



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
5

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

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

SOME BASIC POINTS CONCERNING GOALS - PART I

Mainly as a way of assuring myself that I understand some of the fundamentals (to date) of the Goals Project, I want to summarize some basic points, some of them fairly mundane, that we (or some combination of a "we" that includes Seymour, Danny Marom, Shmuel, Alan, Gail, Barry, and myself) have discussed. The comments are based, in part, on my review of a tape of conversations that went on in Jerusalem in October, and in part on conversations that took place in Milwaukee in mid-November. I also identify a few issues/concerns that seem to me pertinent. I am hoping for feedback (corrections, additions, etc.).

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

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

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

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

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

while there are a variety of goals that will differ for institutions and denominations, it is safe to say that there are certain goals - what I would tentatively call "instrumental goals" - that a community or an institution could agree on in principle even prior to having fully clarified its substantive educational ideals. Examples might include: increasing the numbers of educators who are engaged in formal Jewish study and in other professionally related study; increasing the number of students who continue their studies into the high school years; increasing the percentage of individuals who attend Day Schools; increasing the number who spend a summer or a year in Israel; increasing the number of children and adolescents who attend Jewish summer camps; increasing the number of full-time professional educators working in the community, etc. Such goals are "instrumental" in that they don't identify any particular substantive outcome, but at the same time are instrumental, or would contribute to, most substantive outcomes we could identify. Needless to say, how we understand the desired substantive outcomes will operate to interpret some of these instrumental goals; still, it may be possible to begin identifying and developing strategies to achieve some of these instrumental goals in advance of working through some of the difficult substantive issues at institutional and communal levels. Simultaneously as CIJE works with institutions and communities to develop substantive conceptions, it may be sensible to encourage a parallel process aimed at encouraging them to specify attainable and meaningful instrumental goals.

BASIC POINTS REGARDING GOALS -- (Continuation)

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

5. The Jerusalem meetings took note of the fact that in helping institutions develop their educational and Jewish visions, local institutions had a number of resources to draw on. These included: a) their existing mission-statements, which represent not a resting-point but a good starting-point for discussion and inquiry; b) denominational documents dealing with such matters, which also may serve as a useful starting-point for deliberation; c) "the educated Jew" project and the various resources (human and written) associated with it; and d) "other" -- for example, the availability of CIJE staff to offer help of various kinds (along the lines suggested in Wygoda's and Marom's piece entitled "First Thoughts in Wake of a Goals Project Simulation").

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

GOALS

Substantive issues is the key: this is the beginning of that conversation. Why be Jewish? Vision of Jewish existence.

What does it mean to be an educated Jew? --

Possibility of doing things together as well --like prayer, or other shared experiences.

Include a Reform vision -- Borowitz

VISIONS OF A MEANINGFUL JEWISH EXISTENCE

PLUS

RELATIONSHIP OF VISION TO EDUCATION

Someone needs to take each of the 4, then boil them down

HOW LONG? Real constraint

Perhaps begin by getting them to address certain very basic questions e.g. Why be Jewish? Belief about God.

For: Project leaders, lay-leaders plus spouses.

Having a vision of where you want to go is critical: participants should come away with this. Their job: not to push a vision, but to push them towards this kind of a conversation and understanding.

A DIFFERENT TAKE ON THE JERUSALEM SEMINAR: Perhaps start with point #5 of my document. Need to define larger framework for these discussions: "Educated Jew" project in context of a variety of different kinds of goals project.

Goals -- people hear very different kinds of things. From "Why be Jewish?" to "Institutions need concrete goals."

PRIORITIES: 1. Clarify the map 2. Relationship between Vision, Goals, and educational practice. Critical importance of Vision in driving an educational system.

WHAT WOULD IT MEAN TO HAVE A SCHOOL BASED ON x'S VISION?

Vision-Educational Environment vs. Reality: give up vision, ends up just exciting people's interests.

MEETINGS IN JERUSALEM ARE BACKGROUND, PROPOSALS: THEN GO BACK TO THE STATES TO MAKE DECISIONS.

WHO ARE THEY? ARE THEY CONSULTANTS TO US? WOULD THEY BE
COMFORTABLE WITH THIS?

