that will need to be revisited. On one view, CIJE would work with whomever the institution/community sends; on a second view, CIJE would decide who (from among those identified at the local level) meets the minimum standards for participation in its training-program; on a third view, CIJE would admit all but reserve scholarship funds for those which meet its standards.
4. CIJE would take responsibility for developing the training program. Those admitted to the program would engage in a careful program of study that might involve three months of study (possibly in Israel) spread across three summers as well as work in between. It would probably be necessary to individualize the program of study and preparation with attention to the individual's pattern of strengths and weaknesses and the context in which he/she would be working; conceivably some sort of tutor-tutee relationship would prove desirable.
5. After the training, CIJE would continue in a consulting-relationship to these guides as they go

about their work. It would also convene periodic conferences for them designed to enable them to continue learning from us and from each other, to wrestle with issues, to share insights and problems, etc. CIJE would also organize opportunities for stake holders in participating institutions to meet around appropriate agendas.

As our discussion proceeded, this basic model was revised in at least the following way. While not abandoning the notion that the local entity (community/institution) would play a major role in identifying the guide, we recognized the possibility that some would be unable to come up with anyone appropriate for the work at hand; and we therefore returned to the notion that CIJE should also be trying to identify individuals who might serve as guides to institutions and communities. They would be among those to whom financial support would be offered to facilitate their professional growth as philosophical guides.

Where should we (and communities) be looking for guides? A number of views, some of them possibly complementary, were expressed on this matter:

1. One thought was to look to university faculty -- either Judaica professors who would need to be strengthened in education or education faculty who would be strengthened Judaically.
2. A second possibility was to look for individuals already working in Jewish educating institutions or communal education-related agencies.
3. A third possibility was to begin a careful search for top-notch individuals around the country whom we intuitively judge to be worth our trying to cultivate without worrying too much at this stage about their institutional roles and professional backgrounds. (These might be the ones we invite to next summer's projected seminar in Israel.)

WHO WE ARE!

1. There were some interesting discussions of CIJE's own identity as catalyst of improvement in Jewish education. There was, for example, a discussion of how we stand vis-a-vis being service-providers, a training institution, or an intermediary organization that hands off responsibilities for training and serving to other bodies. The sense of our meeting seemed to be that while it may important on occasion and for strategic

reasons to offer service and to engage in training, we needed to maintain our identity as an intermediary organization.

2. There was a second formulation that emphasized our identification with the view that improvement will depend on simultaneous attention to personnel, community mobilization, goals, and evaluation.

3. There was also a third formulation that, in the context of our discussions over these three days, seemed particularly rich: we are the organization that believes in the practical power of powerful ideas. This, the comment was made, is our signature as an organization. If "the power of ideas" is taken to include "the power of critical inquiry", the theme seems to capture much that we've been discussing.

KITCHEN-WORK ON THE HORIZON

Our conversations emphasized the importance of developing appropriate conceptual, textual, curricular and other materials that would serve as resource-library to the project's efforts to work with educating institutions and other bodies. Much of this work could be conceptualized as an effort to identify resources at each of the five levels we've discussed, supplemented by the tentative grid we've been playing with.

Some of the major possible directions which we discussed are identified below.

Inventory of existing resources and materials. Much of the material that belongs in an adequate resource-library already exists, and DM is familiar with a good deal of it. The challenge is to gather it, to categorize and index it in a meaningful way so that it will be readily available, and to package it in ways will enhance the likelihood that it will be drawn on and appropriately used.

Curricularizing the Educated Jew materials: developing a range of supplementary materials that will facilitate effectively using the Educated Jew materials to stimulate rich and in-depth reflection on serious content-issues and their implications for educational policy and practice. These secondary materials could range from efforts to exhibit what an institution or curriculum modelled on one of these thinkers might look like, to strategies for engaging constituencies we work with to wrestle with the basic existential questions addressed by these thinkers, to strategies for getting educating institutions to use one or more of these articles as tools in reflecting on their own vision and practices, etc.

Refining and curricularizing the Rosenak piece on community-wide vision. Developing exercises, pedagogical strategies, and a range of supporting materials from out of classical and other texts that could be used in conjunction with this essay in our work with communities struggling with the problem of pluralism and education.

Subject-area maps. Following up on our previous discussions, we reiterated the need to map out different subject-areas like Bible, or Hebrew, or Jewish history, with attention to a range or inter-related matters that include: different conceptions of each area understood in relation to the philosophical positions in which these conceptions are rooted; curricular and pedagogical approaches and materials associated with each conception; the skills, knowledge-base and sensibilities required of an educator tied to a particular conception; strategies that could lead an educator to become more reflective about his/her approach to a given subject-area, with attention to competing approaches organized around different understandings of the area and/or pedagogy, etc.

Larger pieces. We recognized that the work going on in the kitchen must also include larger conceptual and other kinds of pieces that excite the imagination of the constituencies we will be working with and stretch their conceptions of what is necessary and possible in the world of Jewish education. We identified a number of different articles/books that seemed worthy of serious consideration. These include the following:

1. A piece, to be developed by SF and NR, that analyzes the development of Camp Ramah with attention to the question: what is necessary in the way of efforts and preconditions for the development of a vision-driven institution?

2. A Jewish Sarah Lightfoot book which provides us with living examples of Jewish educating institutions that are vision-driven, the examples ranging from Esh Ha'Torah to Camp Ramah, to Ha-bonim, etc. The book would provide impressionistic support for the project's assumption that the serious success-stories in Jewish education have been vision-driven institutions. The book would try to make these institutions come alive for the reader, with attention to the ways in which their respective guiding visions find expression in daily life and institutional practices.

3. "The Future as History", modelled on the Carnegie effort to sketch out an educational environment of the future. In a skeptical environment that wonders about the possibility of a powerful non-Orthodox educational institution, the challenge is to develop an image of an

institution -- or perhaps a configuration of inter-related institutions -- that would meaningfully address the educational needs of significant segments of the non-Orthodox world.

4. A Jewish version of "Horace's School" -- a book that would chart the journey of a hypothetical institution in the direction of becoming more self-consciously attentive to questions of basic goals and their relationship to educational practice and evaluation. A companion-piece would try to identify and describe actual educational institutions that have succeeded in becoming significantly more vision-driven.

5. A more conceptual piece that discusses the ways in which vision can enrich the quality of Jewish education. This piece might draw on pertinent empirical and interpretive work being done in general education, e.g. that of Smith, Cohen et. al., and Newmann. Conceivably, such an article could be worked up into a CIJE Policy Brief.

Which of these 5 projects would be worth our doing is a matter we felt deserved careful consideration; and the thought was that this was among the central topics that should engage us in a consultation we imagine taking place in Jerusalem in January of 1996. (See below for further discussion of this point.)

POSSIBLE CONFERENCES, SEMINARS, WORKSHOPS

CIJE has already committed itself to a number of seminars and workshops organized around questions of mission, vision, and goals. We agreed in our discussions that, to the extent possible, these must be approached in ways that make it likely that these activities represent an initiation, a starting-point, or a springboard rather than a self-contained events with no after-life.

Beyond our existing commitments, we projected a number of other seminars and conferences designed to enhance our own learning and understanding of the work at hand, to seed the culture, and to develop capacity. Below is a list of the kinds of seminars we considered:

1. a January consultation in Jerusalem that convenes all the participants in the July consultation, along with selected additional individuals that might include David Cohen, possibly Deborah Kerdimann, and maybe a few others. The challenge of this back-stage conference is to carefully examine, elaborate, and decide among some of the ideas we've been considering and to further refine the project's plan-of-action.

Specific proposals, e.g., concerning extended pieces that might be written, would be written up and distributed prior to the conference. This conference will be enriched by what we learn between July 1995 and December 1995 through our pilot-projects, our kitchen-work, and the seminars and workshops scheduled for the next several months.

2. two already-scheduled conferences for principals. The planned fall conference could devote a substantial segment to questions of goals and vision; and the spring conference could in its entirety be organized around such questions.

3. a third seminar for principals that would bring together those who, from the perspective of this project, seem the most promising to set about launching a serious goals-agenda in their institutions.

4. A seminar for professional/lay teams from CIJE Affiliate communities, to be held some time in the spring or summer. Conceivably, the teams could include stronger institutional representation that we had in Jerusalem. This seminar, like that in Jerusalem, is designed to educate the participants concerning the importance of pursuing a goals-agenda at institutional and communal levels and to enlist their support on behalf of this agenda.

5. A conference organized around the Educated Jew essays, due to be published next year.

6. A week-long seminar tentatively scheduled for next July (near the time of the CAJE conference in Israel) that attempts to initiate into our work and to excite select individuals we take to be exceptionally strong as well as sympathetic to the direction of our efforts. Participants will be invited to participate in a conference in which we will share with them our thinking (including some of the work going on in the kitchen), elicit their feedback, and develop a sense of who among them shows promise of working effectively in one or another phase of the project (in the kitchen, as an institutional guide, as a leader of seminars that aim to seed the culture, etc.) The view was expressed that, given the nature of this seminar, scholarships facilitating attendance would be appropriate.

Here are some of then names mentioned as candidates for this seminar: Michael Paley, Elaine Cohen, Esther Netter, Jodi Hirsh, Bernie Steinberg, Deborah Kerdimann

(perhaps as a faculty member). It was suggested that if we could identify suitable congregational rabbis, this might be a good idea. In addition, it might be worth folding into this seminar the principals mentioned in #3 above.

Given a number of realities, it was stressed that nailing down time, place, and participants needs to be accomplished very soon.

CONCLUSION

As noted at the beginning of this document, what I have thus far written represents the discussion that provided the background for basic decisions made at our Sunday meeting, decisions summarized in a brief document that I have already distributed. For the sake of convenience, I am appending a copy of that document to this one (See next page).

GOALS PROJECT CONSULTATION
July 1995,

Below you will find DP's attempt to articulate major decisions we made at our Sunday meeting based on our work over the last few days. In reviewing the material, please try to do the following:

1. Read it critically with an eye to catching any omissions or misrepresentations or any other problems.

2. Review it for overall soundness. Two criteria come to mind:
 - a. On reflection, does the proposed agenda and set of activities make good sense? Is there anything important that we should be doing missing? Or are some of the things listed not worth doing?

b. Time!

The question is not just whether there is enough time to do all these things -- but whether there is enough time to do them all meaningfully. **I am particularly concerned that the "kitchen-work" not get pushed aside in favor of the other activities. It may be that we will need to review the proposed set of activities with this concern in mind.**

If at all possible, feedback concerning these and other pertinent matters should be pooled by the beginning of next week.

DECISIONS EMERGING OUT OF THE THREE DAYS OF DELIBERATION

Major emphases

1. Seminars, consultations, and workshops organized around the following:

Seeding the culture -- bring lay and professional leaders in the field of Jewish education to a deeper appreciation of CIJE's convictions in this domain, and thus laying the ground for communal and institutional initiatives (e.g., Seminar for leadership from Affiliated Communities; Module in fall principals' seminar and at heart of spring seminar)

Meeting outstanding commitments we've made (e.g., to Baltimore, the JCC, Wexner, and possibly Atlanta and Cleveland)

Thoughtful deliberations designed to better understand the project and decide from among competing directions and projects (e.g., consultation scheduled for January, '96)

Bringing some top-notch people into the work without preconceptions concerning how they will fit in; some of the "kitchen-work" will play a significant role in this seminar (e.g. the seminar scheduled for July, '96)

2. The Kitchen

While work in this area needs to be determined based on a comprehensive plan that still needs to be worked out, we discussed some immediate projects that will need attention:

a. an inventory of existing resources in different domains.

b. a paper to be developed by NR and SF that details the ways in which Ramah is a vision-driven institution and what was necessary in the way of inputs for it to become so.

Less immediate but also discussed as possibly important kitchen work (though in need of further consideration) were the following:

a. building maps of different content-

domains.

b. monographs dealing with one or more of the following: i. "The Future As History", looking at a comprehensive and adequate approach to Jewish education in the non-Orthodox world; ii. a Jewish Sarah Lightfoot piece that looks at existing vision-guided institutions; iii) a book modelled on HORACE'S SCHOOL, detailing the process through which a fictional Jewish educating institution becomes more vision-driven.

3. Pilot Projects: Marom will continue his work with Agnon and, if it can be worked out, Pekarsky will work out an arrangement with another institution. (Toren's work with the Schechter School in Cleveland may also be pertinent here.)

Our discussion emphasized the critical importance of careful written documentation of the work that goes on in the pilot projects, as well as analyses of these experiences. Along the way, seminars designed to analyze the work being done and what is being learned would be pertinent.

4. An imperative and immediate need to develop a plan that carefully breaks down #s 1-3 and determines priorities based on their importance and on available time and resources.

Note that #s 1-4 do not include any reference to the immediate identification and education of facilitator- or coach-figures. As I understand it, we have agreed - for reasons that have in part to do with the need to develop the kitchen - to remain temporarily agnostic concerning the desirability of facilitators, our role in identifying and training them, etc. This matter will be re-approached during our January consultation.

WORK PLAN, REMAINDER OF 1995 AND 1996

July - Dec., 1995

1. Further articulate the plan for 1995 and 1996 with attention to the larger conception of the project, and with special emphasis on what's to go on in the kitchen (both short- and long-term). The plan needs to be reviewed carefully both CIJE and Mandel Institute partners to the project.
2. Planning and implementation of seminars we've committed to (Wexner, JCC, Baltimore, and possibly Atlanta)
3. Conceptualize, recruit for, and organize the seminars projected for 1996. These include the January consultation, the principals seminar, the seminar for the leadership of the affiliated communities, *and the July Senior Seminar.*
4. Pilot-projects: Work-in-settings and systematic efforts to document and analyze (Pekarsky and Marom)
5. Kitchen-work: To be based on a comprehensive plan to be developed during summer of 1995. The plan will probably include a projected paper by SF and NR dealing with the conditions that made possible the development of Ramah as a vision-driven institution. *Rosenak, Ed. Juv, the Marom*
6. Module in the fall seminar for principals.

1996

1. January consultation in Jerusalem (CIJE, Mandel Institute and selected additional participants)
2. Outstanding commitment: support and/or guide Cleveland's efforts to clarify its goals for Beth Torah
2. Spring principals' seminar
3. Seminar for representatives of new affiliated communities
4. Israel Seminar in July designed to draw in potential leaders and resources (e.g. Steinberg, Paley, Hirsh, Elaine Cohen, selected rabbis)
5. Continuing kitchen work (based on plan that will soon be developed)
6. Continuing pilot project efforts (along with appropriate documentation, analysis, and discussions based on them)

6. Other activities as determined based on future deliberations, especially the January consultation.

GOALS PROJECT CONSULTATION,
Cambridge, MA, July 1995
Summary of 2nd Day's Proceedings

REFLECTIONS ON DAY 1

Particular problem reflects universal tendency to resist thinking about the big questions. Reflecting on the discussions on Day 1, one participants pointed to out that in a significant sense the situation we are trying to remedy is found in other arenas as well: that is, there is a tendency to rush headlong into questions of "How?" without seriously addressing the more fundamental "Why?" questions -- the answers to which are regarded as either obvious or inaccessible [and in any case irrelevant to the challenges of "the how?"].

These comments were developed with attention to a particular conception of "the aims of Jewish education", an aim that emphasized becoming more reflective, inquiring, and devout in the conduct of one's affairs, using intellectual, moral, esthetic and other lenses derived from Jewish culture - from Jewish thought, history and custom.

A compromise view proposed: combining the shallow and the deep. While the approach to helping institutions that we have been developing is not directive in the sense that it has a preconception concerning substantive outcome, it is directive in the sense that the job of the coach is actively to guide the process along in the hopes of raising the level of discourse, getting the stake holders to appreciate and wrestle seriously with critical choices concerning aims that have a bearing on the "what" and the "how" of teaching, etc. The alternative conception that had been proposed on Day 1 grew out of a self-study model which put puts in the hands of the institution's stake holders primary responsibility for identifying, interpreting, and addressing the problems that are in need of attention. On this model CIJE's role is to help get the process going, to suggest a menu of possible routes to go in responding to perceived problems, and to develop a library of resources to be made available to the institutions in their efforts to address these problems. Among the advantages identified with this approach were the following: 1) it would not create a culture of dependence, and 2) in its somewhat more modest expectations of CIJE, it may be more in line with our existing capacity.

Based on Day 1's discussion of the two approaches, a new approach was put on the table, described as "a compromise" between them, a compromise which incorporated the advantages of the alternative conception but involved a number of elements of the first one. Much of our day focused on this new proposal; and since we seemed to gravitate towards some version of it, it is described at length below.

CHARACTERIZATION OF THE NEW PROPOSAL

The proposal puts the onus of responsibility for making practical progress on interested educational institutions. CIJE's job is to encourage and help launch such efforts, to offer consultative help to those spearheading these efforts, and to develop an array of resources that can be made available to institutions and that can be used in CIJE's efforts to encourage, help launch, and consult. Here are the primary elements in the proposed model:

1. Efforts, especially seminars, designed to create a supportive context and an interest in participating. The job of these efforts is to impress on key constituencies the importance of undertaking a serious effort to undertake a serious goals agenda. The following might be involved:

a) the problematics of our present social and educational predicament and how ill-thought-out aims that are in any case inadequately embodied contribute to this predicament; this might well include opportunities to focus their attention on their own ill-thought-out ideas concerning the aims of Jewish education and on the varied ways in which their own institutions exemplify and are rendered ineffective by the problems under consideration.

b) case-studies of institutions that are or have grown substantially more effective through rich reflection concerning what they are about;

c) examples of the kinds of things that might be done in a thoughtful goals-process;

d) opportunities to begin thinking substantively about the aims of Jewish education and what taking a particular set of aims seriously would imply for educational practice. The intent is to offer a taste of the kinds of activities a serious institution might be involved with, suggesting both their inherent richness and their power to guide practice.

Though we used the term "seminars," it may be useful to think of seminars as one of several vehicles that can be used to create the kind of interest we would like to generate. Presentations before critical constituencies, the dissemination of good literature, etc. might also play a role in this process.

The seminars we are thinking of have a twofold purpose: 1) they are designed to encourage representatives of particular institutions to initiate a serious goals-process; 2) they are designed to create a supportive cultural context for those who initiate such a process (through transforming the consciousness of lay and professional communal leaders and rank-and-file

members of the Jewish community).

The seminars (and other pertinent activities) need to be designed in such a way that whether or not they lead to the next stage of activity they will be meaningful to the participants - and helpful to the cause of Jewish education.

It was suggested that significant Public Relations efforts may be necessary as background to the seminars in questions -- brochures, perhaps articles, well-disseminated, that ready the ground for these seminars and create an interest in attending.

The Jerusalem Goals Seminar and the Milwaukee Goals Seminars would seem to represent examples of seminars in this general genre.

2. Launch-seminars. Periodic seminars would be held for teams from institutions that have decided that they want to embark on a reflective goals-process. These seminars would be designed so as to offer them a variety of concrete ideas concerning how to begin the process. This might include our developing and offering them instruments that would facilitate an initial process of self-study. What they could expect from CIJE in the process would need to be carefully laid out as well.

3. Facilitator-workshops. Interested institutions might - according to the model, this is not a requirement - identify a lead-person to facilitate the local goals-process. Such facilitators would be invited to seminars designed to help them get started and to offer them tools that may prove useful to them in their efforts.

The suggestion was made that it might be desirable and possible to offer them scholarships that will cover their costs in participating in such workshops.