SUMMARY OF MAJOR POINTS TO EMERGE IN CONVERSATION WITH GAIL AND BARRY (on Dec. 16) CONCERNING THE GOALS PROJECT, WITH SPECIAL ATTENTION TO A PROJECTED SUMMER SEMINAR IN ISRAEL

1. Our shared sense was that seminar should primarily deal with substantive rather than process-issues. Given the importance of having a vision of what one is aiming at for the whole enterprise of Jewish education, we thought it important for participants in the seminar to engage in some serious reflection on this matter. The aim is not - or not only - that they come to grasp how having such a vision can contribute to the work of Jewish educator, but that they actually spend serious time thinking about their own personal visions and the kinds of visions that might inform their work.

2. More concretely, the primary subject we felt that seminar should explore is the following: visions of a meaningful Jewish existence (a phrase that we felt somewhat more comfortable with than we were with "images of an educated Jew"), and the relationship between such a vision and the work of an educational institution. That is, what does it mean for an educational institution to be based on a particular vision of a meaningful Jewish existence? How does having such a vision inform the determination of goals, structures, in-service training, curriculum design, and so forth?

3. We would hope that participants would go home a) with some serious reflection under their belts concerning some significant visions of a meaningful Jewish existence, b) aware of the ways in which having such a vision can fruitfully inform the work of an educational institution; c) ready to go home to encourage local institutions to enter into the conversation concerning such a vision and to recognize the educational importance of so doing; d) with some concrete ideas about how to encourage this process back home.

4. We also felt that it was critical that as part of the seminar participants have a chance to locate the issues they would be exploring (which primarily relate to the educated Jew project) in relation to the entirety of the Goals Project. It would be critical in this connection to offer them a map, or a language for thinking about and differentiating between a variety of related but different ways of thinking about goals and visions. Some of the relevant points are included in Pekarsky's recent paper on goals. Our feeling was that the participants may be using terms like "goals" and "visions" in very different ways -- so different as to make genuine conversation very difficult. To facilitate such conversation and to make possible any real focus, this conceptual map be of critical importance.

5. Our understanding is that the seminar is primarily for the local project directors and for their lay leaders (and spouses).

6. Though more time may well be desirable, we thought it would be unrealistic to expect to get more than a week of their time (about

five days of work).

7. At the heart of the seminar we imagined opportunities to encounter significant visions of a meaningful Jewish existence, as articulate by people who are committed to them -- for example, Greenberg and Brinker. We felt that it was very important - politically and otherwise -- to include a representative of Reform Judaism in this seminar. After encountering these visions, participants would have the chance to take one of them and to explore its educational significance -- as a way of getting at the ways in which visions can help the work of the educator.

8. As elements in the seminar we also imagined: a) a pre-seminar effort on the part of all participants to wrestle in personal terms with some of the substantive questions that seminar would address; this would forward the work of the seminar in a number of ways. It would help generate both focus and motivation. b) well-crafted opportunities to study Jewish texts, with an eye towards making vivid to the participants how - in a variety of conceptions of a meaningful Jewish existence - text study enters in.

9. Our feeling was that the January Jerusalem meetings should be thought of as an effort to develop a proposal, or suggestions, for the summer seminar that reflects the concerns we have been discussing. The ideas that emerge will then come back to the North American team for review, elaboration, etc., in the light of their understanding of the relevant realities and needs in the three lead communities. Once they have turned the proposal into a plan, the Jerusalem team will have primary responsibility for working out the logistics.

10. We had what for me was a very important conversation concerning the relationship between vision, educational practice, and social reality. Among the points made were the following: a) though we recognize it as critical, the relationship between vision and educational practice is often not as clear, even for us, as it should be, and this matter needs urgent attention as we prepare for the seminar. Different ways of understanding this relationship need to be put on the table, and examples need to be found that illustrate the relationship at its best. b) We recognized that even if we were able to identify what an educational institution would look like that took a vision of a meaningful Jewish existence seriously, we would need to face up to social realities that might make such an institution hard to operate in a meaningful way at this moment in time -- realities that pertain to the attitudes and ways of life of the surrounding community, the educational and ideological background of available educators, etc. In this connection, we took note of the fact that even when a school has a vision and a curriculum that reflects it, teachers often feel driven early on to abandon it in favor "what interests and excites the kids" -- which becomes the criterion of success. The need to inform our work with both vision and social reality is critical to our success -- and attention needs to be paid to the relationship between them.