4. Follow-up seminars. Periodic seminars for the original institutional teams and/or for facilitators would be held in order to hear about their progress to date, as well as to offer them new tools and ideas. These seminars might also provide an occasion for individualized consultations on an institution-by-institution basis.

5. Consultation. Those CIJE's role in this domain was left vague, there was talk about our being involved as consultants to institutions undertaking a serious goals-process. This might involve carefully listening the institution's characterization of its situation and, based on this, suggesting possible resources to turn to or routes to go. Conceivably, though not discussed in our meeting, it could involve an on-site visit.

6. "The kitchen." This is a critical element in the proposed model. The kitchen is the backstage of this process; it is where the materials, the conceptions, the tools, the maps, etc. that

this project will be making available to institutions will be developed. It is both the Research and Development Lab and the tool shop.

The kitchen is where we develop a library of resources that includes:

- a. conceptual and strategic maps that help us get a handle on different domains (like Bible) and situations;
- b. articles, books, videos, and other materials -- already available or developed by us -- that can be made available to institutions on a case-by-case basis, as needed;
- c. tools -- exercises, grids, evaluation-devices, promising activities, etc. that can be valuable at different stages in the process;
- d. services that CIJE is willing to offer institutions;
- e. "cases";
- f. carefully documented "case-studies" that could become the basis for a "Best Practices" piece in the domain of educational growth through a serious goals-process.
- g. literature that explains the convictions that undergird the project;
- h. an inventory of the kinds of concerns/anxieties likely to arise in a goals-process, along with ways of fruitfully interpreting and responding to these concerns;
- i. people (e.g. Jodi Hirsh, Esther Netter)
- j. a distillation of what we are learning from the development of the different phases of this project.

7. Pilot-projects. Perhaps this is better categorized as a kitchen-activity. In any event, pilot-projects represent our own efforts to work with institutions in a more active way than the model specifies.

This might mean something like the "coaching" model we have been working with over the last several months. It might also mean trying out a very different model that emerged as we looked at the case a moral philosopher who embedded himself in and profoundly enriched a hospital setting. A few comments on this model may be pertinent at this point.

One of the appeals of this model is that if the philosopher is, in the positive sense, digested and accepted by the host-community (without losing his philosophical concerns and tools) and is viewed as credible by the participants, there are may be ready opportunities to overcome the divorce between philosophy and educational practice. A key question that was raised concerns how the philosopher acquires credibility and moral authority in the eyes of the institution's stake holders. One of the critical variables may have to do with whether the philosopher possesses - and is perceived as possessing - what was characterized as "a deep receptivity" to the concerns of those who make up the institution.

Pilot-projects are important to the development of the Goals Project in at least two different ways:

a) our own efforts to work with institutions will be invaluable in determining what needs to be developed in the kitchen and the utility of what we have developed in the kitchen. In addition, some of our best practical tools may actually arise in the practical settings. In any case, the pilot projects will give us a vivid and taste, and more, of realities and concerns down on the ground, and this will be very important in developing tools, resources, etc. This interplay between resource-development and practice is essential.

It is noteworthy in this connection that careful documentation of our efforts in work with institutions is essential. A significant part of the importance of, say, Marom's work with Agnon is conditional on his and our carefully analyzing this case with attention to the kinds of questions Alan asked the other day (e.g., Why did you decide to start with principal and teachers?) and questions concerning the conditions that made Agnon "ready" for this kind of work.

b) pilot-projects are important because they offer opportunities to test-out models different from the self-directed model this conception emphasizes.

8. Building capacity. In the sense (I think) intended in this discussion, "building capacity" meant identifying strategically important populations and educating them in the direction of ideas and ways of thinking that are integral to the project. These populations include Jerusalem Fellows, Melton's Senior Educators, students in Jewish education around the country, Rabbinical students. While this work could be understood as "building capacity", note that it might also be viewed as "seeding the culture" -- that is, as creating conditions that are favorable to the kinds of initiatives we hope to encourage.

9. Community vision. In response to a comment suggesting that this theme was not part of the agenda we had been discussing

during the meeting, it was suggested that this omission should not be taken as a signal that "community-vision" should be dropped. It was noted that the Goals Project owes its origins in part to Louise Stein's query two years ago concerning how a community would know if it had been successful in its efforts to improve Jewish education. (It was noted in this connection that the Rosenak paper is now available in draft form.)

REACTIONS TO THE PROPOSAL

In at least two senses, the proposal was put forward in a tentative spirit.

First, it came with the caveat that it represents an experimental initiative that would test out the Scheffler-hypothesis re: self-directed institutional growth. Periodic reassessments of the wisdom of this route are critical. Note, though, that even if the hypothesis proves less warranted than we might think, we would not be back to "square one". For in the course of developing this initiative, we would be engaged in varied activities that are independently worthwhile. These include the initiatory seminars that help to raise the level of understanding; the pilot projects, which test out other models; and the varied products of the work going on in the kitchen.

Second, the proposal came with an invitation to critique it, lest we proceed along this path without due attention to possibly serious problems.

In general, there seemed to be a great deal of support for the reconceptualization of our efforts implicit in this proposal. At the same time, a number of concerns were raised. Two of them are summarized below:

The costs of distance. On the Proposed model, CIJE stands at a considerable remove from institutions. We are more like the therapist who hears the patient speak about his or her life than like the participant-observer who is immersed in the life of a community. One of the advantages of the immersion-model is that it provides a sense of context and perhaps a capacity to see and to hear beyond the words that might be uttered by participants in CIJE-sponsored workshops. Will the loss of this sense of context undercut the CIJE's consultant's capacity to give good advice (as well as credibility in the eyes of the institutional representatives)?

Is the degree of trust placed in the institutions warranted? The model of working with institutions we've adopted puts a lot of faith in their ability to take charge of their own self-renewal from the very beginning. It was noted that our decision to look for coaches who would be 1) carefully selected, and 2)

trained by us grew out of our lack of confidence that institutions could identify individuals with the skills, understandings, knowledge-base, sensitivities etc. (in both Judaic and educational realms) to fruitfully guide a goals-process. Does our new model risk going too far in the other direction? Or, are we right to speculate that the "back-ups" we'll provide in the way of workshops, a resource-bank, and consultation will suffice? More generally, have we moved too far in the non-directive direction?

THE GOALS OF THE GOALS PROJECT REVISITED

A meaningful statement of the goals of the Goals Project needs to begin with a characterization of the problems to which the project is a response. Our original formulations stressed the failure of practice to be organized around thoughtfully articulated goals and visions that have arisen through a process of study and reflection; and a resultant state-of-affairs in which institutions drifted along aimlessly and at best ineffectively. In the course of our deliberations, our sense of the problem and of the mission of the project was expanded in at least two ways: a) the power of vision and goals was expanded to "the power of ideas" to inform practice; b) the emphasis on "product", on becoming more vision-driven was complemented with an emphasis on the development of a culture or ethos that encourage serious reflection (in the various senses we've discussed).

It was noted in our discussions that these emphases of the Goals Project are really at the heart of CIJE's approach to educational improvement.

a) The Goals Project does not just represent an effort to encourage vision-driven institutions; it represents a vital dimension of CIJE's approach to issues of educational content, personnel development, etc.

b) The emphasis on the development of a culture of self-renewal through inquiry (inquiry that involves eschewal of quick and the development of habits of mind that encourage introspection, study of sources - Judaic and educational, strategic thinking, evaluation, etc.) is at the heart not just of the Goals Project but of the enterprise as a whole.

Although in some of our discussions the term "ideas" began to replace "goals and vision", questions were raised about the import of this change as well as about the wisdom of changing our lexicon midstream. These matters will need to be returned to.

In addition to some informal comments about the heart of the Goals Project, we also spoke in somewhat more focused terms about

the goals of the project as implicit in the pattern of activities we've been projecting. Crudely put, the goals of the project are the following:

1. Creating the conditions that will support and encourage meaningful efforts at institutional change. This involves nurturing a culture in the American Jewish community and especially among those who lead and support efforts at Jewish education a) that appreciates the importance of careful attention to questions of vision and goals as they pertain to Jewish education - a culture that understands that "success" in any meaningful sense will depend on adequately addressing this matter; b) that is increasingly hospitable to an ethos of self-renewal through inquiry (in lieu of quick-fix approaches).

2. The spread of educating institutions that are increasingly animated both by compelling visions and goals (arrived at through a process of careful study and honest reflection) and by an ethos that supports continuing reflection and inquiry concerning what is being aimed for, how it is reflected in practice, and with what effects.

The discussion of #1, of the conditions that need to be encouraged if a culture hospitable to our efforts is to arise defined the context of an important conversation concerning the kind of educational efforts we should be directing at various lay-constituencies. A number of opinions were expressed, including the following:

1. It's important for lay-leaders to "personally taste" the problems they want institutions to be addressing; they themselves should be encouraged to struggle with questions concerning the nature of a meaningful Jewish existence and concerning proper aims for Jewish education. This will, it was suggested, deepen their understanding of the work at hand and also provide motivation.

2. In a similar vein, it was suggested that it would be important to encourage "the grocer" to address these issues if he/she is to knowledgeably support the kinds of efforts we want to encourage. (The analogy offered pointed to the musician's dependence on an audience that is sophisticated enough to be receptive to and appreciative of what he/she is doing.

3. An alternate view was that although it was important that lay-leaders know that it is crucial that we address problem of aimlessness in the field, it is not our business to encourage personal struggle with aims on their part. It is unnecessary to do so, the reason

being that the key lay-leaders are already powerfully motivated by anxiety concerning the Jewish future. In view of this, the challenge of getting them to wrestle with such religious/existential questions belongs not to us but to their rabbis.

4. As an attempt to put the matter to rest for now, DP suggested that we all agreed about the need to engage the lay-public in our efforts and to become thoughtfully supportive of an agenda that puts questions of goals and vision at the forefront; and that we can leave it as an empirical question to be decided as we move along whether one or the other of the approaches sketched out, or something in between, is most appropriate to our efforts.

SOME CHALLENGES EMERGING OUT OUR DISCUSSIONS

1. Develop a plan of action and a division of labor built out of a careful analysis of the component parts we sketched out.
2. Possibly a policy brief concerning this domain.
3. Possibly a presentation to the CIJE Board.
4. Identify and recruit particularly fertile institutions.
4. Determining what is and is not feasible given our time-constraints; and/or discovering ways to alter the time-constraints.

ON THE AGENDA FOR SUNDAY

1. The identification and role of "Facilitators" and our role in relation to them.
2. "Community-vision" in the revised model.
3. Revisiting the Friday-model.

GOALS PROJECT CONSULTATION
Cambridge, MA, July 1995
Summary of 2nd Day's Proceedings

REFLECTIONS ON DAY 1

Particular problem reflects universal tendency to resist thinking about the big questions. Reflecting on the discussions on Day 1, one participants pointed to out that in a significant sense the situation we are trying to remedy is found in other arenas as well: that is, there is a tendency to rush headlong into questions of "How?" without seriously addressing the more fundamental "Why?" questions -- the answers to which are regarded as either obvious or inaccessible [and in any case irrelevant to the challenges of "the how?"].

These comments were developed with attention to a particular conception of "the aims of Jewish education", an aim that emphasized becoming more reflective, inquiring, and devout in the conduct of one's affairs, using intellectual, moral, esthetic and other lenses derived from Jewish culture - from Jewish thought, history and custom.

A compromise view proposed: combining the shallow and the deep. While the approach to helping institutions that we have been developing is not directive in the sense that it has a preconception concerning substantive outcome, it is directive in the sense that the job of the coach is actively to guide the process along in the hopes of raising the level of discourse, getting the stake holders to appreciate and wrestle seriously with critical choices concerning aims that have a bearing on the "what" and the "how" of teaching, etc. The alternative conception that had been proposed on Day 1 grew out of a self-study model which put puts in the hands of the institution's stake holders primary responsibility for identifying, interpreting, and addressing the problems that are in need of attention. On this model CIJE's role is to help get the process going, to suggest a menu of possible routes to go in responding to perceived problems, and to develop a library of resources to be made available to the institutions in their efforts to address these problems. Among the advantages identified with this approach were the following: 1) it would not create a culture of dependence, and 2) in its somewhat more modest expectations of CIJE, it may be more in line with our existing capacity.

Based on Day 1's discussion of the two approaches, a new approach was put on the table, described as "a compromise" between them, a compromise which incorporated the advantages of the alternative conception but involved a number of elements of the first one. Much of our day focused on this new proposal; and since we seemed to gravitate towards some version of it, it is described at length below.

CHARACTERIZATION OF THE NEW PROPOSAL

The proposal puts the onus of responsibility for making practical progress on interested educational institutions. CIJE's job is to encourage and help launch such efforts, to offer consultative help to those spearheading these efforts, and to develop an array of resources that can be made available to institutions and that can be used in CIJE's efforts to encourage, help launch, and consult. Here are the primary elements in the proposed model:

1. Efforts, especially seminars, designed to create a supportive context and an interest in participating. The job of these efforts is to impress on key constituencies the importance of undertaking a serious effort to undertake a serious goals agenda. The following might be involved:

- a) the problematics of our present social and educational predicament and how ill-thought-out aims that are in any case inadequately embodied contribute to this predicament; this might well include opportunities to focus their attention on their own ill-thought-out ideas concerning the aims of Jewish education and on the varied ways in which their own institutions exemplify and are rendered ineffective by the problems under consideration.
- b) case-studies of institutions that are or have grown substantially more effective through rich reflection concerning what they are about;
- c) examples of the kinds of things that might be done in a thoughtful goals-process;
- d) opportunities to begin thinking substantively about the aims of Jewish education and what taking a particular set of aims seriously would imply for educational practice. The intent is to offer a taste of the kinds of activities a serious institution might be involved with, suggesting both their inherent richness and their power to guide practice.

Though we used the term "seminars," it may be useful to think of seminars as one of several vehicles that can be used to create the kind of interest we would like to generate. Presentations before critical constituencies, the dissemination of good literature, etc. might also play a role in this process.

The seminars we are thinking of have a twofold purpose: 1) they are designed to encourage representatives of particular institutions to initiate a serious goals-process; 2) they are designed to create a supportive cultural context for those who initiate such a process (through transforming the consciousness of lay and professional communal leaders and rank-and-file members of the Jewish community).

The seminars (and other pertinent activities) need to be designed in such a way that whether or not they lead to the next stage of activity they will be meaningful to the participants -

and helpful to the cause of Jewish education.

It was suggested that significant Public Relations efforts may be necessary as background to the seminars in questions -- brochures, perhaps articles, well-disseminated, that ready the ground for these seminars and create an interest in attending.

The Jerusalem Goals Seminar and the Milwaukee Goals Seminars would seem to represent examples of seminars in this general genre.

2. Launch-seminars. Periodic seminars would be held for teams from institutions that have decided that they want to embark on a reflective goals-process. These seminars would be designed so as to offer them a variety of concrete ideas concerning how to begin the process. This might include our developing and offering them instruments that would facilitate an initial process of self-study. What they could expect from CIJE in the process would need to be carefully laid out as well.

3. Facilitator-workshops. Interested institutions might - according to the model, this is not a requirement - identify a lead-person to facilitate the local goals-process. Such facilitators would be invited to seminars designed to help them get started and to offer them tools that may prove useful to them in their efforts.

The suggestion was made that it might be desirable and possible to offer them scholarships that will cover their costs in participating in such workshops.

4. Follow-up seminars. Periodic seminars for the original institutional teams and/or for facilitators would be held in order to hear about their progress to date, as well as to offer them new tools and ideas. These seminars might also provide an occasion for individualized consultations on an institution-by-institution basis.

5. Consultation. Those CIJE's role in this domain was left vague, there was talk about our being involved as consultants to institutions undertaking a serious goals-process. This might involve carefully listening the institution's characterization of its situation and, based on this, suggesting possible resources to turn to or routes to go. Conceivably, though not discussed in our meeting, it could involve an on-site visit.

6. "The kitchen." This is a critical element in the proposed model. The kitchen is the backstage of this process; it is where the materials, the conceptions, the tools, the maps, etc. that this project will be making available to institutions will be developed. It is both the Research and Development Lab and the tool shop.

The kitchen is where we develop a library of resources that includes:

a. conceptual and strategic maps that help us get a handle on different domains (like Bible) and situations;

- b. articles, books, videos, and other materials -- already available or developed by us -- that can be made available to institutions on a case-by-case basis, as needed;
- c. tools -- exercises, grids, evaluation-devices, promising activities, etc. that can be valuable at different stages in the process;
- d. services that CIJE is willing to offer institutions;
- e. "cases";
- f. carefully documented "case-studies" that could become the basis for a "Best Practices" piece in the domain of educational growth through a serious goals-process.
- g. literature that explains the convictions that undergird the project;
- h. an inventory of the kinds of concerns/anxieties likely to arise in a goals-process, along with ways of fruitfully interpreting and responding to these concerns;
- i. people (e.g. Jodi Hirsh, Esther Netter)
- j. a distillation of what we are learning from the development of the different phases of this project.

7. Pilot-projects. Perhaps this is better categorized as a kitchen-activity. In any event, pilot-projects represent our own efforts to work with institutions in a more active way than the model specifies.

This might mean something like the "coaching" model we have been working with over the last several months. It might also mean trying out a very different model that emerged as we looked at the case a moral philosopher who embedded himself in and profoundly enriched a hospital setting. A few comments on this model may be pertinent at this point.

One of the appeals of this model is that if the philosopher is, in the positive sense, digested and accepted by the host-community (without losing his philosophical concerns and tools) and is viewed as credible by the participants, there are may be ready opportunities to overcome the divorce between philosophy and educational practice. A key question that was raised concerns how the philosopher acquires credibility and moral authority in the eyes of the institution's stake holders. One of the critical variables may have to do with whether the philosopher possesses - and is perceived as possessing - what was characterized as "a deep receptivity" to the concerns of those who make up the institution.

Pilot-projects are important to the development of the Goals Project in at least two different ways:

a) our own efforts to work with institutions will be invaluable in determining what needs to be developed in the kitchen and the utility of what we have developed in the kitchen. In addition, some of our best practical tools may actually arise in the practical settings. In any case, the pilot projects will give us a vivid and taste, and more, of realities and concerns down on the ground, and this will be very important in developing tools, resources, etc. This interplay between resource-development and practice is essential.

It is noteworthy in this connection that careful documentation of our efforts in work with institutions is essential. A significant part of the importance of, say, Marom's work with Agnon is conditional on his and our carefully analyzing this case with attention to the kinds of questions Alan asked the other day (e.g., Why did you decide to start with principal and teachers?) and questions concerning the conditions that made Agnon "ready" for this kind of work.

b) pilot-projects are important because they offer opportunities to test-out models different from the self-directed model this conception emphasizes.

8. Building capacity. In the sense (I think) intended in this discussion, "building capacity" meant identifying strategically important populations and educating them in the direction of ideas and ways of thinking that are integral to the project. These populations include Jerusalem Fellows, Melton's Senior Educators, students in Jewish education around the country, Rabbinical students. While this work could be understood as "building capacity", note that it might also be viewed as "seeding the culture" -- that is, as creating conditions that are favorable to the kinds of initiatives we hope to encourage.

9. Community vision. In response to a comment suggesting that this theme was not part of the agenda we had been discussing during the meeting, it was suggested that this omission should not be taken as a signal that "community-vision" should be dropped. It was noted that the Goals Project owes its origins in part to Louise Stein's query two years ago concerning how a community would know if it had been successful in its efforts to improve Jewish education. (It was noted in this connection that the Rosenak paper is now available in draft form.)

REACTIONS TO THE PROPOSAL

In at least two senses, the proposal was put forward in a tentative spirit.