VISION AND EDUCATIONAL PRACTICE -- PART ONE

I

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

II

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

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

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

bring into being

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

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

- 1) it takes extraordinary talent to take a vision and translate it meaningfully into an educational design that adequately mirrors and reflects the vision;
- 2) there are probably several distinct models -- which we should be trying to identify (in a way that parallels the Scheffler piece on different ways of understanding the relationship between theory and practice) -- of what the relationship between vision and educational practice optimally is.
- 3) The translation of a vision into educational design requires a host of assumptions concerning the nature of human growth and learning, the power and limits of various social settings, etc. If we are strong on vision but weak on these kinds of matters, our likelihood of success is doubtful.

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

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

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

VISION AND EDUCATIONAL PRACTICE -- PART TWO

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

VISION -- Part Three: a few addenda

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

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

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

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

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

VISION4 --SOME MISCELLANEOUS THOUGHTS

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

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

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

2. FROM VISION TO PRACTICE.

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

Take 1: SEQUENTIAL IMPLEMENTATION

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

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

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

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

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

THE GOALS PROJECT OF THE COUNCIL ON INITIATIVES IN JEWISH EDUCATION: TOWARDS A POSITIVE AGENDA

INTRODUCTION

CIJE's February meeting will work towards generating agreement concerning how we should proceed with the Goals Project. This report is designed to provide some background for that meeting. It includes an introduction in which some of the basic conceptual points concerning the Goals Project and some basic conceptual points are stressed; a second section in which some pertinent points concerning the relationship between vision and educational practice are discussed; and a third section in which some possible directions for proceeding are articulated. The report reflects and tries to integrate discussions between Barry, Gail, Alan and myself over the last couple of months, as well as some very intensive conversations at the Mandel Institute in mid-January among Seymour Fox, Danny Marom, Shmuel Wygoda, and myself. Of necessity, some of the points made below repeat comments made in previous discussions.

The basic idea. Along with "Best Practices" and "Monitoring and Evaluation", the Goals Project has been associated with the CIJE conception and agenda from the very beginning. The reasons for this are simple but compelling.

The Goals Project is predicated on the idea that much of what passes for Jewish education today is lacking in any sense of direction, much less a compelling sense of direction. That is, the enterprise is not informed by coherent sense of what it is that one wants to achieve. This undermines efforts at education in a variety of significant ways. Absent a clear sense of what it is one wants to achieve in Jewish education, there can be no thoughtful basis for deciding such basic matters as the organization of the educational environment, the principal focus of instruction and the appropriate kind of pedagogy, the kinds of curricular materials that are appropriate, and the kinds of characteristics that are desirable in educators. Nor, in the absence of a clear sense of what one hopes to achieve, is there a reasonable basis for evaluating our efforts at education and making recommendations for reform. As I have noted in another CIJE memorandum, the upshot of this is that the de facto criteria of success in Jewish education become the following: Do the students continue coming? Are they non-disruptive? Do they seem engaged? Though these are, of course, vital matters that educators need to attend to, they do not establish a sufficient basis for determining educational practice.

To put the matter positively, the Goals Project takes it as a given that a necessary condition of success in Jewish education is the development of a clear and coherent vision of what it is that one hopes to accomplish. "What it is that one hopes to accomplish" can be interpreted in more than one way. It could, for example, refer to the kind of educational environment, peopled by what kinds of educators and featuring what kinds of activities, one would like

to bring into being. This is, of course, important and part of what the Goals Project is interested in. Notice, however, that decisions concerning the kind of educational environment one would like to bring into being are themselves dependent on answering a more fundamental question: namely, what kinds of human beings, featuring what constellation of attitudes, understandings, commitments, and dispositions, should Jewish educational institutions be trying to nurture? What is one's vision of a meaningful Jewish existence? If Jewish educators and those that employ them are to take us significantly beyond where we now are, they need to be guided by thoughtful answers to such questions. This conclusion seems to us sound not only on theoretical grounds; there is also ample, empirically grounded literature from general education that identifies the existence of a substantive guiding vision as a critical ingredient of a thriving educational environment.