First, it came with the caveat that it represents an experimental initiative that would test out the Scheffler-hypothesis re: self-directed institutional growth. Periodic reassessments of the wisdom of this route are critical. Note, though, that even if the hypothesis proves less warranted than we might think, we would not be back to "square one". For in the course of developing this initiative, we would be engaged in varied activities that are independently worthwhile. These include the initiatory seminars that help to raise the level of understanding; the pilot projects, which test out other models; and the varied products of the work going on in the kitchen.

Second, the proposal came with an invitation to critique it, lest we proceed along this path without due attention to possibly serious problems.

In general, there seemed to be a great deal of support for the reconceptualization of our efforts implicit in this proposal. At the same time, a number of concerns were raised. Two of them are summarized below:

The costs of distance. On the Proposed model, CIJE stands at a considerable remove from institutions. We are more like the therapist who hears the patient speak about his or her life than like the participant-observer who is immersed in the life of a community. One of the advantages of the immersion-model is that it provides a sense of context and perhaps a capacity to see and to hear beyond the words that might be uttered by participants in CIJE-sponsored workshops. Will the loss of this sense of context undercut the CIJE's consultant's capacity to give good advice (as well as credibility in the eyes of the institutional representatives)?

Is the degree of trust placed in the institutions warranted? The model of working with institutions we've adopted puts a lot of faith in their ability to take charge of their own self-renewal from the very beginning. It was noted that our decision to look for coaches who would be 1) carefully selected, and 2) trained by us grew out of our lack of confidence that institutions could identify individuals with the skills, understandings, knowledge-base, sensitivities etc. (in both Judaic and educational realms) to fruitfully guide a goals-process. Does our new model risk going too far in the other direction? Or, are we right to speculate that the "back-ups" we'll provide in the way of workshops, a resource-bank, and consultation will suffice? More generally, have we moved too far in the non-directive direction?

THE GOALS OF THE GOALS PROJECT REVISITED

A meaningful statement of the goals of the Goals Project needs to begin with a characterization of the problems to which the project is a response. Our original formulations stressed the failure of practice to be organized around thoughtfully articulated goals and visions that have arisen through a process of study and reflection; and a resultant state-of-affairs in which institutions drifted along aimlessly and at best ineffectively. In the course of our deliberations, our sense of the problem and of the mission of the project was expanded in at least two ways: a) the power of vision and goals was expanded to "the power of ideas" to inform practice; b) the emphasis on "product", on becoming more vision-driven was complemented with an emphasis on the development of a culture or ethos that encourage serious reflection (in the various senses we've discussed).

It was noted in our discussions that these emphases of the Goals Project are really at the heart of CIJE's approach to educational improvement.

a) The Goals Project does not just represent an effort to encourage vision-driven institutions; it represents a vital dimension of CIJE's approach to issues of educational content, personnel development, etc.

b) The emphasis on the development of a culture of self-renewal through inquiry (inquiry that involves eschewal of quick and the development of habits of mind that encourage introspection, study of sources - Judaic and educational, strategic thinking, evaluation, etc.) is at the heart not just of the Goals Project but of the enterprise as a whole.

Although in some of our discussions the term "ideas" began to replace "goals and vision", questions were raised about the import of this change as well as about the wisdom of changing our lexicon midstream. These matters will need to be returned to.

In addition to some informal comments about the heart of the Goals Project, we also spoke in somewhat more focused terms about the goals of the project as implicit in the pattern of activities we've been projecting. Crudely put, the goals of the project are the following:

1. Creating the conditions that will support and encourage meaningful efforts at institutional change. This involves nurturing a culture in the American Jewish community and especially among those who lead and support efforts at Jewish education a) that appreciates the importance of careful attention to questions of vision and goals as they pertain to Jewish education - a culture that understands that "success" in any meaningful sense will depend on adequately addressing this matter; b) that is increasingly hospitable to an ethos of self-renewal through inquiry (in lieu of quick-fix approaches).

2. The spread of educating institutions that are increasingly animated both by

compelling visions and goals (arrived at through a process of careful study and honest reflection) and by an ethos that supports continuing reflection and inquiry concerning what is being aimed for, how it is reflected in practice, and with what effects.

The discussion of #1, of the conditions that need to be encouraged if a culture hospitable to our efforts is to arise defined the context of an important conversation concerning the kind of educational efforts we should be directing at various lay-constituencies. A number of opinions were expressed, including the following:

1. It's important for lay-leaders to "personally taste" the problems they want institutions to be addressing; they themselves should be encouraged to struggle with questions concerning the nature of a meaningful Jewish existence and concerning proper aims for Jewish education. This will, it was suggested, deepen their understanding of the work at hand and also provide motivation.
2. In a similar vein, it was suggested that it would be important to encourage "the grocer" to address these issues if he/she is to knowledgeably support the kinds of efforts we want to encourage. (The analogy offered pointed to the musician's dependence on an audience that is sophisticated enough to be receptive to and appreciative of what he/she is doing.
3. An alternate view was that although it was important that lay-leaders know that it is crucial that we address problem of aimlessness in the field, it is not our business to encourage personal struggle with aims on their part. It is unnecessary to do so, the reason being that the key lay-leaders are already powerfully motivated by anxiety concerning the Jewish future. In view of this, the challenge of getting them to wrestle with such religious/existential questions belongs not to us but to their rabbis.
4. As an attempt to put the matter to rest for now, DP suggested that we all agreed about the need to engage the lay-public in our efforts and to become thoughtfully supportive of an agenda that puts questions of goals and vision at the forefront; and that we can leave it as an empirical question to be decided as we move along whether one or the other of the approaches sketched out, or something in between, is most appropriate to our efforts.

SOME CHALLENGES EMERGING OUT OUR DISCUSSIONS

1. Develop a plan of action and a division of labor built out of a careful analysis of the component parts we sketched out.
2. Possibly a policy brief concerning this domain.
3. Possibly a presentation to the CIJE Board.
4. Identify and recruit particularly fertile institutions.
4. Determining what is and is not feasible given our time-constraints; and/or discovering ways to alter the time-constraints.

ON THE AGENDA FOR SUNDAY

1. The identification and role of "Facilitators" and our role in relation to them.
2. "Community-vision" in the revised model.
3. Revisiting the Friday-model.

CIJE GOALS PROJECT CONSULTATION, JULY 1995
PROCEEDINGS OF DAY 1

INTRODUCTION

After a summary of a number of developments over the last few months, some of the concerns that gave rise to the consultation were articulated. To cite two examples:

1) CIJE has been invited to participate in a number of programs around a goals-agenda for some significant groups (e.g. Wexner, JCCs, Baltimore's central agency). Our recent experience in Atlanta is both encouraging but gives us pause as we approach these upcoming events. In an important sense, Atlanta was very successful -- there was great enthusiasm for what was accomplished, the engagement in the session was real, etc. On the other hand, we did not come away convinced that the struggle with content-issues was as rich or serious as we might have hoped and wondered whether for the participants this was more of a one-shot episode rather than an event that set the tone and the questions for further deliberations. This raises the question: what would be the most fruitful ways to approach these upcoming events so as to ensure an experience that is immediately rich but also has a fruitful after-life?

2) There have been serious questions concerning our readiness at this point in time to train and engage coaches to work with institutions. The questions pertain not just to the kinds of people who would make good coaches or to the nature of training, but more fundamentally to the nature of working with institutions and what one needs in the way of a knowledge-base and skills in order to do so effectively.

3) There have been some uncertainties concerning the appropriate working-relationship and division of labor in this enterprise between CIJE and the Mandel Institute.

Such concerns are among those the consultation needs to address. Most fundamentally, we want to get clearer concerning the following kinds of questions:

1. What is the fundamental mission of the Goals Project, and what goals flow from that mission?
2. What will it take to ready us to fulfill that mission, and how do we best proceed to arrive at this state of readiness?
3. What set of activities need to be at the heart of our work in light of our answers to #s 1 and 2?

4. What working-relationship between CIJE and the Mandel Institute will prove most fruitful in determining and carrying out the project's agenda?

It was suggested that the following criteria need to be satisfied in answering these questions: a) Genuine agreement on the part of all of us; b) decisions are consistent with commitments we've made; c) decisions will forward the CIJE agenda; and d) do-ability given the time and energy that are available to this project (a matter that we cannot afford to treat cavalierly!).

Following our agenda, our discussion began with the subject of the "Goals of the Goals Project" and built on the documents prepared by Marom and Pekarsky. In what follows, some of the main issues and points are reconstructed -- though not necessarily in the order in which they were expressed. I'm pretty sure I've lost a number of significant insights along the way and have misinterpreted other points; but I am hopeful that these will emerge in reactions to the summary.

GOALS PROJECT CONSULTATION, July 1995

BACKGROUND

Against a background of some uncertainty concerning both the future direction of the Goals Project and the best way for the Mandel Institute and CIJE to collaborate on this project, the primary tasks of this consultation are:

- a. to arrive at a shared sense of the project's mission and the goals that flow from this mission;
- b. to arrive at a shared sense of the principal activities through which the project's mission and goals will be achieved.
- c. to arrive at a shared sense of the roles of CIJE and the Mandel Institute in the development of the project - - in determining, implementing, and evaluating the project's priorities and activities. Included here is the identification of mechanisms that will facilitate more effective communication and coordination.
- d. to deepen our understanding of what is involved in working with institutions around a serious goals-agenda, with an eye towards refining our understanding of the skills, understandings, bodies of knowledge,, and sensibilities, needed by coaches who guide the efforts of institutions.

Preliminary discussions of this set of tasks have suggested that a better understanding of item d. may be invaluable when we consider items b. and c., and therefore the sequence for the proposed agenda looks like this:

1. MISSION AND GOALS OF THE GOALS PROJECT
2. WORKING WITH INSTITUTIONS: THE NATURE OF THE WORK (with participation of Rob Toren)
3. THE PRINCIPAL ACTIVITIES THAT THE PROJECT WILL UNDERTAKE
4. CONCEPTUALIZING AND OPERATIONALIZING THE CIJE/MANDEL INSTITUTE COLLABORATION IN THE GOALS PROJECT

Our work can be considered a success if we can achieve a measure of closure concerning our mission, our principal activities, and our collaborative relationship. Closure of a desirable kind implies: a) genuine agreement among those present; b) decisions made honor existing commitments; c) decisions made forward the CIJE agenda. The agenda is filled out below.

d) Done.

AGENDA

1. Overview (Pekarsky)

Review the consultation's tasks and agenda against background of developments since February.

2. The Goals of the Goals Project

Discussion of different views of the principal desirable outcomes around which the project should be organized.

Immediately relevant materials include Marom's letter to Pekarsky (summarizing some of his and Fox's thinking) and Pekarsky piece on "The Goals of the Goals Project." [It may be wise to take 10 minutes to review these documents at the beginning of the discussion since not everyone will have had the chance to see them prior to the meeting.]

Background materials you may want to consult along the way include Pekarsky's "Priorities" document and the summaries of the Oct. and Nov. Goals Project consultations.

3. "Working with Institutions"

Pertinent materials include the summary of our February consultation in Cambridge and Pekarsky's "Working with Institutions" piece.

a. Background presentation by Pekarsky concerning the status of the "working with institutions" agenda, with special attention to the progress made at our February meetings, other developments, and issues that have arisen since that time.

b. Examination of one or more cases, with an eye towards surfacing pertinent issues, strategies, and insights concerning the nature of working with institutions and the skills, knowledge-base, and understandings needed to carry out the work fruitfully. Designated participants have been asked to launch this discussion via one of two different routes, and we can decide as we move along which seems most promising:

i. examining a hypothetical case of an institution interested in serious self-improvement. We might consider how, given the information provided, we would proceed: what additional information we need, what initial activities seem promising, possible arenas in which to intervene, what kinds of outcomes we

would hope to attain, etc.

or
ii. considering some actual cases that relate to our on-going work, e.g. the Atlanta consultation relating to a new high school; the upcoming set of workshops for Baltimore's central agency; issues arising out of Marom's work with the Agnon School; the way to approach our upcoming work with select JCC camps.

c. An attempt to draw out some general points, hypotheses and questions concerning the nature of goals-oriented work with institutions, concerning institutional preconditions, etc.

d. Based on foregoing, revisit question of the characteristics needed by coaches.

3. Determination of priorities and activities

With attention to our discussions under items 1 and 2, identify priorities and activities that should define our efforts in the foreseeable future.

4. Determining roles and relationship of CIJE and the Mandel Institute in the development of the project.

TO: Participants in the July Cambridge Seminar
FROM: Daniel Pekarsky
RE: Goals for the Goals Project

As a way of helping to launch our attempt to develop a shared understanding of what the Goals Project is about, I am drafting this brief statement that articulates my own view of the basic goals around which this project should be organized. In order not to distract from the focus on basic goals, the identification of activities associated with each goal was developed separately in the second half of the document.

1. Cultivation of a vision-and-goals-sensitive culture.

The cultivation of a culture and a discourse (at national, communal, and institutional levels) that evidence an understanding and appreciation of the importance of seriously addressing basic questions pertaining to the goals of Jewish education. An important measure of success in this area is the extent to which communal and institutional planning processes involve serious efforts to wrestle with basic questions of vision and goals. Another index of success would be a demand on the part of institutions for CIJE help in undertaking a sustained and serious goals-process. The following must be cultivated:

a. An awareness of the multiple and critical roles that having a shared and compelling vision and set of goals can play in contributing to educational effectiveness - and of how far most educating institutions are from a vision-driven reality today.

b. A deep awareness that the process of deliberation concerning vision and goals is profoundly enriched by opportunities to study and ponder visions of an educated Jew and of a meaningful Jewish existence that can be found in Jewish religious thought and in the products of the Educated Jew Project.

c. An appreciation that engaging in this process of deliberation in the right way is itself an intrinsically rewarding opportunity to grow as a Jewish human being.

2. Development of the knowledge-base and the curricular resources needed to help appropriate educating institutions (and the agencies that support them) carry through a serious goals-agenda.

a. The requisite knowledge-base and resources must be developed with attention to the project's assumption that a serious goals-process includes as an integral component (and not as an aside or as a kind of perfunctory bow to Tradition) significant encounters

with conceptions of Jewish existence found within classical Jewish texts, Jewish philosophy, and the products of the Educated Jew Project. The knowledge-base must identify the kinds of conceptions and ideas that might infuse efforts to address questions of vision and goals, as well as strategies for successfully achieving this infusion.

b. The requisite knowledge-base and resources need to encompass ideas concerning at least the following: the institutional pre-conditions for taking on a goals-agenda; models that articulate the nature of work with institutions around a goals agenda, what would count as success, and the role of "coaches" in that process; possible levels of intervention and available strategies at different levels - along with considerations pertinent to determining level and strategy; the effects (unintended and intended) of engaging in a goals-process, as well as predictable tensions, concerns, and obstacles that will need to be contended with; the skills, knowledge (Judaic, pedagogical, and other), and sensibilities needed to "coach" an institution; evaluation-instruments that will forward the work of institutions in relation to goals and offer meaningful indices of progress.

Building on progress made with goals 1. and 2.,

3. Recruiting and training appropriate individuals to serve as coaches to institutions embarking on a Goals Agenda.

4. Develop a network of appropriate institutions pursuing a goals agenda under the guidance of the coaches identified and trained by the project. This is to be accompanied by on-going study of what happens with an eye toward developing an increasingly rich and fruitful body of lore.

ACTIVITIES ASSOCIATED WITH EACH OF THE PRINCIPAL GOALS

Goal 1: Towards a goals-sensitive culture and discourse.

Seminars, conferences, workshops, presentations aimed at carefully targeted constituencies. This effort must include the development of a range of strategies and materials that will enrich these activities and make it likely that they will have an enduring and fruitful impact (rather than being interesting events that may have no after-life). One of the challenges here is to find ways to more fully exploit opportunities that come our way - for example, with the Atlanta high school or with Baltimore's upcoming central agency retreat - to nurture a deeper appreciation of the importance of goals and how they can fruitfully be approached.

Development, production, and dissemination of articles and books and other materials that in compelling ways help to convey the insights and nurture the culture we hope to establish. This should be assumed to include the development of strategies and materials that will make it likely that these documents will be used in powerful and appropriate ways. Below are some representative activities:

Publication of the Educated Jew papers and the development of additional papers in the same general genre that will educate and stimulate thoughtful deliberation. Along with this, the development of materials, strategies, and exercises that will enhance the usefulness of these essays in work with lay and professional, communal and institutional, constituencies.

A vivid case-study -- perhaps a video -- of what happened, and especially of the good that came about, when an institution underwent a serious goals-process;

An "educational utopia" based on, say, Greenberg's ideas - a vision-driven institution organized around his ideal. Or perhaps a book that offers three or four different ways Greenberg's ideas might be used as guides to educational change.

A careful effort to ensure that all dimensions of CIJE's work in such areas as personnel development, community mobilization, and Monitoring and Evaluation are sensitive to and advance the concerns at the heart of the Goals Project.

Goal 2: Developing the knowledge-base and curricular resources needed to facilitate a goals-process in an educating institution.

Pilot projects/Case studies: Carefully monitored and documented work on a goals agenda with a few carefully selected institutions.

High-level seminars designed to examine, improve, and learn from the work going on in the field and to work towards the development of materials and strategies that will forward the work. It will be especially important to develop effective ways of engaging institutional participants in serious reflection on Jewish content and practical deliberations that build on this reflection. [See, in this connection, Marom's companion piece which specifies important kinds of engagement with Jewish content that need to be encouraged among communal and institutional constituencies. A major challenge is to discover productive ways of engaging them in such study and reflection and infusing their practical deliberations with themes and questions that emerge from such study.]

Careful written accounts that distill what is learned through the preceding activities about the nature of the work, about useful strategies, about obstacles, about foreseen and unforeseen outcomes, about the nature of effective coaching, and about the characteristics that make for a good coach.

Basic and applied research activities designed to illuminate our understanding of such matters as the nature of work with educating institutions and communal agencies and the kinds of outcomes to be sought; the kinds of philosophical ideas about Judaism and Jewish existence that it would be fruitful to infuse into institutional and communal deliberations, along with ideas about how to effectively do this. Also efforts to produce appropriate tools -- especially, for example, in the area of evaluation.

Goal 3: Identifying, recruiting, and training coaches.

Workshops and seminars that include immersion in the philosophy of the project and in the work of the Educated Jew Project, a lot of work with cases designed to help participants become more adept at judging when, where, how, and why to intervene; opportunities for clinical work. The training builds on and uses understandings, materials, and strategies developed through the work subsumed under Goal 2.

Goal 4: Towards a network of vision-driven institutions.

Develop criteria to determine appropriateness to undertake a Goals-process under our auspices. This means articulating principles of readiness and seriousness. It may prove appropriate to establish different levels of participation depending on the institution's readiness-stage (rather than taking an all-or-nothing stance).

Identify appropriate institutions through a process we need to determine.

Pair institutions with coaches so that the work can begin

and work out financial and other logistical arrangements.

Periodic seminars, workshops for the coaches that afford opportunities to share and examine what they are learning, to explore pertinent problems, to contribute to our own knowledge-base, and to become acquainted with new ideas.

Periodic opportunities for key stake holders in participating institutions to actively network and to learn from one another's experience.

MEMO TO: Alan Hoffmann and Barry Holtz
FROM: DP
RE: GOALS PROJECT PRIORITIES
DATE: June 15, 1995

This is a follow-up to a preliminary conversation Alan and I had concerning Goals Project priorities for the coming year. In general terms, the situation is like this: there are a number of things in the hopper, some of them definite and some of them less certain. If all of them actually come about, we may be on overload, but it's not clear that all of them will come about or what, if they do come about, they will demand. More importantly, given the number of activities we will potentially be involved with, we may be in danger of losing focus -- of diffusing our limited energies and finding ourselves in a reactive mode (simply responding to requests that happen to come our way). It is therefore critical that we step back and determine what we believe it most important to focus on in light of resources, capacity, and needs. This will, I hope, be at the center of the upcoming conversation between the three of us.

As background to our conversation, I will do the following below: a) lay out our projected activities; b) identify the 3 major directions which, in varied combinations, we might pursue; c) discuss how we might reasonably proceed in relation to the larger purposes of the Goals Project and CIJE. My hope is that by the end of our July meetings, if not before, we (a "we" that includes our Jerusalem partners) will emerge with an agenda that feels sufficiently shared, clear, meaningful, and do-able to permit us to move along expeditiously.

In sketching out the range of things we are thinking about and or committed to doing, my intention is to put before us the kinds of data we need to deliberate concerning our priorities and possibilities. But in addition to this and for purposes of stimulating some pertinent discussion, I also put forward a substantive proposal towards the end of the document. This proposal explores a possibility that Alan and I briefly considered during our New York conversation -- namely, what would the Goals Project look like in the immediate and long-term future if we take seriously the concerns we have been recently discussed regarding our immediate readiness to proceed with the coaching-agenda? What would the Goals Project look like if the coaching-agenda were not the center-piece (at least in the short run)? I am aware that the proposal I make may be politically problematic, but I will rest easier knowing it has at least been seriously considered.

I look forward to discussing these matters with you.

PROJECTED ACTIVITIES

1. Milwaukee.

I have been in active conversation with 3 institutions concerning Goals Project work next year (See the materials sent concerning Beth Israel, Sinai, and Milwaukee Jewish Day School). It is conceivable that I will in different ways work with each of these institutions as they begin to pursue a Goals Project agenda. In addition, Jay Roth and I spoke in mid-April concerning our involvement with the JCC's efforts to develop a Goals agenda. He envisaged an initial meeting followed by a day-long retreat. Which, if any, of these institutions will follow-through in a serious way -- and what that might mean - remains unclear.

2. Baltimore.

I have been in conversation with Marci Dickman concerning a set of programs designed to encourage her central agency to become more thoughtful concerning their underlying vision and priorities. We have tentatively spoken of an all-day retreat scheduled for Oct. 22, preceded by a shorter preparatory session scheduled the preceding month. Whether and how this has the potential to grow beyond these sessions -- perhaps to institutional levels - remains uncertain; but it does strike me that this program may offer the Goals Project a chance to get more involved in Baltimore.

3. Atlanta.

Gail and I have both been in conversation with Steve Chervin concerning possible Goals Project involvement there. As I understand it, they have been encouraging local institutions to enter into a process of self-renewal, a process that prominently includes a vision/goals component. He has suggested the possibility that we be involved in that process; but exactly how, and what it would demand of us, remains unclear.

4. Cleveland.

There are two areas of possible involvement in Cleveland. First, two institutional efforts that have a strong Goals-component seem to be developing in Cleveland -- one of them at Agnon and the other, largely through Rob Toren's initiative, at the Schechter school. Through Rob and Marom, we may want to carefully track both of these efforts next year; and we need to consider the ways in which we do or don't want to be involved. An immediate possibility for involvement that has arisen in conversation with Toren is that I lead a set of Goals Seminars for stake holders in these two institutions as part of their process of institutional improvement; whether or not other institutions or communal stake holders would be invited remains unclear. Given changes going on in other institutions, for example, Park Synagogue, which is in process of getting a new director, it might be wise to include other institutions as well.

The second area of possible involvement in Cleveland has only

begun to come into focus. There is now serious conversation going on concerning Beth Torah -- a Hebrew-oriented supplementary school that is made up of children from three major Conservative congregations in town (Park, Bnai Yeshurun, and Beth Am). In recent years, children have gone to their respective congregations for Sunday programs (with a non-Hebrew emphasis) and to Beth Torah during the week. The question is whether Beth Torah should survive at all, and if so, in what form. As Toren and Gurvis see it, this question needs to be addressed in relation to larger issues of community- and institutional-goals. In conversation amongst themselves, they began thinking that perhaps CIJE could be helpful in this process.

5. Wexner Seminar

I will be involved - as will all of you - in the Wexner retreat scheduled for early December. As best I can tell, this is a one-shot deal, and that my primary work will be in planning and preparing facilitators for the very first session. This is an opportunity to communicate the importance of vision/goals to the Wexner graduates -- but Lauffer (or is it Lauffman?) has eaten away at some of the program's potential with his own program conception. It may be worth our having a conversation about whether we would like to see our involvement with this effort as the beginning of a longer-term involvement with the organization or its graduates. I met with Paley and Lauffer last week in NY, and I have a meeting in New York with Paley scheduled for the Monday after our August 25 meeting.

6. The JCC Seminar

Some time this fall or winter is the projected seminar for a number of JCC institutions. I am not entirely clear at this point a) who will be participating; b) what would count as a desirable outcome; and c) what follow-up work is imagined. [Note: since drafting this paragraph, Barry has clarified some of this for me, but I would profit from further conversations.]

7. Furthering the Coaching-agenda.

Three projects are in the planning. The first is the small seminar scheduled for mid-July, intended for us, for the Mandel Institute folks, and for Scheffler. My understanding is that our challenge at this seminar is to further clarify the work of coaches with attention to three issues: a) what skills, understandings, sensitivities, etc. do coaches need?; b) what's the best way to train them?; and against this background and more practically, c) who should be recruited, how should they be trained, and when should the training begin?

The second project (which tentatively presumes a certain answer to question c. in the preceding paragraph) is that in January

of 1996 we hold a seminar for prospective coaches, designed to initiate them into the work, with an eye towards deciding who among them are the most promising and perhaps beginning to think about where to assign them.

The third project, pointed to above, consists in efforts by Pekarsky and hopefully Marom and Toren to get involved with educating institutions as a way of enriching our knowledge-base in the area of coaching institutions.

8. Whereas 1 - 7 reflect efforts that we have committed to and/or been leaning towards, we have also had serious discussions concerning the following:

a. Regional Goals Seminars, to be held around the country.

b. A national Goals Seminar, on the Harvard Model, to be held in Jerusalem or Cambridge next summer.

9. Distinct from 1 - 8 in that we have never moved beyond the "It might be interesting and important..." stage are the various activities associated with the Community Vision agenda (including: writing a serious think-piece; getting Rosenak's piece edited and made available; a serious seminar designed to better understand the nature and importance of this domain, etc. See my recent paper for some thoughts about this.)

THE THREE MAJOR DIRECTIONS

If we review the various activities we've committed ourselves to or are thinking about, there emerge three general and variously inter-related directions which need to be prioritized and balanced in a meaningful way.

a. Changing the culture and the discourse in Jewish education so that issues of vision and goals become part of the conversation: the Goals Seminars. Goals Seminars aimed at communal leadership, at central agencies, at educating institutions (individually or in groups) are designed to change the discourse among those interested in Jewish education -- to provide new lenses through which to view educational practice and to stimulate serious reflection concerning underlying vision and goals. Such seminars have to date included "one-shot" programs as well as more sustained educational encounters. But there has yet to be a seminar that includes the kind of sustained study that we have sometimes hoped for. While such seminars have been viewed as essential to the coaching-agenda (in that they may be a source of interested institutions), they have also been viewed as possibly integral to the Community Mobilization agenda.

b. Encouraging and facilitating work with educating institutions: the coaching agenda. The coaching-agenda is concerned with helping a seriously committed educating institution make serious progress on a goals-agenda with the help of a CIJE-trained professional. The work of the Coach has been the subject of our discussion on a number of occasions, most notably in Cambridge in February, 1995.

c. The Community Vision agenda. There has been a lot of interest on the part of a number of our constituencies in the subject of "community-vision": what would it mean - and how would it help - to be "a vision-driven community", and how might such a vision arise? My recent paper on the subject is an attempt to try out some ideas concerning what it might mean to pursue this agenda in a reasonably serious way.

REFLECTIONS ON THE MENU

Uncertainties. Various uncertainties contribute to the difficulty of choosing from among this menu of possibilities. Most notably, when we scan the list of activities that we've projected, it is not clear whether each and every one of them will pan out and what will grow out of those that do pan out. As an example of the latter point, even assuming a slew of Goals Seminars that excite representatives of communities and educating institutions, we don't know how many institutions will be eager and able to take the next step -- to commit to a serious Goals Agenda will require; and this uncertainty has a bearing on the number of coaches we need to be cultivating.

Considerations relevant to prioritization. In the face of such uncertainties and limited resources, it is all the more important that we be very clear about what our priorities are, so that we know how to react to the possibilities that come our way and can set about systematically shaping the project's future. For without an overall game-plan, we may well get caught responding in an ad hoc way to various requests that come our way. Prioritizing our possible efforts and weaving them into a coherent plan should be based on such matters as 1) outstanding commitments and expectations; 2) foreseeable contribution to the larger CIJE agenda and, more narrowly, to the outcomes we envisage for the Goals Project; 3) necessary and available resources, including time, money and competence.

Note that we have discussed these matters before -- most extensively at our November 1994 meetings with Seymour and Annette (see the appendix to this document for the relevant text from that discussion). Based on that discussion and on our experience since that time (including recent conversations with Seymour), I will propose a 5-Year Plan for the Goals Project that should guide our decisions and allocation of energies.

3 AND 5-YEAR OUTCOMES

The outcomes described below reflect what we should strive for over the next five years. Not all these outcomes need be sought after immediately; proceeding in stages might prove wiser. In this spirit, I propose a two-stage plan, the first two years in length and the second three years. I have starred the outcomes that might be the focus of our immediate efforts for the first two-year period; the others, while in some cases launched in the initial period, are the principal objects of attention in the second stage.

*1. A broad awareness among critical constituencies at a variety of levels concerning the importance of the goals agenda, of its feasibility, of work being done in this area. This dissemination to be accomplished via seminars, publications, film, conferences for different constituencies, etc. It is critical that this "consciousness-raising" be done in ways that include and highlight the importance of serious study of Jewish sources that speak to issues of goals and vision.

*2. Case-studies of institutional efforts to become better organized around a goals-agenda.

*3. Out of the first-order work in institutions and its analysis in the case-studies, we would acquire an articulated body of lore that includes:

a. strategies and models that can guide efforts at institutional improvement;

b. identification of skills, understandings, and aptitudes that are needed by those guiding the process of change;

c. identification of institutional "readiness-conditions" if meaningful change is to take place;

d. documentation of some of the effects (expected and unexpected) of taking on a goals-agenda;

e. identification of important issues, tensions, etc. that need to be addressed, either by institutions embarking on a change-process or national organizations like CIJE seeking to catalyze this kind of change.

*4. The development evaluation tools (that would be usable in the future by other institutions undergoing a change process). These tools would include:

a. an instrument for taking an initial snapshot of an institution, a look at reality that focuses on avowed goals, on their implementation, and on educational outcomes;

b. an instrument for assessing the results of having engaged in a serious effort to become more goals-sensitive.

5. The development of a cadre of resource-people, identified and cultivated by CIJE who have been, and will continue to be involved in helping institutions become better organized around a Goals agenda.

6. Guided by the resource-people identified in 5., an expanding community of partnered institutions, each engaged in a goals-agenda and offering their experiences and their ideas to one another on a regular basis.

In the first stage (1-4), the thrust of this plan is to do two things:

a) to emphasize, exploit, and expand the Project's potential to raise consciousness concerning the importance and role of vision and goals in Jewish education. This would include an ongoing effort to improve our Goals Seminars, with special attention i) to finding ways of introducing more serious study into them, and ii) to developing follow-up activities. In addition to enabling us to identify institutions that seem promising candidates to engage in a serious goals-process, this effort will contribute to the Community Mobilization agenda. Also, depending on the outcome of future deliberations, it could also include a "community-vision" dimension.

b. to use a limited number of case-studies as opportunities to build our knowledge-base concerning various matters, including: the nature and conditions of change, the role of coaches, evaluation-strategies, and the like.

In the second stage, the achievements at the first stage would become the basis for training a cadre of coaches, for extensive work with varied institutions, and for the coalition-idea.

The proposal tries to be responsive to a number of concerns surrounding our readiness at this moment to proceed to the full-fledged coaching agenda. 1) Since we don't yet know very much about how the goals-process plays out in institutions, we are not as ready as we might want to be to train a cadre of coaches; 2) Until we grow clearer, via Pilot Projects, about how to facilitate an institutional goals process, it may be wise not to get involved with too many institutions; 3) It is not yet clear that there is yet an eager clientele among institutions for what we are proposing.

I hope this doesn't sound too cautious. My own view is that this plan allows for addressing major CIJE priorities and commitments as well as for significant research at both stages of the process. If there is a strong need, political or otherwise, to move on with the coaching-agenda in Stage 1, I do believe this can be done in a meaningful way, but I think we would need to be extremely careful in selecting institutions, rather than trying to expand too fast. This is not just a question of whether we are ready to work with a large number of institutions; it is also imperative that we resist the assumption that any institution whatsoever that says "We're ready to do this with you!" is really "ready" to pursue a Goals-agenda in a serious way. As we've said on numerous occasions, unless an institution is really serious, the results - for them and for us - are not likely to be good ones. We cannot afford to lose sight of this principle.

APPENDIX: OUTCOMES-DISCUSSION AT THE NOV. '94 MEETINGS

This examination began with Pekarsky offering two different accounts of what Goals Project "success" might look like. A) The first, prompted by a comment by Annette Hochstein in the first part of the day, set forth some very general long-term goals (that were not, at least by design, tied to the October plan. B) The second identified what success might look like if we fully exploited the potentialities of the October-plan.

A) General long-term goals - three were identified:

1. Increasing numbers of institutions organized around a goals-agenda that includes serious wrestling with issues of content.
2. Heavy emphasis in communal planning processes on the place of goals in Jewish education.
3. A National Center for the Study and Development of Goals for Jewish Education (or the "Center for Research in the Philosophy of Jewish Education"). The Center would:
 - a) conduct original research concerning the goals of Jewish education, as well as concerning implementation, and evaluation. Such work might, for example, include a Jewish version of the two HORACE books or Carnegie's "The Future As History" chapter;
 - b) develop strategies to disseminate its research findings in ways likely to make an impact;
 - c) educate key professional and lay constituencies concerning matters pertaining to the goals-agenda;
 - d) develop and make available expertise that will inform the efforts of communities and institutions that seek to become more adequately organized around a goals-agenda.

B) What would success look like for the October Plan?

1. Case-studies of institutional efforts to become better organized around a goals-agenda.
2. Out of the first-order work in institutions and its analysis in the case-studies, we would acquired an

articulated body of lore that includes:

- a. strategies and models that can guide efforts at institutional improvement;
 - b. identification of skills, understandings, and aptitudes that are needed by those guiding the process of change;
 - c. identification of institutional "readiness-conditions" if meaningful change is to take place;
 - d. documentation of some of the effects (expected and unexpected) of taking on a goals-agenda;
 - e. identification of important issues, tensions, etc. that need to be addressed, either by institutions embarking on a change-process or national organizations like CIJE seeking to catalyze this kind of change.
3. The development evaluation tools (that would be usable in the future by other institutions undergoing a change process). These tools would include:
- a. an instrument for taking an initial snapshot of an institution, a look at reality that focuses on avowed goals, on their implementation, and on educational outcomes;
 - b. an instrument for assessing the results of having engaged in a serious effort to become more goals-sensitive.
4. The development of a cadre of resource-people, identified and cultivated by CIJE who have been, and will continue to be involved in helping institutions become better organized around a Goals agenda.
5. From among the institutions identified in #1, a community of partnered institutions each engaged in a goals-agenda and offering their experiences and their ideas to one another on a regular basis.
6. A broad awareness among critical constituencies at a variety of levels concerning the importance of the goals agenda, of its feasibility, of work being done in this area. This dissemination to be accomplished via publications, film, conferences for different

From: Daniel Pekarsky at ☐ 608-233-4044
To: CIJE at ☐ 12125322646

⊕ 06-25-95 11:26 pm
☐ 013 of 013

constituencies, etc.

MEMO TO: Seymour Fox and Daniel Marom
FROM: Daniel Pekarsky
RE: the July Seminar in Cambridge
DATE: June 5, 1995

As promised, I'm sending along some thoughts that might serve as a springboard to conversations over the next several weeks concerning the agenda and materials around which to organize our July seminar in Cambridge. I have, by the way, not yet confirmed Gerstein's attendance; but I did, following my conversation with Seymour, invite Rob Toren, and he, after conversation with Gurvis, indicated that he would enthusiastically attend. In my conversation with him, I floated the possibility of his working with a JCC, and he seemed amenable. It is worth noting, though, that in his Jewish Education Center of Cleveland role he will be working next year with the local Schechter School on questions that substantially overlap our project.

Following the advice Seymour offered on another occasion, I will stay away from actual seminar content on this occasion in order to focus on desirable outcomes. For your reference, I am including two additional pieces of material at the end of this memo. One of them is the list of tentative outcomes I had proposed when we were thinking about the larger end-of-July seminar; my sense is that some, but certainly not all of them, continue to be pertinent. The other is a copy of a document concerning the nature of coaching entitled "Working with Institutions" which, based in part on our meetings last winter in Cambridge, I drafted earlier this year. I may or may not have already sent it to you; but I thought it might be a useful document to work with.

SEMINAR OUTCOMES

In very general terms and as a first approximation, my understanding is that the July seminar is designed a) to deepen our understanding of the activities and purposes associated with coaching educating institutions in the direction of greater vision-drivenness, with an eye towards b) better understanding the skills and understandings needed by coaches and c) clarifying the critical elements that need to enter into a training-seminar for coaches. (Note that I use the word "coach" more out of habit than out of conviction - for I'm not sure that the word adequately captures the work of the person who is to serve as a guide/gadfly to educating institutions).

As a first approximation, I want to suggest that these general purposes will be best achieved if we accomplish the following at the seminar:

1. Revisit and, if necessary, expand on the general conception of the coach's mission that we discussed in February. As a springboard, see Pekarsky's brief document "Working with

Institutions..."

2. Clarify the minimal (institutional) conditions under which a relationship between CIJE and an educating institution around a goals/vision agenda is likely to prove fruitful.

3. With attention to local circumstances that have a bearing on appropriateness, articulate and refine the kinds of strategies that are likely to raise the level of consciousness and discussion concerning goals and to stimulate serious reflection and study that is more than values-clarification.

4. A corollary of #3: identify fruitful ways of launching the relationship between CIJE and an educating institution. What should the coach say, offer, stipulate, recommend, ask, do, insist on, request, organize, etc. at the outset in order to get the process off to a good start? What should the coach avoid doing? In answering such questions in concrete cases, what circumstances need to be taken into account?

5. Clarify different degrees of success to be aspired to in working with an educating institution. What would success in a full or partial sense look like?

6. Understand other approaches to educational change (notably Senge/Fullan and Sizer), with an eye towards grasping how our approach differs from theirs and also what we might learn from them that would be helpful to our efforts.

7. Clarify how experimental fieldwork now under way (through via Pekarsky and Marom) can provide insight into the aims, processes, and challenges of coaching educating institutions.

8. Based on 1 through 7, what are the skills and understandings that a coach needs in order to be an effective catalyst and facilitator of a vision/goals agenda? And, related to this, what should a coaches training-seminar focus on?