Against this background, the Goals Project has been established to help appropriate groups and individuals to address basic questions concerning their guiding visions in a meaningful way and to arrive at answers which they find compelling. Beyond this, and equally important, the Goals Project is concerned with helping them to identify and find ways to begin actualizing the educational implications of these answers.

Caveats. A few caveats, some of them made in other memos but nonetheless worth summarizing, are in order:

1. Being able to articulate a guiding vision of a meaningful Jewish existence and really being committed to that vision are two very different things. The power of a vision to influence practice for the better probably depends substantially on genuine commitment to the vision.
2. For a guiding vision to really guide, it is important that front-line educators as well as lay and professional leaders come to identify strongly with it.
3. Those working with the Goals Project are under no illusion that arriving at the kind of guiding vision discussed above will itself yield clear educational implications or will suffice to improve the state of Jewish education. Indeed, we believe that hard, imaginative, and lengthy work is necessary if a guiding vision is to be actualized in a meaningful way. Our contention is, however, that the effort to articulate a guiding educational vision is the necessary starting-point.
4. Needless to add, our contention concerning the indispensability of vision is not an endorsement of any particular vision; it is, however, an endorsement of the

view that educating institutions should be hard at work identifying, clarifying, or deciding on what their own guiding vision is.

Clarifications. The more clarity there is concerning the nature and scope of the Goals Project, the more likely it is that we will proceed fruitfully. With this in mind, I want to stress or reiterate a few basic points that may help to clarify the enterprise.

1. The Goals Project is closely linked to but is not identical with the Educated Jew Project. The Educated Jew Project is a long-term research endeavor that involves identifying a discrete number of visions of an educated Jew, or a meaningful Jewish existence, and then trying in a systematic way to think through what, educationally speaking, they might imply. The ideas, articles, and personnel associated with the Educated Jew Project are resources available to CIJE's Goals Project, but how they are used and at what stage needs to be decided on a case-by-case basis. It may, in some but not all instances, be a mistake in some instances for the Goals Project to be the "Educated Jew" materials at the center of its efforts to stimulate serious thinking about goals.

2. Elsewhere I have drawn a distinction between two important, inter-related but nonetheless different, kinds of goals: substantive educational goals (that derive from a vision of a meaningful Jewish existence) and instrumental goals that a community or an institution sets for itself. Instrumental goals identify desiderata that are likely to contribute to success no matter what one's substantive vision might be (for example, increasing to a given level the number of appropriately qualified educational leaders or teachers in a school or community; increasing the number of students in Jewish educational settings like schools, summer camps, Israel programs, etc.) It has elsewhere been noted that the two kinds of goals are not as independent of each other as the distinction might suggest, but that is not my concern here. The important question concerns whether the Goals Project should be looking at both kinds of goals or only at the substantive educational goals. My impression is that while reflection on instrumental goals will go on in the Goals Project, its primary mandate is to stimulate progress in the area of substantive educational goals. If this is true, we need to be giving more thought as a group to the arena in which instrumental goals -- which are, I believe, invaluable -- will be developed for communities and institutions.

3. What is the appropriate clientele for the Goals Project? The Goals Project is concerned with three major levels:

educating institutions, Jewish communities, and the denominations. While the Goals Project has a special interest in the three Lead Communities, its work is not necessarily limited to them (and, in fact, as will be seen below, it may be fruitful to go beyond them).

FROM VISION TO EDUCATIONAL PRACTICE

In our Jerusalem meetings we found it useful to view the relationship between a vision of an educated Jew, or of a meaningful Jewish existence, and educational practice as mediated by other levels:

Level 1: Jewish Vision/philosophy of education

What kind of human being you are hoping to nurture via the educational process? What is the vision of a meaningful Jewish existence that is to guide your work as an educator?

Level 2: Educational Vision

What would an educational environment built on the Jewish vision identified at level 1. look like?

Level 3: From Vision to Practice (a)

At this level, the question becomes: what is necessary in order to actualize the vision described at the second level?

Level 4: From Vision to Practice (b)

Further concretization of the question considered at level 3, but taking into account increasing numbers of local, practical obstacles and opportunities.