8. Finally, last but by no means least, clarify the working relationship and communication-patterns between CIJE and the Mandel Institute on the Goals Project, so that in an ongoing way our efforts will be complementary.

Though the foregoing represents my real views at this moment in time, I also regard it as no more than a conversation-starter and welcome your reactions.

I want to note that I view #8 as very important and believe it should occupy us on the first day of the seminar - either for half the day or the full day. I have alerted both Toren and Gerstein to the possibility that there will be a closed meeting at some point during our seminar to discuss what I described to them as "house-keeping" matters.

I look forward to hearing from you. I'll be in New York for the CIJE meetings from Wednesday to Friday and will then be in Madison pretty much for the rest of the month. All the best.

APPENDIX 1: OUTCOMES IDENTIFIED IN EARLIER MEMO SKETCHING OUT THE SUMMER SEMINAR (scheduled for end of July, but postponed)

1. Deep familiarity with basic concepts, assumptions, and materials associated with the Goals Project and the Educated Jew Project. This familiarity includes an appreciation for the power of these concepts, assumptions and materials.
2. An awareness of other prominent approaches to institutional reform, and how these approaches relate to - and differ from - our own. Attention needs to be paid to what can be learned from other approaches, even as we recognize their limitations.
3. An ability to use the Project's concepts and principles as lenses through which to interpret the state of goals in the life of an institution - in ways that suggest critical questions that need to be raised.
4. An awareness of the different levels at which one "can cut in" to the problem, and of different strategies that can be used (at different levels) to stimulate serious reflection concerning vision and goals (and their relationship to existing practice and outcomes). There need to be opportunities to experiment with these strategies in the course of our seminar. Participants also need to emerge from the seminar with some sense of the appropriate level at which to intervene in any given institution.
5. An awareness of the sources of resistance to a serious inquiry into an institution's basic goals and their relationship to practice, as well as of the ways to defuse, circumvent, or exploit this resistance.
6. Awareness of the kinds of conditions that must obtain in an institution if one is to have a fighting chance of making progress on a goals-agenda.
7. Excitement about being part of a pioneering venture that is in its formative stages and that offers participants a chance to engage in and to share "action research".

APPENDIX 2: PEKARSKY'S "WORKING WITH INSTITUTIONS" DOCUMENT,
DRAFTED IN LIGHT OF OUR FEBRUARY, 1995 SEMINAR.

WORKING WITH INSTITUTIONS:
THE GOALS PROJECT AGENDA

INTRODUCTION

The CIJE proposes to work with select institutions around a goals-agenda. Its guiding convictions are:

1. Thoughtfully arrived at goals play a critical role in the work of an educating institution. They help to focus energy that would otherwise be dissipated in all-too-many directions; they provide a basis for making decisions concerning curriculum, personnel, pedagogy, and social organization; they offer a basis for evaluation, which is itself essential to progress; and, if genuinely believed in, they can be very motivating to those involved.

2. In Jewish educating institutions, as in many others,

there is inadequate attention to goals. All too often, one or more of the following obtain: goals are absent or too vague to offer any guidance; they are inadequately represented in practice; they are not understood or identified with in any strong way by key-stake holders; they are not grounded in some conception of a meaningful Jewish life which would justify their importance.

Goals Project work with institutions would focus on remedying these deficiencies. The following discussion tries to explain the presuppositions and the nature of this work.

WORK WITH INSTITUTIONS

Presuppositions. CIJE's work with institutions around a Goals Agenda is informed by a number of critical assumptions, including the following:

- a. Key stake holders need to be committed to the effort to work on a goals-agenda.
- b. Wrestling with issues of Jewish content is an integral, though not the only, element in the process.
- c. A coach identified and cultivated by CIJE will work with the institution around the Goals Agenda. (The work of the coach is described more fully below.)
- d. The institution will identify a Lead Team that will

be in charge of its efforts and work with the coach in designing appropriate strategies. The Lead Team will have primary responsibility for implementing the plan.

e. The institution's Lead Team will be invited to participate in seminars, workshops, and other activities designed to enhance their effectiveness. This may well include the development of a partnership with the Lead Team of one or two other institutions engaged in similar efforts at improvement.

f. There is no one strategy for encouraging fruitful wrestling with goals-related issues. Whether to begin with lay leaders, with parents, with the principal and/or with teachers; whether to start with mission-statement, curriculum, and/or evaluation -- such matters need to be decided on a case-by-case basis by the institution's lead-team in consultation with CIJE.

The heart of the work. The essence of the work that will be done with institutions under the auspices of the Goals Project has three dimensions:

1. A serious, multi-faceted examination of the way goals do and don't fit into the institution's efforts at present. This phase of the work is designed to identify the institution's challenges by highlighting weaknesses: for example, unduly vague goals, inconsistent goals, goals that are lacking in support by key stake holders, goals that are not reflected in practice in meaningful ways.

2. Reflection and deliberation. Stake holders engage in a thoughtful effort to wrestle with the uncertainties and challenges identified through #1. This effort includes a serious effort to clarify their fundamental educational priorities, through a process that includes wrestling with issues of Jewish content. Materials emanating from the Mandel Institute's Educated Jew Project will be invaluable to this effort. This stage will give rise to basic decisions concerning what needs to be accomplished.

3. The institution determines what needs to happen and be done in order that the basic decisions articulated in #2 can be accomplished. Strategies need to be developed and then implemented.

4. The effort to implement needs to be carefully monitored and the outcomes evaluated. This is indispensable if there is to be learning and a chance of serious mid-course corrections in aims and/or strategies.

The work of the coach. The coach is involved in all phases of this work. The coach works with key constituencies (separately and sometimes together) and wears a number of hats: he or she is sometimes a consultant on questions of strategy; sometimes a bridge to extra-institutional resources that are necessary to the effort; sometimes a thoughtful critic of directions for change that are proposed. In these and in other matters, the coach's primary job is to help the institution get clearer about its primary goals and their relationship to practice.

The initial and perhaps most important challenge of the coach is to stimulate the institution to do the kind of serious examination and self-examination that will identify its critical challenges. This means posing basic questions of different kinds, although which ones it will be fruitful to ask at any given time will depend heavily on local circumstances. Below is a list of some of the basic questions:

1. What are your avowed goals (as found in the opinion of key stake holders, as found in mission statements, as found in the curriculum)?
2. Are the avowed goals (as articulated or implicit in these different ways) clear or are they very vague? Do the participants understand what they mean and entail?
3. Are the various avowed goals mutually consistent?
4. Do the key stake holders - lead-educators, parents, and teachers - really believe in these goals?
5. If the stake holders do believe in these goals, why do they believe they are important? How will accomplishing them help make the life of the student as a Jewish human being more meaningful in the short- and/or long-run?
6. Are the goals anchored in an underlying vision of a meaningful Jewish existence? Can the stake holders flesh out the vision that is implicit in the goals they have identified as important?
7. As a way of better understanding what they are committed to or might be committed to in #s 5 and 6, have the stake holders looked seriously at alternative views?
8. In what ways and to what extent are the avowed goals actually reflected in the life of the institution - in its social organization, in its pedagogy, in what happens in classrooms, etc.?
9. To what extent are the goals achieved? To what extent are actual educational outcomes consistent with the goals?
10. If you were serious about Goal X or Y, what would you need

to do in order to have a realistic shot at accomplishing it?

[ca MAY 1995]

MEMO TO: Seymour Fox and Daniel Marom
FROM: Daniel Pekarsky
RE: Coaches Seminar

As we agreed, I'm sending along some material that can be used as a starting-point for our conversation on Tuesday. I'll begin with a few comments concerning the projected invitees and then move on to discuss what seem to be some reasonable outcomes to expect. I won't be addressing the insides of the seminar -- "the how", but some preliminary work has been done in this area (See Marom's memo on this matter about a month ago).

INVITEES

Discussions concerning who to invite originally tended in two opposite directions -- with one side urging a small, intimate group of people we felt very sure of and with whom we could "go backstage", and the other side urging a large group of up to 25. In the course of deliberations over the last month and a half, a compromise-position was arrived at: we would aim for a group of some 10 to 15 individuals. The rationale for going beyond a very small group (my original preference) was 1) that for a variety of reasons some of the people we might identify as promising would turn out not to be appropriate or not to be able to serve as coaches, and 2) in inviting a somewhat larger group, we need not commit ourselves to employing all of them as CIJE-coaches down the road. Indeed, we assume that we'll discover - or they will - that some of them are not suitable to this kind of a project.

In trying to identify individuals to invite to the conference, we relied on a number of criteria (though we didn't insist that each candidate satisfy each and every one of them). These criteria included: 1) a philosophic bent; 2) good Judaic knowledge-base; 3) deep familiarity with one or more Jewish educational settings; 4) strong interpersonal skills, suggesting an ability to work with a number of different constituencies; and 5) the kind of good judgment that is necessary to decide whether, where, when, and how to intervene - or how to respond.

In addition to these general criteria, we've tried to take into account gender, denominational leanings, and geographical location.

Thus far, we've come up with the following:

YES: Rob Toren, Kyla Epstein, Elaine Cohen, Alisa Kurshan, Alvan Kaunfer, Shelly Kniaz, Jody Hirsch, Bernie Steinberg, Tzvia Blumberg, Nechama Tamler.

Maybe: David Ackerman, Stuart Seltzer, Danny Margolis, Susan Shevitz, Steve Chervin.

Yet-to-be-contacted: Marcie Dickman.

We've been wondering about the suitability of Cindy Levine and Jack Bieler. Any thoughts??

OUTCOMES

1. Deep familiarity with basic concepts, assumptions, and materials associated with the Goals Project and the Educated Jew Project. This familiarity includes an appreciation for the power of these concepts, assumptions and materials.
2. An awareness of other prominent approaches to institutional reform, and how these approaches relate to - and differ from - our own. Attention needs to be paid to what can be learned from other approaches, even as we recognize their limitations.
3. An ability to use the Project's concepts and principles as lenses through which to interpret the state of goals in the life of an institution - in ways that suggest critical questions that need to be raised.
4. An awareness of the different levels at which one "can cut in" to the problem, and of different strategies that can be used (at different levels) to stimulate serious reflection concerning vision and goals (and their relationship to existing practice and outcomes). There need to be opportunities to experiment with these strategies in the course of our seminar. Participants also need to emerge from the seminar with some sense of the appropriate level at which to intervene in any given institution.
5. An awareness of the sources of resistance to a serious inquiry into an institution's basic goals and their relationship to practice, as well as of the ways to defuse, circumvent, or exploit this resistance.
6. Awareness of the kinds of conditions that must obtain in an institution if one is to have a fighting chance of making progress on a goals-agenda.
7. Excitement about being part of a pioneering venture that is in its formative stages and that offers participants a chance to engage in and to share "action research".

I hope this proves a helpful start in launching our conversations concerning the seminar. Keep in mind that to date it looks like Amy Gerstein (of the Coalition for Essential Schools) will participate, but it looks like Greenberg and Scheffler will not be available. Note, though, that Alan won't concede their absence and thinks that an upcoming trip of mine out East may operate to change their plans. Marom will be coming, and it is possible that Seymour Fox will as well.

Incomplete and crude though this may be, I'm sending it along in

hopes of its stimulating fruitful conversation.

P.S. I am also faxing a short document on "Working with Institutions" that may prove helpful in thinking about our seminar.

WORKING WITH INSTITUTIONS:
THE GOALS PROJECT AGENDA

INTRODUCTION

The CIJE proposes to work with select institutions around a goals-agenda. Its guiding convictions are:

1. Thoughtfully arrived at goals play a critical role in the work of an educating institution. They help to focus energy that would otherwise be dissipated in all-too-many directions; they provide a basis for making decisions concerning curriculum, personnel, pedagogy, and social organization; they offer a basis for evaluation, which is itself essential to progress; and, if genuinely believed in, they can be very motivating to those involved.

2. In Jewish educating institutions, as in many others, there is inadequate attention to goals. All too often, one or more of the following obtain: goals are absent or too vague to offer any guidance; they are inadequately represented in practice; they are not understood or identified with in any strong way by key-stake holders; they are not grounded in some conception of a meaningful Jewish life which would justify their importance.

Goals Project work with institutions would focus on remedying these deficiencies. The following discussion tries to explain the presuppositions and the nature of this work.

WORK WITH INSTITUTIONS

Presuppositions. CIJE's work with institutions around a Goals Agenda is informed by a number of critical assumptions, including the following:

- a. Key stake holders need to be committed to the effort to work on a goals-agenda.
- b. Wrestling with issues of Jewish content is an integral, though not the only, element in the process.

c. A coach identified and cultivated by CIJE will work with the institution around the Goals Agenda. (The work of the coach is described more fully below.)

d. The institution will identify a Lead Team that will be in charge of its efforts and work with the coach in designing appropriate strategies. The Lead Team will have primary responsibility for implementing the plan.

e. The institution's Lead Team will be invited to participate in seminars, workshops, and other activities designed to enhance their effectiveness. This may well include the development of a partnership with the Lead Team of one or two other institutions engaged in similar efforts at improvement.

f. There is no one strategy for encouraging fruitful wrestling with goals-related issues. Whether to begin with lay leaders, with parents, with the principal and/or with teachers; whether to start with mission-statement, curriculum, and/or evaluation -- such matters need to be decided on a case-by-case basis by the institution's lead-team in consultation with CIJE.

The heart of the work. The essence of the work that will be done with institutions under the auspices of the Goals Project has three dimensions:

1. A serious, multi-faceted examination of the way goals do and don't fit into the institution's efforts at present. This phase of the work is designed to identify the institution's challenges by highlighting weaknesses: for example, unduly vague goals, inconsistent goals, goals that are lacking in support by key stake holders, goals that are not reflected in practice in meaningful ways.

2. Reflection and deliberation. Stake holders engage in a thoughtful effort to wrestle with the uncertainties and challenges identified through #1. This effort includes a serious effort to clarify their fundamental educational priorities, through a process that includes wrestling with issues of Jewish content. Materials emanating from the Mandel Institute's Educated Jew

Project will be invaluable to this effort. This stage will give rise to basic decisions concerning what needs to be accomplished.

3. The institution determines what needs to happen and be done in order that the basic decisions articulated in #2 can be accomplished. Strategies need to be developed and then implemented.

4. The effort to implement needs to be carefully monitored and the outcomes evaluated. This is indispensable if there is to be learning and a chance of serious mid-course corrections in aims and/or strategies.

The work of the coach. The coach is involved in all phases of this work. The coach works with key constituencies (separately and sometimes together) and wears a number of hats: he or she is sometimes a consultant on questions of strategy; sometimes a bridge to extra-institutional resources that are necessary to the effort; sometimes a thoughtful critic of directions for change that are proposed. In these and in other matters, the coach's primary job is to help the institution get clearer about its primary goals and their relationship to practice.

The initial and perhaps most important challenge of the coach is to stimulate the institution to do the kind of serious examination and self-examination that will identify its critical challenges. This means posing basic questions of different kinds, although which ones it will be fruitful to ask at any given time will depend heavily on local circumstances. Below is a list of some of the basic questions:

1. What are your avowed goals (as found in the opinion of key stake holders, as found in mission statements, as found in the curriculum)?
2. Are the avowed goals (as articulated or implicit in these different ways) clear or are they very vague? Do the participants understand what they mean and entail?
3. Are the various avowed goals mutually consistent?
4. Do the key stake holders - lead-educators, parents, and

teachers - really believe in these goals?

5. If the stake holders do believe in these goals, why do they believe they are important? How will accomplishing them help make the life of the student as a Jewish human being more meaningful in the short- and/or long-run?

6. Are the goals anchored in an underlying vision of a meaningful Jewish existence? Can the stake holders flesh out the vision that is implicit in the goals they have identified as important?

7. As a way of better understanding what they are committed to or might be committed to in #s 5 and 6, have the stake holders looked seriously at alternative views?

8. In what ways and to what extent are the avowed goals actually reflected in the life of the institution - in its social organization, in its pedagogy, in what happens in classrooms, etc.?

9. To what extent are the goals achieved? To what extent are actual educational outcomes consistent with the goals?

10. If you were serious about Goal X or Y, what would you need to do in order to have a realistic shot at accomplishing it?

MEMO TO: Alan Hoffmann and Daniel Marom - and the CIJE gang
FROM: Daniel Pekarsky
RE: Proposal RE: Next Steps in the Goals Project
DATE: March 8, 1995

This document is less than I would want it to be in two ways. First, I had hoped to process it with Daniel Marom prior to sending a draft off to Alan Hoffmann; second, it is not as fully developed as I had hoped. The truth is that between mid-term commitments at UW and trying to draft my piece on Scheffler for the Philosophy of Education conference, I've been buried this week and haven't had the chance to write as full a piece as I would like. Hopefully, what follows is true to the conversations which Daniel Marom and I had and our shared sense of where we should go. DM will, I trust, correct any misrepresentations and significant omissions. In any event, I thought it best to get some version of the document off as soon as possible so as to move the process along.

THE GOALS PROJECT IN '95-'96: PROPOSAL

The Three Elements

Three elements will define the Goals Project in '95-96: 1) work with institutions (with the help of coaches); 2) Goals Seminars modelled on the Jerusalem and/or Milwaukee models, designed to initiate leadership in major communities and/or regions to the importance of the Goals Agenda; 3) progress on the community-vision theme, possibly including work with a promising community. Note that both 2) and 3) contribute to Lay Leadership development, a matter that may be independently explored with Paley and the Wexner folks. This document focusses exclusively on the #1, which is concerned with work with institutions.

Towards Work with Institutions

1. Marom and I anticipate initial work next year with a small number of institutions - from 3 to 5; ideally, there will be at least one JCC, Congregation, and Day School involved. Getting two of any one type might be desirable from the standpoint of our own learning - and it cannot be emphasized enough that we need to regard these pioneering efforts as opportunities to learn!

Please note that the proposal to work with a limited number of institution is consistent with CIJE's interest in moving from 3 to 9, since according to this proposal, other pieces of the Goals Project will be involved in introducing new communities to the project's ideas (via the projected seminars).

2. Coaches: In addition to Marom and Pekarsky, who will probably serve as coaches in year #1, we want to recruit an initial cohort of 3 to 5 additional individuals to be cultivated as coaches.

Our sense was that at this initial stage, rather than

cast a wide net, we should zero in on a select group of individuals in whom we already have great confidence -- confidence concerning their ability and our ability to work with them in a collegial and trusting atmosphere.

Our sense was that in addition to some of the varied attributes we've indicated in the past (an intellectual bent, strong interpersonal skills, a seriousness about Jewish education, etc.), they need to be individuals who are intimately familiar with the kinds of Jewish educational settings in which they will be working.

One way to identify these individuals is for each of the core-CIJE staff to identify the 2 individuals (say, from among the extensive list we had drawn up) that generate the most confidence as coach-candidates.

A few people who came to mind are: Toren, possibly Kyla Epstein, and Cheryl Finkel (each of whom is close to a different kind of educational setting). DM wondered whether Sam Heilman might be good and available for something like this. Were he in the country, a Mark Rosenstein might be great for this. (Speaking of Marks, how about Smiley?)

Note that we view the initial cohort of coaches as a foundational group. We anticipate that as early as next year, by which time our own sense of the m'lachah and the theory will be considerably more developed than it is now or will be this summer, the group will be considerably expanded.

3. We imagined an intensive seminar in Cambridge, probably early August for the coaches-to-be, in the company of Scheffler, Howard, Fox -- and possibly Gerstein as a resource-person.