A few comments about these levels. First, the relationship between levels is by no means simple or obvious. There is, for example, no sense in which one could deduce the contents of Level 2 from Level 1 or Level 3 from Level 2, etc. On the contrary, a host of considerations that go beyond what is implicit in any given level will influence what the next level in the sequence looks like. To take an important example, identifying a compelling vision of a meaningful Jewish existence by no means pre-determines our vision of an ideal educational setting for actualizing that vision (Level 2). In part this is because what the ideal educational setting will look like will depend on a host of other kinds of beliefs concerning, for example, what it means to use an educational ideal to guide practice (Compare, say, a Deweyan and

Tyler approach!), and the social and psychological conditions under which meaningful learning is likely to take place. Beyond this, the movement from a compelling vision of a meaningful Jewish existence to a portrait of an educational environment that is meaningfully informed by this vision requires what is really a feat of the imagination that meaningfully integrates a vast number of assumptions and beliefs (many of which may not even be articulated). This suggests the value of encouraging a variety of discrete efforts by different kinds of individuals to try to come up with the educational significance of, say, Greenberg's or Twersky's vision of an educated Jew.

How levels 2, 3, and 4 differ from each other may not be fully clear. The truth is that the differences between them can be drawn in different ways. The important point is that as we move from one level to the next we introduce not only increasing detail but also increasing amounts of local, contextual material. It is also important to note that the kind of individual who might be helpful to us in moving from Level 1 to Level 2 may not be the most helpful in moving from Level 3 to 4. That is, an imaginative person who might paint for us a compelling image of an educational setting that is anchored in Twersky's vision might not be the best person to guide our thinking about the design of the Bible or History curriculum. This means that the Goals Project will need to draw on diverse kind of human resources at different stages.

While in an important sense Level 1 is prior to Level 2, Level 2 is prior to Level 3 and so forth, this generally correct impression needs to be qualified. First, there are times when our analysis at level 3 may lead us to re-think our interpretation at Level 2, or when our analysis at Level 2 may lead us to re-think our views at Level 1. That is, in our attempt to paint an educational setting that is anchored in, say, Greenberg's vision of a meaningful Jewish existence, we may end up describing a setting which expresses a religious ideal that is somewhat different from the one Greenberg articulates or identifies with. It could be that on reflection we find the latter more compelling and that we dissolve the dissonance not by changing the conception of the setting but by re-interpreting our guiding religious vision.

Second, though the picture of successive levels painted above begins with Level 1, in actuality, meaningful reflection on educationally powerful visions need not begin here. Suppose, for example, that we chance to come upon a compelling portrait of an educational setting that seems to us very rich. We could very reasonably work upwards from this portrait to the vision of a meaningful Jewish existence which seems to be implicit in it. That is, in some cases, the starting-point for reflection on meaningful goals might be Level 2 and not level 1. Similarly, it is not inconceivable that reflection concerning a particular of educational practice, e.g. the direction of the Hebrew curriculum, could push inquiry upwards towards reflection concerning the institution's basic underlying vision. The relevance of these considerations is the following: while it is clear that the

important thing for the Goals Project is to stimulate meaningful reflection on guiding visions and goals, it does not follow that the starting-point need be with what I have called Level 1; rather, where among the various levels one is to begin will depend on a variety of practical and strategic considerations that will need to be assessed on a case-by-case basis.

{ca FEBRUARY, 1994}

TOWARDS AN AGENDA FOR THE GOALS PROJECT

INTRODUCTION

The Goals Project is a multi-pronged effort to catalyze what might be called "vision-drivenness" in Jewish educational institutions. To refer to an educating institution as vision-driven is to say that its work is guided and energized by a substantive vision of what it wants to achieve, of the kinds of human beings it is trying to cultivate. To speak of a Jewish educational institution as vision-driven is to say of it that it is animated by a vision or conception of a meaningful Jewish existence. The Goals Project will encourage vision-drivenness by educating relevant individuals, groups, and institutions concerning the importance of vision-drivenness and through various strategies designed to facilitate and encourage both serious reflection on underlying visions and equally serious efforts to identify and actualize the educational implications of the answers arrived at through such reflection.

This principal aim of this report is to set forth, for purposes of our deliberation, some fairly concrete ideas -- or, rather, options - about how the Goals Project should proceed. Prior to describing these ideas, the framework for discussion will be laid out in three brief sections, respectively entitled Rationale, Caveats, Clarifications.

Many of the ideas expressed in this report summarize ideas developed in the course of discussions among CIJE staff in North America and an intensive set of meetings at the Mandel Institute in Jerusalem held in January, 1994.

Rationale. Along with "Best Practices" and "Monitoring and Evaluation", the Goals Project has been associated with the CIJE conception and agenda from the very beginning. The reasons for this are simple but compelling.

The Goals Project is predicated on the idea that much of what passes for Jewish education today is lacking in any sense of direction, much less a compelling sense of direction. That is, the enterprise is not informed by coherent sense of what it is that one wants to achieve. This undermines efforts at education in a variety of significant ways. Absent a clear sense of what it is one wants to achieve in Jewish education, there can be no thoughtful basis for deciding such basic matters as the organization of the educational environment, the principal focus of instruction and the appropriate kind of pedagogy, the kinds of curricular materials that are appropriate, and the kinds of characteristics that are desirable in educators. Nor, in the absence of a clear sense of what one hopes to achieve, is there a reasonable basis for evaluating our efforts at education and making recommendations for reform. As I have noted in another CIJE memorandum, the upshot of this is that the de facto criteria of success in Jewish education become the following: Do the students continue coming? Are they

non-disruptive? Do they seem engaged? Though these are, of course, vital matters that educators need to attend to, they do not establish a sufficient basis for determining educational practice.

To put the matter positively, the Goals Project takes it as a given that a necessary condition of success in Jewish education is the development of a clear and coherent vision of what it is that one hopes to accomplish. "What it is that one hopes to accomplish" can be interpreted in more than one way. It could, for example, refer to the kind of educational environment, peopled by what kinds of educators and featuring what kinds of activities, one would like to bring into being. This is, of course, important and part of what the Goals Project is interested in. Notice, however, that decisions concerning the kind of educational environment one would like to bring into being are themselves dependent on answering a more fundamental question: namely, what kinds of human beings, featuring what constellation of attitudes, understandings, commitments, and dispositions, should Jewish educational institutions be trying to nurture? What is one's vision of a meaningful Jewish existence? If Jewish educators and those that employ them are to take us significantly beyond where we now are, they need to be guided by thoughtful answers to such questions. This conclusion seems to us sound not only on theoretical grounds; there is also ample, empirically grounded literature from general education that identifies the existence of a substantive guiding vision as a critical ingredient of a thriving educational environment.

The contention that vision is indispensable is, of course, not intended to suggest the desirability of any particular vision. It does, however, represent an endorsement of the view that each educating institution should be hard at work identifying the vision appropriate for it, and then looking for ways to better embody this vision in the institution's culture and educational activities. It is this effort that the Goals Project will try to encourage and support.

Caveats. A few caveats are in order:

1. Being able to articulate a guiding vision of a meaningful Jewish existence and really being committed to that vision are two very different things. The power of a vision to influence practice for the better probably depends substantially on genuine commitment to the vision.
2. For a guiding vision to really guide, it is important that front-line educators as well as lay and professional leaders come to identify strongly with it.
3. The road from a compelling vision of a meaningful Jewish existence to the design and implementation of appropriate educational arrangements is long, complex, and under-determined. In particular, no unique set of

educational arrangements can be deduced from any given vision of a meaningful Jewish existence. The movement from vision to a characterization of educational arrangements that offer promise of realizing that vision presupposes a host of beliefs not contained in the original vision, as well as considerable imagination; and the movement from a portrait of optimal educational arrangements to actual practice in the real world in which we live is also anything but simple. [Time permitting, these points concerning the relationship between vision and practice will be elaborated in an appendix to this document.]

Clarifications. The more clarity there is concerning the nature and scope of the Goals Project, the more likely it is that we will proceed fruitfully. With this in mind, I want to stress or reiterate a few basic points that may help to clarify the enterprise.

1. The Goals Project is closely linked to but is not identical with the Educated Jew Project. The Educated Jew Project is a long-term research endeavor that involves identifying a discrete number of visions of an educated Jew, or a meaningful Jewish existence, and then trying in a systematic way to think through what, educationally speaking, they might imply. The ideas, articles, and personnel associated with the Educated Jew Project are resources available to CIJE's Goals Project, but how they are used and at what stage needs to be decided on a case-by-case basis. It may, in some but not all instances, be a mistake in some instances for the Goals Project to be the "Educated Jew" materials at the center of its efforts to stimulate serious thinking about goals.