4. Although we felt no immediate urgency about blocking out the seminar now, both of us had given some thought to it, and our thoughts were along similar lines. I summarize Marom's conception of it below:

a. Develop a summary of, as well as a response to the varied change-strategies now being proposed or in use. Emphasis should focus on how and why our approach may differ.

b. An in-depth immersion in the materials and ideas that have defined the different phases of the Educated Jew Project.

c. Exercises with mission-statements, curriculum-guides, etc., with an eye towards articulating and teaching strategies for using these as vehicles of raising consciousness concerning goals-issues and

catalyzing a desire to address them.

d. Work with Cases: e.g., deliberations concerning a problem situation that might arise in a goals-process.

e. Based on a very favorable recent experience at Agnon in Cleveland, Marom has proposed that prior to the summer, he and Pekarsky embark on some preliminary field-work in institutions as a way of enhancing our knowledge-base. At the seminar, issues, insights, and questions arising out of this work would be reported.

f. Though our feeling is that a coach's role is more multi-faceted than is the Socratic gadfly we discussed in Cambridge, nonetheless, having a repertoire of strong questions and activities to be drawn on thoughtfully and selectively is essential. Prior to the summer such a resource will have been developed. Along with a more comprehensive fieldbook which summarizes assumptions and concepts that define the Goals Project, the seminar will take participants through this instrument, which will no doubt be refined through the discussion.

g. Consultations on actual institutions that we are planning to get involved with, with an eye towards understanding them and thinking through strategies for entry.

Based on this plan, our tasks between now and the summer in relation to this phase of the Goals Project (Others will require a different plan) are the following:

1. identifying coaches.
2. identifying institutions.
3. Field work in institutional settings by both Marom and Pekarsky
4. Develop a compendium of approaches to change and the relationship of such approaches to our own.
5. Develop a Goals Project Handbook that can guide the work of coaches. This Handbook will include a succinct Goals Project description of the kind Nessa has been asking for, a set of questions to be used as a tool by a coach, a set of pertinent articles, etc.
6. Develop a faculty and a full-fledged curriculum for the summer.

In a nut-shell, this is roughly how we think we'd like to proceed. The plan is significant but is not overly ambitious. By the way, the plan assumes MEF involvement in monitoring some of our efforts and perhaps doing institutional profiles.

I look forward to discussing this document with you in the very near future. For what it's worth, here's my upcoming schedule: On Thursday, I'm out of commission due to the Milwaukee Seminar, and on Friday I've got a slew of meetings - though I'll certainly be reading my email. Sunday I am meeting with Ackerman at O'Hare, and Monday I need to finish my response to the Scheffler book. Still, I should be reachable on Sunday evening or Monday - and by Tuesday, if all goes well, my schedule is pretty open -- and this might be an optimal time to talk.

Once again, I apologize to DM for not processing this draft with him before sending it on to others, but I certainly don't regard it as final or authoritative.

Talk to you soon.

January 29, 1995

Dear CIJE Colleagues:

I have intended for some time to send you a summary of our early January meeting - along with a list of names of potential coaches and a draft of a letter to them. I have, however, had a hard time getting to the task of drafting this material. In part, this has had to do with the press of University of Wisconsin beginning-of-the-semester matters; but I think there's more to it than that! I think there's also been an element of procrastination, procrastination rooted in a measure of uncertainty concerning certain elements of the path we charted in January.

I've solved my problem by determining to do two things rather than one: in Part I, to summarize the course of our deliberations and our decisions; and in Part II, to articulate some of my concerns and a possible alternative route to go. As you will see, some of the concerns addressed in Part II are alluded to in Part I.

My sense is that this document may not be as well-organized as I'd like, and it probably suffers from a measure of repetition. My apologies - but I figured it was better to get it out than to take too much time working it over.

I'd welcome your thoughts as soon as possible.

Thanks.

DP

SUMMARY OF OUR JAN. NEW YORK MEETING - AND SOME AFTER-THOUGHTS

INTRODUCTION

The following document attempts to do two things: first, to summarize where we went and what we decided at the early January meeting in New York (participants: Alan, Barry, Gail, Nessa, and myself), as well as to fill-in certain details; second, to raise some questions concerning some of the decisions we made. I have felt a measure of uneasiness concerning some of them and rather than keep them to myself I thought it best to share them and to suggest some possibilities that flow out of them.

PART I

THE PLAN WE'VE PROJECTED FOR THE MONTH AHEAD

Building on the document regarding the "building capacity" challenge that had been prepared for the January meeting, our discussion raised questions concerning some of its points and moved towards defining an agenda for the months ahead. This is to be a period in which we build capacity in two ways: by furthering our own learning and through the identification, recruitment, and cultivation of a cadre of able individuals from whom coaches will be chosen to work with institutions. It is anticipated that there will be at least one, and possibly 2 seminars for the individuals identified as possible coaches between now and the end of the summer; and that next year, some of these individuals will be working with institutions. As they engage in this work, they will keep careful track of what they are doing and learning; they will also meet periodically with one another and with other CIJE staff for purposes of furthering their, and our, learning. With this in mind, we spent much of the morning identifying the kinds of people we would want as coaches, developing a list of names, thinking through the kind of letter that need to be sent to them, and raising pertinent questions. Below is a summary of decisions/issues/questions that arose in relation to this agenda.

Two meetings or one? The initial idea developed at our meeting was to aim for a late spring initiatory meeting, followed by a lengthier summer workshop (probably in Cambridge). In the aftermath of our meeting, two considerations have led me to think that it might be wiser to hold only one meeting (in the summer), rather than two. One of these considerations is cost: particularly since some of the participants may be paying their

own way - and transportation is a major cost, having one set of meetings rather than two might make it easier for our targeted clientele to participate. The second consideration is this: in my mind, the primary reason for a spring meeting was to assess the match between promising individuals and our project, so that by the time the summer seminar came along, the participants would only be individuals who we were prepared to move into coaching roles. But as we discussed the future in NY, it seemed clear that in inviting folks to a seminar next summer, we would not be committing ourselves to employing any of them as coaches; rather, coaches would be selected from among them. Thus, it no longer seemed to me imperative that we weed anyone out in the spring. This remains a matter in need of decision!

How many people should be invited to the seminar(s)? The Pekarsky-document had assumed we would invite a small group of up to 10 individuals, on the assumption that they were hand-picked to work with institutions. Alan encouraged us to think of inviting a substantially larger group of individuals (20 to 25), on the assumption that in the end only some of them would seem suitable for our purposes. Our discussion adopted the Hoffmann view (though, as will be noted later, I continue to have some concerns in this area).

Who would make a good coach? Criteria identified included the following: 1. Strong Jewish knowledge; 2. Knowledge of settings; 3) conceptual bent; 4) strong interpersonal skills, including capacity to work effectively with different kinds of constituency (rabbi, lay leaders, teachers, principals, etc.) (See Pekarsky's "Building Capacity" piece for a related discussion).

Categories of coaches. As the discussion unfolded, some important distinctions were made concerning the kinds of coaches we might want to recruit:

a. "Young blood" and "tried and true": the feeling was that we should be looking not just for people who've already proved their skill and savvy but also for people of promise in whom we should be investing.

b. Agents (or representatives) of institutions or communities and individuals who do not come representing any body. The distinction was important because while there might be natural avenues for securing funding in the case of those who are sent by communities and/or institutions, this may not be the case for those who come as individuals. Moreover, whereas those who come representing some body may have some sense of the immediate contexts in which they will go on to do some coaching, this may not be true for those who do not come representing any institution.

This suggested that in the case of those who come as individuals, there might be instances in which we would try to help them secure funding -- possibly by establishing a linkage between them and some institution that they would work with (as coaches) after the training period.

c. A third distinction is between those who come with a clear understanding that the coaching-skills they acquire will be put to work in a particular institutional or communal context and those who come without any clear sense of where (or even whether) what they learn will be put to use. (This point overlaps the point made in b.)

Money-issues in relation to the coaches. There are two issues: one of them pertains to the seminar(s), the other to their work - down the road - as coaches.

With respect to the costs incurred in coming to the seminar(s), we came to the view that CIJE was not responsible for such costs. In the case of many of the kinds of folks we imagined would participate, funding should come from the institution or community for which they work (and which will reap benefits from their training). In the case of others (as noted earlier), we might try to pair them with particular institutions whom they would later serve; or, they would have to pay for themselves. Some of us were less confident than others that those who don't have external sources of support would find their way to the projected seminar(s).

We did not systematically look at the question of how their work in the field would be paid for beyond the summer; but implicit in our conversation was the view that in the case of many of them, their work would fall within their job-descriptions and hence would be paid for by their parent-institution or community; in the case of others, their work might be paid for by the institution they are coaching. Conceivably, in the case of some communities, a kind of barter-system could be worked out, so that X could coach in Y's community in exchange for Y coaching an institution in X's community.

What will coaches do? Precisely what coaches (if "coaches" is in the end the right term - which it may not be) will do out in the field is what we are trying to better understand through our own learning this spring. Nonetheless it is possible in a general sort of way to suggest the kind of work they would be engaged in. This would include:

a. Regular consultations to the institution's lead-staff designed to keep them focused on critical

questions and tasks, to suggest and/or discuss possible desiderata, plans and strategies, and to help assess the best way to approach the institution's educational challenges;

b. Facilitating or leading discussions, classes, or workshops designed to carry the work forward;

c. accessing CIJE-resources that would be useful to the institution in its reform-efforts, e.g. MEF or someone representing the Educated Jew project.

d. carefully monitoring and logging what transpires with an eye towards CIJE's learning.

e. participation in regular meetings and workshops with other coaches and with CIJE staff, with the aim of further professional growth and building our collective body of lore..

How much time this work would take is something we haven't discussed; but I imagine spending a day or so with the institution every 6 weeks, with periodic phone-consultations in between; and also periodic meetings with other coaches, CIJE staff, and educators who can guide our collective learning (about week or so per year). This amounts to about 3 weeks of work per year -- not insubstantial. I don't know whether this is way off-base (and if so, in what direction). Gerstein may be helpful to us on this point.

What's the incentive for people to join with us? It was not at all clear from our discussions that those coming to our seminars and going on to work as coaches would necessarily be making more money than they now do -- particularly if their coaching turned out to be part of their job-portfolio. People felt that the main reasons for participation would be professional growth and the sense that what they learned could be put to effective use in their own work-contexts. What this means is that our recruitment efforts for the upcoming seminars need to emphasize these elements:

"as part of its efforts to improve Jewish ed. in North America, CIJE is offering talented senior educators a professional development opportunity that will, we believe, enhance your work. Beyond this, we are hopeful that some of you will play a role coaching institutions that we will be working with intensively..."

Is there a "CIJE-approach" - and if not, how can we proceed?
Pekarsky's building-capacity document referred to using the

spring and summer seminars as a way of introducing our colleagues-to-be to the "CIJE-approach?" Well, someone asked at our meeting, exactly what is this CIJE approach? Do we have one?

The answer to this question, intimated in the "building capacity" document, is somewhere between "Yes" and "No". "No" - in the sense that we don't have, as does Levin, a step-by-step process to recommend. But "Yes!" in the non-trivial sense that we have the following:

1. a set of guiding principles (of the kind summarized in the building-capacity document, pp. 7-9) that relate to such matters as the kinds of stake holders that are needed, the place of content in the process, the need to wrestle seriously with issues of goals, etc.
2. an understanding (by the end of the spring a deep understanding) of pertinent approaches to educational improvement (including the Educated Jew project, Sizer, Levin, Comer, etc.), and a commitment and ability on the part of coaches - alone or as teams! - to use elements of one or more of them thoughtfully and eclectically in working with institutions.
3. an understanding that this stage of our enterprise requires structures and an ethos that support careful experimentation, monitoring, and efforts to build a richer knowledge-base.
4. an understanding of the kinds of individuals who are likely to subscribe to #'s 1 - 3, both in theory and in practice.

It is arguable that these four elements are jointly enough to enable us to identify potential coaches, to plan the spring and summer workshops, and to launch work with institutions; this in any case is what the "building capacity" document asserted. BUT: it was precisely this assumption that was called into question at our January meeting. Do we really have enough to offer the sophisticated group we intend to convene so that they come away feeling that (to use Barry's phrase) "we've got our act together", that it's important, that their time has been well-spent, and that it will be worthwhile to share in this process?

There are at least three possible answers to this question, all of which need to be seriously considered: 1) we do know enough to proceed; 2) we don't know as much as we'd like, but we know enough to get started, and much of what we need to be learning will only be learned through the doing - a kind of na'aseh v; 'nishmah!; 3) we don't yet know enough "to go public" and need to give ourselves more time to develop capacity before launching the kinds of seminars we've been projecting.

Our meeting in early January took #2 as its working assumption. I want to re-visit this assumption in the second part of this document.

What would a seminar/workshop look like? We did not explore this in any detail, but we spoke a bit about what a two-day spring seminar might look like. In addition to including a chance to familiarize participants with the thinking that has informed the Goals Project, we might give them an opportunity to meet with the likes of Scheffler and/or Greenberg and/or Sizer -- both as ways of exciting them and as ways of stimulating some good thinking concerning some elements of our project.

As we discussed names of possible invitees, it was clear that, if they come, we will be dealing with a sophisticated group of people, and this must be very seriously taken into account in thinking about how to structure whatever seminars we develop.

Names. (In no particular order - some probably misspelled)

Here is a list of the names who were mentioned. This is not a final list in two senses - 1) we aren't committed to all the names on the list; 2) we may well want to add others.

Rob Toren
Tzivia Blumberg
Betsy Katz
Susan Shevitz
Elaine Cohen
Poupko (Montreal)
Jodi Hirsch
Debbie Kerdimann
Michael Berger (Atlanta)
Debbie Hirschman
Bob Abramson
Jack Bieler
David Ackerman
Amy Gerstein
Carol Ingle
Vicki Kelman
Carolyn Keller
Marion Gribbetz
Sara Gribbetz
Stuart Seltzer
Danny Lehman
Amyh Wolk Katz
Mitch Cohen
Kyla Epstein
Elana Kanter
Sara Lynn Newberger
Cindy Rich
Eddie Rauch

Michael Posnick
 Lifsa Schachter
 Jeffrey Schein
 Karen Sobel
 Marci Dickman
 Steve Chervin
 Debbie Goldstein
 Zvi Blanchard
 Kula
 Paley
 David Soloff
 Yossi Gordon
 Harvey Shapiro

Recruitment. Recruitment will involve the following steps:
 a) refining the list; b) drafting a letter to them (see below);
 c) phone calls (by people who know them) that follow-up the
 letter; c) contact with communal/institutional leadership to
 explain the project and get them to financially and otherwise
 support the effort of invitees that "belong" to them; d) finding
 ways to subsidize promising individuals who will not be covered
 by an institution or community.

Below is a first draft of a letter to invitees:

Dear _____:

As you know, the Council for Initiatives in Jewish Education
 is engaged in a multi-faceted effort to improve Jewish education
 in North America.

The Goals Project is one of several projects launched by the
 Council for Initiatives in Jewish Education in its efforts to
 help improve the quality and the outcomes of Jewish education in
 North America. The Goals Project is organized around several
 guiding assumptions, including the following: 1) that in Jewish
 (as in general) education inadequate attention to the
 identification of appropriate goals and to their thoughtful
 implementation significantly undermines our efforts to educate;
 2) that efforts at institutional reform in Jewish education must
 seriously address questions concerning a guiding vision or set of
 goals; 3) that with the help of thoughtful resource-people, it
 is possible for an institution that is serious about change to
 make considerable progress on this front.

Guided by these assumptions, CIJE is inviting a select
 group of educators to participate in a set of seminars designed
 to enhance their ability to help Jewish educating institutions
 deal with issues of goals in the context of their efforts at
 self-improvement. Although CIJE will be satisfied if the
 seminars accomplish this purpose, it is also hopeful that in the
 aftermath of the seminar, some of you will be interested in

working as coaches or resource-people with one or more institutions that are committing themselves to a long-term process of struggling with a goals agenda as part of a broad effort of educational reform.

Our plan is to hold a day-long seminar at Harvard in late April to launch this effort. At this seminar, you will have the opportunity to learn more about CIJE's approach and efforts in the Goals Project; you will also have the chance to meet with _____, who is a thoughtful leader in the area of educational reform. A follow-up 5-day seminar in the summer is designed to help participants grow in their ability to help institutions go through a process of change that takes goals seriously. Given the thoughtfulness and experience of the people we are inviting to participate, we are confident that this seminar will also provide CIJE staff with an invaluable opportunity to further to test and refine their own views on the issues we will be considering.

We are happy to announce that CIJE will cover all tuition-costs associated with the seminar and that it will provide X # of meals; other costs are the responsibility of participants or their institutions. Please let us know whether you are interested in attending at your earliest convenience. We are hopeful that you will be able to take advantage of this exciting opportunity.

Sincerely,

Alan Hoffmann, Executive Director
CIJE

SOME MISC. POINTS MADE AT THE MEETING (NOT MENTIONED ABOVE)

1. It was suggested that in addition to looking at the Educated Jew Project, Senge/Fullan, Sizer, and Levin, we should also be looking to the work of Comer. Michael Ben-Avi (at JTS) works for Comer and would be a good contact-person.
2. On what distinguishes our approach: at other times we've focused on the importance of engaging stake holders in an institution in a process of study, in wrestling with content-issues; at today's meeting it was suggested that an additional distinguishing feature of our approach is that it actively engages lay-people in thinking about issues relating to goals.
3. We should not invest too much effort in learning what others are doing before entering our own doing-phase. There is only so

much we can learn from them; moreover, much of our own learning will take place in the doing. Which is not to deny that we can learn from the practical knowledge that's already out there!

It was suggested in this connection that perhaps one of the roles Daniel Marom could fulfill (since he will be available to us) is to scout out the landscape with attention to approaches, strategies, and practical knowledge that might be of value to us.

4. We re-visited a comment I made early last summer concerning Fred Newmann's view that there are no serious success-stories out there -- that is, stories about institutions that had "turned it around." When scrutinized, he suggested, it turns out that the success was more rhetorical than real -- or else short-lived. We felt at our meeting that this view needed to be tested out some more rather than just accepted with resignation. Pekarsky will meet again with Newmann and do other relevant follow-up inquiry.

5. A question was raised concerning our own study. Earlier we had spoken about some seminars designed exclusively for ourselves prior to meeting with potential coaches. This seems to have droppe out. Should we provide for this? (Parenthetically: Fullan is unavailable to come to anything, but is willing to meet with me in March in Toronto; perhaps one or more of the rest of us could come along. Gerstein is unavailable until summer due to dissertation commitments, but she is interested in participating in a summer seminar.)

PART II

Part II of this report will be brief and somewhat more general. It tries to raise some basic questions concerning what we are projecting for the period ahead. A useful starting-point in assessing the agenda mapped out above is to remind ourselves, or clarify, what our fundamental priorities and goals are at this stage of the enterprise. In fact, this question -- What are the goals of the Goals Project? - arose at our January meeting. Though not addressed in depth then, it is worthy of attention as we look ahead. Such attention may help us not to scatter our scarce resources in too many or low priority directions or to bite off more than we can chew.

GOALS FOR THE GOALS PROJECT: Here are some of the themes that are often at work in our discussions:

- a) to develop a knowledge-base and know-how concerning such matters as: the critical role that goals and vision play in education; dimensions of the effort to become more goals-and-vision-driven; ways in which educating institutions can become more goals- and vision-driven.
- b) to develop a reservoir of resources (material and human) that will be available to institutions in their effort to become more goals- and vision-driven.
- c) to catalyze in various communities around the country (or at least 9 of them) an interest in

encouraging their constituent institutions to become more vision-driven.

d) to actively work, via coaches, with a number of institutions in their efforts to become more vision-driven. This could mean identifying 6 institutions (2 day schools, two camps, and two congregational institutions); or it could mean something more ambitious that included a coalition of vision-driven institutions.