2. Elsewhere I have drawn a distinction between two important, inter-related but nonetheless different, kinds of goals: substantive educational goals (that derive from a vision of a meaningful Jewish existence) and instrumental goals that a community or an institution sets for itself. Instrumental goals identify desiderata that are likely to contribute to success no matter what one's substantive vision might be (for example, increasing to a given level the number of appropriately qualified educational leaders or teachers in a school or community; increasing the number of students in Jewish educational settings like schools, summer camps, Israel programs, etc.) It has elsewhere been noted that the two kinds of goals are not as independent of each other as the distinction might suggest, but that is not my concern here. The important question concerns whether the Goals Project should be looking at both kinds of goals or only

at the substantive educational goals. While reflection on instrumental goals will go on in the Goals Project, its primary mandate is to stimulate progress in the area of substantive educational goals. [If this is true, we need to be giving more thought as a group to the arena in which instrumental goals -- which are, I believe, invaluable - will be developed for communities and institutions.]

3. What is the appropriate clientele for the Goals Project? The Goals Project is concerned with three major levels: educating institutions, Jewish communities, and the denominations. It is interested not only in working with each of these levels independently but also in encouraging them to support one another's efforts to articulate and actualize their educational visions. While the Goals Project has a special interest in the three Lead Communities, its work is not necessarily limited to them (and, in fact, as will be seen below, it may be fruitful to go beyond them).

SOME CONCRETE PROPOSALS

There are many possible ways in which CIJE might try to encourage serious and productive attention to questions of vision and goals, and it is an open question precisely how much or what we should be doing. Relevant considerations include the following: a) What seem to be fruitful ways of encouraging productive work in this area? b) What human and financial resources will be required by these different strategies, and are they available to us? c) What is the appropriate time-frame within which we should be working?

Below I summarize a number of strategies that have been under discussion within CIJE and the Mandel Institute. In putting some of these concrete ideas on the table, the expectation is not that one or all of them will be accepted but that they will provide a springboard to serious deliberation concerning what the Goals Project should be doing. My hope is that by the end of the February 10 meeting we will have arrived at a preliminary decision concerning a set of strategies that seem both feasible and fruitful, as well as the rudiments of a plan of action. The decision made might be to endorse one or more of the strategies discussed below, in the form presented or in a revised form; or it might be to pursue an as-yet unidentified route.

SOME STRATEGIES TO BE CONSIDERED

1. Encouraging vision-drivenness via educational efforts.

Whatever CIJE accomplishes with the Goals Project will depend in large part on whether the relevant groups, institutions,

communities, and individuals come to recognize the important role of vision-drivenness in education. The need to nurture such an appreciation poses a serious educational challenge for CIJE. How this challenge is to be addressed will vary with different contexts; but there are certain general things we can be doing which may have a high pay-off across these contexts. In particular, the Goals Project should work systematically to develop a library of materials that explain the importance of and exemplify vision-drivenness. Such a resource bank would include the following:

A. Thoughtful, readily understandable discussions of what it means to be guided by a vision, of the way vision-drivenness can contribute to the development, implementation, and evaluation of educational practices, and of the accumulating evidence from the world of general education that being vision-driven pays rich educational dividends.

B. One picture, the saying goes, is worth a thousand words. Examples of flourishing educating institutions that are vision-driven will be invaluable, particularly if accompanied by vivid accounts of the ways in which the vision informs what goes on in the institution. Such examples could come from the world of Jewish education but also from general education. The Waldorf school that grows out of the work of Rudolph Steiner has been pointed to as a possibly interesting example.

C. Examples of institutions that have gone through a serious goals-defining process and have, through this process, succeeded in transforming what they are doing in fruitful ways. Examples might well be found in the work of the Coalition of Essential Schools, as documented in their journal, HORACE.