If some variant of d) is adopted, we need to be clear what underlying purpose is:

- i. our own learning;
- ii. showing what can be done when issues of goals are seriously addressed,
- iii. expanding the field of institutions engaged with issues of goals and vision.

e) to work with the communities that shared in the Jerusalem seminar as they try to encourage their institutions to become more vision-driven (=outstanding commitments!), via the promised local seminars and other strategies.

My sense is that we may need to make some strategic decisions concerning which of these to emphasize in the period ahead. Such decisions will, I think, enhance our effectiveness significantly.

SOME BASIC QUESTIONS

I noted earlier that I have had some uneasiness about the direction we sketched out in our January meeting. The uneasiness concerns a matter intimated by Barry when he asked whether we have an "it", that is, a CIJE approach, to share with invitees to a conference. Above I made the case that we do -- and that, to the extent that we don't, immersion in the world of practice is the key to developing a useful one. But I have some doubts about this. I am concerned that there may considerable more work we want to do before "going public" in a splashy way by inviting a whole lot of people (not all of whom are necessarily friendly to CIJE) and trying to engage them.

My own instinct is decidedly not to avoid cultivating coaches and immersing in practice. Rather, I think we should consider going about it in a smaller-scale way as a prelude to something bigger down the road. In a nut-shell, I think we should consider the following:

1. that we identify and recruit a small group of potential coaches (5 to 10 max.), consisting of people whom we strongly believe in and who we think will be genuinely sympathetic to what we're up to. These should be the kinds of people we trust and can go back-stage with as we think through what we're doing.

2. that we hold one or two sets of seminars for this more limited clientele in the months ahead.

3. that we identify a limited number of prototype institutions (no more than a total of 4 or so) that these coaches work with (singly or in combination); one or more of us may also be at work in this process.

4. that, perhaps with the help of MEF, we carefully monitor and try to learn from our efforts, evolving an increasingly sharp approach to our various challenges.

5. that simultaneously we involve other communities in the Goals process by regional or local seminars of the kind we did in Jerusalem. This would be consistent with the idea of moving from 3 to 9.

6. that we find some ways of beginning to tackle the "Community goals" problem, in which, as we know, there's a great deal of interest.

7. that, if we seem to be making reasonable progress in our various pilot-projects with prototype institutions, we proceed next spring to involve in our work the kind of larger group of possible resource-people that we identified in January. By then, we will be surer of where we're going and of where we want to take them.

Although this approach may seem somewhat more modest, it strikes me as possibly safer in more than one respect, while at the same time still being ambitious. To me it feels more in line with where we are in terms of available resources for the project and knowledge-base. Needless to say, I could be wrong about how to proceed and would welcome your thoughts.

January 29, 1995

Dear CIJE Colleagues:

I have intended for some time to send you a summary of our early January meeting - along with a list of names of potential coaches and a draft of a letter to them. I have, however, had a hard time getting to the task of drafting this material. In part, this has had to do with the press of University of Wisconsin beginning-of-the-semester matters; but I think there's more to it than that! I think there's also been an element of procrastination, procrastination rooted in a measure of uncertainty concerning certain elements of the path we charted in January.

I've solved my problem by determining to do two things rather than one: in Part I, to summarize the course of our deliberations and our decisions; and in Part II, to articulate some of my concerns and a possible alternative route to go. As you will see, some of the concerns addressed in Part II are alluded to in Part I.

My sense is that this document may not be as well-organized as I'd like, and it probably suffers from a measure of repetition. My apologies - but I figured it was better to get it out than to take too much time working it over.

I'd welcome your thoughts as soon as possible.

Thanks.

DP

SUMMARY OF OUR JAN. NEW YORK MEETING - AND SOME AFTER-THOUGHTS

INTRODUCTION

The following document attempts to do two things: first, to summarize where we went and what we decided at the early January meeting in New York (participants: Alan, Barry, Gail, Nessa, and myself), as well as to fill-in certain details; second, to raise some questions concerning some of the decisions we made. I have felt a measure of uneasiness concerning some of them and rather than keep them to myself I thought it best to share them and to suggest some possibilities that flow out of them.

PART I

THE PLAN WE'VE PROJECTED FOR THE MONTH AHEAD

Building on the document regarding the "building capacity" challenge that had been prepared for the January meeting, our discussion raised questions concerning some of its points and moved towards defining an agenda for the months ahead. This is to be a period in which we build capacity in two ways: by furthering our own learning and through the identification, recruitment, and cultivation of a cadre of able individuals from whom coaches will be chosen to work with institutions. It is anticipated that there will be at least one, and possibly 2 seminars for the individuals identified as possible coaches between now and the end of the summer; and that next year, some of these individuals will be working with institutions. As they engage in this work, they will keep careful track of what they are doing and learning; they will also meet periodically with one another and with other CIJE staff for purposes of furthering their, and our, learning. With this in mind, we spent much of the morning identifying the kinds of people we would want as coaches, developing a list of names, thinking through the kind of letter that need to be sent to them, and raising pertinent questions. Below is a summary of decisions/issues/questions that arose in relation to this agenda.

Two meetings or one? The initial idea developed at our meeting was to aim for a late spring initiatory meeting, followed by a lengthier summer workshop (probably in Cambridge). In the aftermath of our meeting, two considerations have led me to think that it might be wiser to hold only one meeting (in the summer), rather than two. One of these considerations is cost: particularly since some of the participants may be paying their

own way - and transportation is a major cost, having one set of meetings rather than two might make it easier for our targeted clientele to participate. The second consideration is this: in my mind, the primary reason for a spring meeting was to assess the match between promising individuals and our project, so that by the time the summer seminar came along, the participants would only be individuals who we were prepared to move into coaching roles. But as we discussed the future in NY, it seemed clear that in inviting folks to a seminar next summer, we would not be committing ourselves to employing any of them as coaches; rather, coaches would be selected from among them. Thus, it no longer seemed to me imperative that we weed anyone out in the spring. This remains a matter in need of decision!

How many people should be invited to the seminar(s)? The Pekarsky-document had assumed we would invite a small group of up to 10 individuals, on the assumption that they were hand-picked to work with institutions. Alan encouraged us to think of inviting a substantially larger group of individuals (20 to 25), on the assumption that in the end only some of them would seem suitable for our purposes. Our discussion adopted the Hoffmann view (though, as will be noted later, I continue to have some concerns in this area).

Who would make a good coach? Criteria identified included the following: 1. Strong Jewish knowledge; 2. Knowledge of settings; 3) conceptual bent; 4) strong interpersonal skills, including capacity to work effectively with different kinds of constituency (rabbi, lay leaders, teachers, principals, etc.) (See Pekarsky's "Building Capacity" piece for a related discussion).

Categories of coaches. As the discussion unfolded, some important distinctions were made concerning the kinds of coaches we might want to recruit:

a. "Young blood" and "tried and true": the feeling was that we should be looking not just for people who've already proved their skill and savvy but also for people of promise in whom we should be investing.

b. Agents (or representatives) of institutions or communities and individuals who do not come representing any body. The distinction was important because while there might be natural avenues for securing funding in the case of those who are sent by communities and/or institutions, this may not be the case for those who come as individuals. Moreover, whereas those who come representing some body may have some sense of the immediate contexts in which they will go on to do some coaching, this may not be true for those who do not come representing any institution.

This suggested that in the case of those who come as individuals, there might be instances in which we would try to help them secure funding -- possibly by establishing a linkage between them and some institution that they would work with (as coaches) after the training period.

c. A third distinction is between those who come with a clear understanding that the coaching-skills they acquire will be put to work in a particular institutional or communal context and those who come without any clear sense of where (or even whether) what they learn will be put to use. (This point overlaps the point made in b.)

Money-issues in relation to the coaches. There are two issues: one of them pertains to the seminar(s), the other to their work - down the road - as coaches.

With respect to the costs incurred in coming to the seminar(s), we came to the view that CIJE was not responsible for such costs. In the case of many of the kinds of folks we imagined would participate, funding should come from the institution or community for which they work (and which will reap benefits from their training). In the case of others (as noted earlier), we might try to pair them with particular institutions whom they would later serve; or, they would have to pay for themselves. Some of us were less confident than others that those who don't have external sources of support would find their way to the projected seminar(s).

We did not systematically look at the question of how their work in the field would be paid for beyond the summer; but implicit in our conversation was the view that in the case of many of them, their work would fall within their job-descriptions and hence would be paid for by their parent-institution or community; in the case of others, their work might be paid for by the institution they are coaching. Conceivably, in the case of some communities, a kind of barter-system could be worked out, so that X could coach in Y's community in exchange for Y coaching an institution in X's community.

What will coaches do? Precisely what coaches (if "coaches" is in the end the right term - which it may not be) will do out in the field is what we are trying to better understand through our own learning this spring. Nonetheless it is possible in a general sort of way to suggest the kind of work they would be engaged in. This would include:

a. Regular consultations to the institution's lead-staff designed to keep them focused on critical

questions and tasks, to suggest and/or discuss possible desiderata, plans and strategies, and to help assess the best way to approach the institution's educational challenges;

b. Facilitating or leading discussions, classes, or workshops designed to carry the work forward;

c. accessing CIJE-resources that would be useful to the institution in its reform-efforts, e.g. MEF or someone representing the Educated Jew project.

d. carefully monitoring and logging what transpires with an eye towards CIJE's learning.

e. participation in regular meetings and workshops with other coaches and with CIJE staff, with the aim of further professional growth and building our collective body of lore..

How much time this work would take is something we haven't discussed; but I imagine spending a day or so with the institution every 6 weeks, with periodic phone-consultations in between; and also periodic meetings with other coaches, CIJE staff, and educators who can guide our collective learning (about week or so per year). This amounts to about 3 weeks of work per year -- not insubstantial. I don't know whether this is way off-base (and if so, in what direction). Gerstein may be helpful to us on this point.

What's the incentive for people to join with us? It was not at all clear from our discussions that those coming to our seminars and going on to work as coaches would necessarily be making more money than they now do -- particularly if their coaching turned out to be part of their job-portfolio. People felt that the main reasons for participation would be professional growth and the sense that what they learned could be put to effective use in their own work-contexts. What this means is that our recruitment efforts for the upcoming seminars need to emphasize these elements:

"as part of its efforts to improve Jewish ed. in North America, CIJE is offering talented senior educators a professional development opportunity that will, we believe, enhance your work. Beyond this, we are hopeful that some of you will play a role coaching institutions that we will be working with intensively..."

Is there a "CIJE-approach" - and if not, how can we proceed?
Pekarsky's building-capacity document referred to using the

spring and summer seminars as a way of introducing our colleagues-to-be to the "CIJE-approach?" Well, someone asked at our meeting, exactly what is this CIJE approach? Do we have one?

The answer to this question, intimated in the "building capacity" document, is somewhere between "Yes" and "No". "No" - in the sense that we don't have, as does Levin, a step-by-step process to recommend. But "Yes!" in the non-trivial sense that we have the following:

1. a set of guiding principles (of the kind summarized in the building-capacity document, pp. 7-9) that relate to such matters as the kinds of stake holders that are needed, the place of content in the process, the need to wrestle seriously with issues of goals, etc.
2. an understanding (by the end of the spring a deep understanding) of pertinent approaches to educational improvement (including the Educated Jew project, Sizer, Levin, Comer, etc.), and a commitment and ability on the part of coaches - alone or as teams! - to use elements of one or more of them thoughtfully and eclectically in working with institutions.
3. an understanding that this stage of our enterprise requires structures and an ethos that support careful experimentation, monitoring, and efforts to build a richer knowledge-base.
4. an understanding of the kinds of individuals who are likely to subscribe to #'s 1 - 3, both in theory and in practice.

It is arguable that these four elements are jointly enough to enable us to identify potential coaches, to plan the spring and summer workshops, and to launch work with institutions; this in any case is what the "building capacity" document asserted. BUT: it was precisely this assumption that was called into question at our January meeting. Do we really have enough to offer the sophisticated group we intend to convene so that they come away feeling that (to use Barry's phrase) "we've got our act together", that it's important, that their time has been well-spent, and that it will be worthwhile to share in this process?

There are at least three possible answers to this question, all of which need to be seriously considered: 1) we do know enough to proceed; 2) we don't know as much as we'd like, but we know enough to get started, and much of what we need to be learning will only be learned through the doing - a kind of na'aseh v; 'nishmah!; 3) we don't yet know enough "to go public" and need to give ourselves more time to develop capacity before launching the kinds of seminars we've been projecting.

Our meeting in early January took #2 as its working assumption. I want to re-visit this assumption in the second part of this document.

What would a seminar/workshop look like? We did not explore this in any detail, but we spoke a bit about what a two-day spring seminar might look like. In addition to including a chance to familiarize participants with the thinking that has informed the Goals Project, we might give them an opportunity to meet with the likes of Scheffler and/or Greenberg and/or Sizer -- both as ways of exciting them and as ways of stimulating some good thinking concerning some elements of our project.

As we discussed names of possible invitees, it was clear that, if they come, we will be dealing with a sophisticated group of people, and this must be very seriously taken into account in thinking about how to structure whatever seminars we develop.

Names. (In no particular order - some probably misspelled)

Here is a list of the names who were mentioned. This is not a final list in two senses - 1) we aren't committed to all the names on the list; 2) we may well want to add others.

Rob Toren
Tzivia Blumberg
Betsy Katz
Susan Shevitz
Elaine Cohen
Poupko (Montreal)
Jodi Hirsch
Debbie Kerdimann
Michael Berger (Atlanta)
Debbie Hirschman
Bob Abramson
Jack Bieler
David Ackerman
Amy Gerstein
Carol Ingle
Vicki Kelman
Carolyn Keller
Marion Gribbetz
Sara Gribbetz
Stuart Seltzer
Danny Lehman
Amyh Wolk Katz
Mitch Cohen
Kyla Epstein
Elana Kanter
Sara Lynn Newberger
Cindy Rich
Eddie Rauch

Michael Posnick
Lifsa Schachter
Jeffrey Schein
Karen Sobel
Marci Dickman
Steve Chervin
Debbie Goldstein
Zvi Blanchard
Kula
Paley
David Soloff
Yossi Gordon
Harvey Shapiro

Recruitment. Recruitment will involve the following steps:
a) refining the list; b) drafting a letter to them (see below);
c) phone calls (by people who know them) that follow-up the
letter; c) contact with communal/institutional leadership to
explain the project and get them to financially and otherwise
support the effort of invitees that "belong" to them; d) finding
ways to subsidize promising individuals who will not be covered
by an institution or community.

Below is a first draft of a letter to invitees:

Dear _____:

As you know, the Council for Initiatives in Jewish Education is engaged in a multi-faceted effort to improve Jewish education in North America.

The Goals Project is one of several projects launched by the Council for Initiatives in Jewish Education in its efforts to help improve the quality and the outcomes of Jewish education in North America. The Goals Project is organized around several guiding assumptions, including the following: 1) that in Jewish (as in general) education inadequate attention to the identification of appropriate goals and to their thoughtful implementation significantly undermines our efforts to educate; 2) that efforts at institutional reform in Jewish education must seriously address questions concerning a guiding vision or set of goals; 3) that with the help of thoughtful resource-people, it is possible for an institution that is serious about change to make considerable progress on this front.

Guided by these assumptions, CIJE is inviting a select group of educators to participate in a set of seminars designed to enhance their ability to help Jewish educating institutions deal with issues of goals in the context of their efforts at self-improvement. Although CIJE will be satisfied if the seminars accomplish this purpose, it is also hopeful that in the aftermath of the seminar, some of you will be interested in

working as coaches or resource-people with one or more institutions that are committing themselves to a long-term process of struggling with a goals agenda as part of a broad effort of educational reform.

Our plan is to hold a day-long seminar at Harvard in late April to launch this effort. At this seminar, you will have the opportunity to learn more about CIJE's approach and efforts in the Goals Project; you will also have the chance to meet with ____, who is a thoughtful leader in the area of educational reform. A follow-up 5-day seminar in the summer is designed to help participants grow in their ability to help institutions go through a process of change that takes goals seriously. Given the thoughtfulness and experience of the people we are inviting to participate, we are confident that this seminar will also provide CIJE staff with an invaluable opportunity to further to test and refine their own views on the issues we will be considering.

We are happy to announce that CIJE will cover all tuition-costs associated with the seminar and that it will provide X # of meals; other costs are the responsibility of participants or their institutions. Please let us know whether you are interested in attending at your earliest convenience. We are hopeful that you will be able to take advantage of this exciting opportunity.

Sincerely,

Alan Hoffmann, Executive Director
CIJE

SOME MISC. POINTS MADE AT THE MEETING (NOT MENTIONED ABOVE)

1. It was suggested that in addition to looking at the Educated Jew Project, Senge/Fullan, Sizer, and Levin, we should also be looking to the work of Comer. Michael Ben-Avi (at JTS) works for Comer and would be a good contact-person.
2. On what distinguishes our approach: at other times we've focused on the importance of engaging stake holders in an institution in a process of study, in wrestling with content-issues; at today's meeting it was suggested that an additional distinguishing feature of our approach is that it actively engages lay-people in thinking about issues relating to goals.
3. We should not invest too much effort in learning what others are doing before entering our own doing-phase. There is only so

much we can learn from them; moreover, much of our own learning will take place in the doing. Which is not to deny that we can learn from the practical knowledge that's already out there!

It was suggested in this connection that perhaps one of the roles Daniel Marom could fulfill (since he will be available to us) is to scout out the landscape with attention to approaches, strategies, and practical knowledge that might be of value to us.

4. We re-visited a comment I made early last summer concerning Fred Newmann's view that there are no serious success-stories out there -- that is, stories about institutions that had "turned it around." When scrutinized, he suggested, it turns out that the success was more rhetorical than real -- or else short-lived. We felt at our meeting that this view needed to be tested out some more rather than just accepted with resignation. Pekarsky will meet again with Newmann and do other relevant follow-up inquiry.

5. A question was raised concerning our own study. Earlier we had spoken about some seminars designed exclusively for ourselves prior to meeting with potential coaches. This seems to have droppe out. Should we provide for this? (Parenthetically: Fullan is unavailable to come to anything, but is willing to meet with me in March in Toronto; perhaps one or more of the rest of us could come along. Gerstein is unavailable until summer due to dissertation commitments, but she is interested in participating in a summer seminar.)

PART II

Part II of this report will be brief and somewhat more general. It tries to raise some basic questions concerning what we are projecting for the period ahead. A useful starting-point in assessing the agenda mapped out above is to remind ourselves, or clarify, what our fundamental priorities and goals are at this stage of the enterprise. In fact, this question -- What are the goals of the Goals Project? - arose at our January meeting. Though not addressed in depth then, it is worthy of attention as we look ahead. Such attention may help us not to scatter our scarce resources in too many or low priority directions or to bite off more than we can chew.

GOALS FOR THE GOALS PROJECT: Here are some of the themes that are often at work in our discussions:

- a) to develop a knowledge-base and know-how concerning such matters as: the critical role that goals and vision play in education; dimensions of the effort to become more goals-and-vision-driven; ways in which educating institutions can become more goals- and vision-driven.
- b) to develop a reservoir of resources (material and human) that will be available to institutions in their effort to become more goals- and vision-driven.
- c) to catalyze in various communities around the country (or at least 9 of them) an interest in

encouraging their constituent institutions to become more vision-driven.

d) to actively work, via coaches, with a number of institutions in their efforts to become more vision-driven. This could mean identifying 6 institutions (2 day schools, two camps, and two congregational institutions); or it could mean something more ambitious that included a coalition of vision-driven institutions.

If some variant of d) is adopted, we need to be clear what underlying purpose is:

- i. our own learning;
- ii. showing what can be done when issues of goals are seriously addressed,
- iii. expanding the field of institutions engaged with issues of goals and vision.

e) to work with the communities that shared in the Jerusalem seminar as they try to encourage their institutions to become more vision-driven (=outstanding commitments!), via the promised local seminars and other strategies.

My sense is that we may need to make some strategic decisions concerning which of these to emphasize in the period ahead. Such decisions will, I think, enhance our effectiveness significantly.

SOME BASIC QUESTIONS

I noted earlier that I have had some uneasiness about the direction we sketched out in our January meeting. The uneasiness concerns a matter intimated by Barry when he asked whether we have an "it", that is, a CIJE approach, to share with invitees to a conference. Above I made the case that we do -- and that, to the extent that we don't, immersion in the world of practice is the key to developing a useful one. But I have some doubts about this. I am concerned that there may considerable more work we want to do before "going public" in a splashy way by inviting a whole lot of people (not all of whom are necessarily friendly to CIJE) and trying to engage them.

My own instinct is decidedly not to avoid cultivating coaches and immersing in practice. Rather, I think we should consider going about it in a smaller-scale way as a prelude to something bigger down the road. In a nut-shell, I think we should consider the following:

1. that we identify and recruit a small group of potential coaches (5 to 10 max.), consisting of people whom we strongly believe in and who we think will be genuinely sympathetic to what we're up to. These should be the kinds of people we trust and can go back-stage with as we think through what we're doing.

2. that we hold one or two sets of seminars for this more limited clientele in the months ahead.

3. that we identify a limited number of prototype institutions (no more than a total of 4 or so) that these coaches work with (singly or in combination); one or more of us may also be at work in this process.

4. that, perhaps with the help of MEF, we carefully monitor and try to learn from our efforts, evolving an increasingly sharp approach to our various challenges.

5. that simultaneously we involve other communities in the Goals process by regional or local seminars of the kind we did in Jerusalem. This would be consistent with the idea of moving from 3 to 9.

6. that we find some ways of beginning to tackle the "Community goals" problem, in which, as we know, there's a great deal of interest.

7. that, if we seem to be making reasonable progress in our various pilot-projects with prototype institutions, we proceed next spring to involve in our work the kind of larger group of possible resource-people that we identified in January. By then, we will be surer of where we're going and of where we want to take them.

Although this approach may seem somewhat more modest, it strikes me as possibly safer in more than one respect, while at the same time still being ambitious. To me it feels more in line with where we are in terms of available resources for the project and knowledge-base. Needless to say, I could be wrong about how to proceed and would welcome your thoughts.

1

January 3, 1995

Dear CIJE Colleagues:

Below you will find my effort to summarize where we are in the Goals Project and to look ahead, with special attention to the "building capacity" theme. In the back of my mind were questions posed by Alan and Barry concerning the kinds of people we should be recruiting to serve as coaches and resource people and the kind of preparation they will need. In considering these matters, I found that it was impossible to proceed without at least some, even if very crude, characterization of the nature of the work we imagine them doing -- something which requires, in turn, some reflection concerning our views on the nature of the change-process at the level of institutions. So....I ended up trying to say something concerning these various matters; and though the account is lacking in adequate depth and detail, I think it may help to move some of our thinking along (as much through the questions it may provoke and the omissions it suggests as through what it does say). Since I have not had the opportunity to see a hard copy of this draft, there are probably various errors (stylistic and other) for which I apologize in advance.

I welcome your feedback and am hopeful that this proves helpful in thinking together in Cleveland about the next stage of our work.

Dan Pekarsky

PS to Ginny Levi: Please make copies of this document for participants in our meeting on Thursday. If it's possible to get the document to participants prior to the meeting, this would be desirable. (If I can get my own copy on Wednesday around 4 pm - which is when I believe I will be meeting with Alan - I would be grateful. Than ks.

January 1995

THE GOALS PROJECT'S "BUILDING CAPACITY" AGENDA

BACKGROUND

The Goals Project Agenda. CIJE's Goals Project assumes that progress in Jewish education depends significantly (though by no means exclusively) on the ability of educating institutions to become clearer concerning their major educational goals and to use these goals as a tool for organizing and assessing their educational practices and policies. The challenge of the Goals Project is to encourage and actively support efforts in this direction.

Past, continuing, and projected activities. Against the background of work done in Israel under the auspices of the Mandel Institute's Educated Jew Project and serious discussions in the first part of 1994 between CIJE and the Mandel Institute concerning the direction of the Goals Project, the Goals Project launched its work with communities through a seminar in the summer of 1994 designed for lay and professional educational leaders from a number of communities in the United States. This seminar was designed to educate the participants concerning the important place of goals and vision in Jewish education and to encourage them to engage their local educating institutions back home in a process of becoming more thoughtful concerning their goals and the relationship between these goals and educational practice.

CIJE promised to support such local efforts by means of a series of seminars in the local communities aimed at key stakeholders in their educating institutions. It was assumed that the clientele for these seminars would be generated by these communities. It was also assumed that among institutions participating in these seminars, some would decide that the goals-agenda did not meet their needs; others would use the opportunities provided by these seminars to improve their educational efforts; and that from among the latter group of institutions a few would emerge as candidates for intensive work beyond the period of these local seminars. These institutions might become the nucleus of a kind of coalition of institutions seriously striving to be vision-driven.

Since the time of the 1994 Summer Seminar on Goals, all 3 of the major communities that were represented in Jerusalem have embarked on Goals-related efforts. In Baltimore, a set of seminars organized around goals is scheduled to be launched with a special program in the late spring. Moreover, a Baltimore institution that participated in the Jerusalem seminar reports that the seminar has catalyzed some fruitful efforts at self-improvement over the last

several months. In Cleveland, a seminar organized around the theme of goals and led by Walter Ackerman has become a vehicle for bringing together key lay and professional leaders in the Jewish education from across the community for regular meetings. In addition, Rob Toren has been hard at work with his Drisha Project, which is designed to engage local educating communities (schools and congregations) in a serious self-improvement process in which issues pertaining to goals play a very prominent role. Finally, Cleveland's Agnon School has approached CIJE with a proposal for collaborative work around a goals-agenda, a proposal to which we have yet to respond. In Milwaukee, a four-session seminar on goals is scheduled to begin in February for a constituency that will include two Day Schools, the JCC, and possibly also one or more congregations.

Alongside these efforts, CIJE has agreed to organize an all-day seminar on goals in Atlanta for the key stakeholders of a new Hebrew High School that is now being developed there. There have also been conversation concerning Goals Project involvement with a number of JCC camps and possibly with one or more congregations (for example, in Baltimore) that seem particularly interesting.

The "building capacity" challenge. Based on its work to date, CIJE is well-equipped to develop and run the kinds of seminars that it will be holding in the months ahead. Such seminars have the promise of helping representatives of participating institutions become substantially more aware of the important role that goals ought to play - but usually do not - in guiding our efforts at Jewish education, as well as of stimulating a lot of reflection concerning the status of goals and vision in their own institutions. If successful, these seminars will also generate a serious desire on the part of at least some participating institutions do launch into a serious effort at self-improvement that takes the goals-issue to heart.

CIJE is, however, not yet adequately positioned to move the Goals Project agenda beyond the stage represented by this year's local seminars. If CIJE is to be able adequately to support the efforts of educating institutions to become substantially more goals-sensitive than they now are, it needs to do much in the way of building capacity in this area. Specifically, capacity needs to be built up in two areas: first, we need to develop more of the kind of knowledge and know-how that are necessary if serious educating institutions are to be adequately helped in their efforts to implement a goals-agenda. Second, since CIJE's core-staff cannot itself work with individual institutions around the country in any sustained way, there is a need to identify, recruit, and cultivate a cadre of resource-people who will be available to work with educating institutions.

So important and pressing is this matter of building capacity that it needs to be viewed as the Goals Project's pre-eminent

challenge and priority in the months ahead. We must use the period between now and the fall of 1995 to become "tooled up" for the next stage of the Goals Project.

BUILDING CAPACITY: A SKETCH OF THE PLAN OF ACTION

Building our knowledge-base and know-how. With respect to the development of the right kind of knowledge-base and know-how, our strategy is fairly straight-forward. We are aware of the major literatures and resource-people in areas that concern the Goals Project agenda.

1. Within the orbit of Jewish education, we need to do what we can to continue working with and learning from the individuals associated with the Mandel Institute's Educated Jew project. Special attention needs to be paid to the "curricularization" of the "Educated Jew" ideals.

2. We need to learn what we can from other instructive efforts going on in Jewish education that are related to our agenda - for example, the project Isa Aron has undertaken (both its conceptualization and the experience to date).

3. As a staff, we need to fully digest and assess the relevance to our own work of the pertinent efforts in general education (and organizational development). This includes the work done under the auspices of the Coalition of Essential Schools and of the Accelerated Schools movement; it also includes the work of change-theorists like Michael Fullan, Peter Senge, and related literatures. In addition to studying the relevant literatures, we need to continue the process initiated in our recent conversation with Amy Gerstein (of the Essential Schools Coalition) of arranging meetings and/or seminars with key individuals representing different approaches to reform. The aim of meetings with such individuals will be not just to better understand their views but to encourage them to reflect with us concerning how their approaches might lend themselves to work in our arena.

4. Intellectual energy and time need to be given to the effort to pull together the results of the efforts described in #s 1 - 3, to integrate them into an approach that will be adequate to the training of resource-people and to the work they will need to be doing. As will be discussed below, our work to date already suggests quite a lot in this area; but there is reason to hope the process of learning described above will continue to refine our understandings and skills.

Developing personnel. With respect to the other part of "capacity-building" - the part that concerns personnel, our plan of action, roughly speaking, is as follows:

1. to identify from 5 to 10 individuals who will be recruited and trained to serve as coaches/resource people to communities and institutions. (January, 1995)

2. to hold a one-to-two-day workshop in the late spring, probably right after Pesach, for these individuals, which will be used to "bring them up to speed" with the work of the Goals project - to initiate them into the project's concerns, universe of discourse, core-literature, and agenda. This workshop will be an opportunity for both CIJE and each of the individuals we've recruited to make an assessment of whether a continuing relationship is desirable; that is, in addition to educating the participants concerning the rudiments of the Goals Project, the workshop will also provide an opportunity to identify obvious mis-matches.

3. a week-long seminar for the same set of participants (CIJE staff and the resource-people) this coming summer, probably in July. At this seminar, the participants will have the opportunity to develop understandings and tools that will enable them to enter into working relationships with institutions as coaches/consultants.

It is anticipated that the seminar will include sustained day-long opportunities to meet with thoughtful representatives of approaches to educational reform which seem most closely related to our own efforts; opportunities to initiate participants into a CIJE approach that draws on these various approaches; opportunities to acquire a repertoire of strategies and skills that will be useful in working with institutions; opportunities to struggle with concrete cases that require decisions concerning the appropriateness of different strategies.

4. Precisely because the cadre of resource-people will be "out in the field" after the summer, it will prove important to have periodic follow-up seminars during the 1995-96 year. This will provide all of us with an opportunity to continue our learning. The next paragraph develops this point.

Building capacity through work with institutions. It is important not to draw a sharp distinction between "building capacity" and "work with institutions". In fact, one of the ways, and perhaps the most important way, in which our knowledge-base

concerning such matters as goals, the change-process, the traits desired in the coaches/resource people who will work with institutions, etc. will expand is through the actual process of working with institutions. This, of course, will only happen if we do what we can do view and use our work with institutions as experiments from which there is a lot to learn. This in turn entails serious efforts to keep track of what happens in the institutions we work with. Note that this is not intended to suggest that we or our cadre of coaches will enter into work with institutions without substantial knowledge and know-how; but it is to acknowledge that there is much that remains to be learned, and that much of this learning can only arise out of work "in the trenches".

ARTICULATING AND ADDRESSING AN OBSTACLE TO THE IDENTIFICATION AND CULTIVATION OF COACHES/RESOURCE PEOPLE WHO WILL WORK WITH INSTITUTIONS

"The problem." As already noted, our challenge this spring is to identify a cadre of coaches/resource people who, after a suitable initiation into the work, can carry forward the Goals Project agenda with educating institutions. But in order to identify the right kinds of coaches/resource people to work with institutions and in order to develop an adequate curriculum that will serve to initiate them into their work with institutions, we need to understand the nature of that work, and this, in turn, requires us to have an understanding of the ways in which fruitful change in educating institutions can be catalyzed and guided. Unfortunately (and as evidenced by our insistence that our effort to build capacity this spring needs to focus heavily on the development of understanding and know-how), we don't yet have as much knowledge in these areas as we need. In view of this, it would thus seem that an attempt in the near future to identify coaches/resource people and to develop a curriculum for them is a good example of "putting the cart before the horse."

Putting "the problem" in perspective. There is, it is true, a measure of truth in this characterization of our situation and in the objection that it implies; and certainly it would be better if we had a clearer theory than we now do of the conditions of institutional change and the ways in which coaches/resource people can contribute to it. But the objection is not decisive; and the reason that it is not decisive is that we have in fact been developing considerable lore concerning the work to be done with institutions. This lore falls way short of a full-fledged "theory" or "approach", but it includes significant familiarity with the approaches identified with different reform movements, as well as a number of fundamental beliefs that are jointly sufficient to guide us in selecting coaches/resource people and in developing

fruitful working-relationships with institutions -- relationships that will both benefit them and offer us opportunities to deepen our own understandings of the work at hand. The critical point is to organize our efforts in such a way as to maximize our learning and to feed it back into our work.

I want, in this connection, to stress that we do not need to feel any embarrassment concerning the fact that we don't have a full-fledged theory or approach to guide our efforts. In point of fact, it is far from clear that anyone has an adequate theory or approach to the kind of work at the level of institutions that we want to encourage. If, for example, we look at the most prominent movements (like the Essential Schools Coalition), we discover that: a) studies of their efforts show very mixed results; b) the approaches associated with such movements are themselves fluid and evolving; and c) these approaches are in many ways very open-ended and depend on a whole lot of "seat-of-the-pants" intuition on the part of the participants.

This said, I want to illustrate the claim made above that we already have a quite a few ideas concerning the nature of institutional change process in which we would like to engage institutions. I will do so by summarizing some of these points. Then, in the concluding section, I will speak briefly about some of the implications of these ideas for the identification and cultivation of coaches/resource people to work with our project.

SOME GUIDING PRINCIPLES IN OUR WORK WITH INSTITUTIONS

As just suggested, in this section I identify some of the basic assumptions that can guide our work. I have not attempted to develop an exhaustive list of assumptions but to articulate enough of them to offer some guidance in thinking about identifying and cultivating a cadre of coaches/resource people for the work ahead. Some of these assumptions have been explicit or implicit in our conversations; in some cases I go beyond these conversations, drawing on insights gleaned from other arenas. These assumptions are tentative in two senses: first, they may be revised or withdrawn based on our own conversations; second, even if they "pass muster" among ourselves right now, they may need to be dropped or revised in light of experience. And, as noted above, even if reasonable, this list of assumptions will need spelling out and augmentation. In any event, here is the list:

1. Under the best circumstances fundamental change is difficult to achieve and cannot be guaranteed in advance; but there will not even be "a fighting chance" unless an institution's key stakeholders and a substantial element in its core constituency are committed to the effort.
2. The identification of compelling educational goals, as

well as serious efforts to organize practice in their light and to assess these efforts at regular intervals, must play a prominent role in the process of institutional self-renewal.

3. As part of its efforts to clarify the goals and the vision that are to inform its work, the major stakeholders of a Jewish educating institution should unearth and struggle to give voice to their own most heart-felt convictions; but the process should also include a serious opportunity to encounter and struggle with other visions of a meaningful Jewish existence, for example, those emerging from the Educated Jew project and from denominational ideologies.

4. Institutions that enter into the CIJE goals-process will undertake a careful survey of what they are presently doing: special attention will focus on the identification of the institution's avowed goals and how they are and are not expressed - and with what effect - in the life of the institution.

5. To suggest that thoughtful attention to goals needs to be at the heart of the process of change in Jewish education is not intended to imply that the process of improvement necessarily begins with a "visioning-activity" or any other institution-wide effort to articulate underlying goals. On the contrary, there are many possible roads an institution might travel in its efforts to clarify and better achieve its fundamental goals. Which road to travel depend on an array of local circumstances that need to be assessed on a case by case basis. A measure of intuition and eclecticism, informed by a thoughtful survey of the situation at hand and an awareness of a range of possible strategies for "cutting into" the situation, is indispensable to the enterprise. The appropriate plan should be determined after careful deliberation by the institution in collaboration with CIJE staff.

6. In order to enter into a partnership with CIJE around a goals-agenda, an institution will need to identify a team of key stakeholders who will be responsible for overseeing and guiding the institutional process. The institution will need to make it financially and otherwise possible for this team to participate in periodic and sometimes extended seminars and workshops organized by CIJE for teams of institutional representatives. Opportunities for such teams to meet on-site with teams representing other institutions for purposes of give-and-take consultations will also be provided.

7. When CIJE agrees to work with an institution, it will appoint a coach identified and trained by CIJE to serve as a consultant to the institution and as a liaison to CIJE. [The job of the coach will be to help the institution to identify and keep focused on central questions, to encourage appropriate forms of study and self-study, to identify and to help in deciding among and implementing strategies for advancing the reform-agenda, to access appropriate CIJE-resources, and to encourage periodic self-assessment.]

In addition to the initial training provided by CIJE, coaches will participate in periodic seminars and workshops in which they will continue their learning and will share what they are learning in the field with their colleagues and with CIJE.

8. The coach and the institutional team will have shared responsibility for keeping and sharing with CIJE a record of its efforts.

IMPLICATIONS OF THE GUIDING PRINCIPLES FOR THE IDENTIFICATION AND CULTIVATION OF COACHES/RESOURCE PEOPLE

Based on the foregoing, we can begin to identify the kinds of individuals who would make good institutional coaches. For example, a) such individuals would need to have a familiarity with a variety of subject-matters ranging from the Educated Jew Project to different approaches to institutional reform; b) they would need to have at their finger-tips a number of different strategies that, at different stages, might be used by an institution to forward and to assess its efforts; c) they would need to have an in-depth grasp of the role of vision and goals in the process of education and of ways to work towards strong coherence between goals and practice; d) and they would need to have a solid grasp of the kinds of goals that are likely to figure prominently in Jewish education and of competing interpretations of these goals. But such skills and understandings, while important, will prove no substitute for the savvy and thoughtfulness needed to size up a situation and arrive at a judgment concerning what is needed at a particular juncture, or for the interpersonal skills needed to develop fruitful working relationships with the diverse stakeholders that make up an institution.

Some of the characteristics identified in the preceding paragraph can be nurtured through seminars, workshops, and other CIJE-sponsored initiatives; but others, and particularly those that pick out traits of character - savvy, thoughtfulness, good judgment even under pressure, and interpersonal skills, may well be beyond our capacity to cultivate. In looking for appropriate individuals for the work of the Goals Project, we need to seek out individuals

who already seem to have these characteristics.

CONCLUSION

Time permitting it would be possible to go on to do two very important things: first, to offer a fuller characterization of what adequate coaches would look like; and second, to more fully discuss the implications of the foregoing analysis of the organization of the projected summer-seminar. Such matters will, however, need to be deferred