D. "The future as history." Following the lead of the Carnegie Commission in A NATION PREPARED, CIJE would do well to commission one or more articles that vividly present educating institutions of the kind we -- or some segment of "we" - might hope to see ten or twenty years down the road. The challenge would be i) to make the institution(s) come alive in an appealing way, and ii) to show how, down to its very details, it reflects a particular animating vision. The suggestion that more than one such article be commissioned reflects our sense that we would want to see portraits reflecting more than one vision of a meaningful Jewish existence.

E. The "Educated Jew" project is a potentially rich resource, particularly as the philosophical conceptions that are its starting-point are translated into portraits of educational institutions that adequately reflect that vision.

2. Strategies for working with individual educational institutions

A. A Coalition of Vision-Driven Institutions

This proposal is that a coalition be established for educating institutions that are seriously interested in going through a process of clarifying their underlying vision and goals, as well as in articulating and working towards the actualization of the relevant educational implications. In addition to providing evidence of seriousness, participating institutions would have to meet a variety of standards in order to qualify for admission and to remain in good standing. Member institutions would be offered a variety of CIJE-resources designed to facilitate and support their efforts.

While some institutions from Lead Communities might well be interested in and qualify for membership in the coalition, the proposal does not assume that the coalition will be limited to Lead Communities. On the contrary, the hope is that institutions in other communities would want to enter the process.

It is far from clear how many institutions would be interested in participating in the coalition or would qualify. If the coalition were to begin with only two or three institutions, this would by no means be a disaster; indeed, it might be desirable. If, on the other hand, a host of institutions were both interested and able to meet the standards for entry, this might create some resource-problems for CIJE. In particular, it might well require CIJE to identify appropriate individuals in Jewish education from around the country who could serve as consultants or resources to the member-institutions as they set about their work. Identifying who such people might be and getting clearer on their availability is some thing that is probably worth getting started on.

If CIJE is to pursue this proposal, a variety of important tasks lie on the immediate horizon. It might also be useful to invite an articulate representative of the Coalition of Essential Schools to meet with us so that we

can benefit from that coalition's experience and insight.

B. Identify a single institution, or perhaps one or two within each lead community, and work intensively with each one on issues of goals.

This proposal is in a sense more modest than the Coalition proposal (A., above). The intuition that informs it is that, particularly given possibly scarce human resources available to the project, we would be better off pouring these resources intensively into one or a few settings than to risk squandering them by trying to address the needs of too many institutions.

3. Strategies for working with Lead Community lay and professional leadership.

A. A planning seminar (planned for this summer).

This seminar would be designed to engage lay and professional leadership, especially within Lead Communities, around the theme of Vision and Educational Practice. The seminar, as now conceptualized, would include the following kinds of elements: 1. opportunities for participants to come to appreciate the important role that vision and goals can play in guiding the educational process; 2. a chance to begin or continue working through their own visions of a meaningful Jewish existence; 3. a chance to encounter other such views, including but not limited to formulations developed in the "Educated Jew" project; 4. a chance to begin thinking about what's involved in trying to use such a vision to guide educational practice; 5. a chance to develop a strategy for engaging educating institutions in their local communities in the goal-setting process.

If such a seminar is to take place, a number of decision need to be made fast. For example, when and for how long will it take place? Where will it take place -- in Israel or in the United States? Who will be the faculty?

Who will be invited to participate? Should it be limited to the lay and professional leadership in the Lead communities or should it be opened to a broader clientele? If the latter, who should be included in this broader clientele?

B. Consultations to a community's leadership around efforts already under way or accomplished that are concerned with goals.

For example, in a community like Milwaukee that recently went through a strategic planning experience that put "visioning" at the center, CIJE could initiate a serious conversation designed to unearth and develop the substantive ideals, the educational visions, that underlie the proposals that emerged from the Strategic Planning process. And if it turns out that these substantive ideals prove elusive, this could be a fruitful catalyst for serious discussions of questions of visions and goals.

4. At the denominational level, we need to find ways of encouraging the national training institutions to develop a pro-active approach to the problem of goals for Jewish education, an approach that includes efforts to catalyze serious attention to vision and goals on the part of constituent educational institutions. The question is how to do this. Below a few possible directions in which to proceed are identified.

A. Encourage the denominations to clarify and more adequately articulate their own guiding visions of a meaningful Jewish existence. This could be done in more than one way. One route would be to use existing vision-statements as guides, or in any case, as springboards for further clarification. Another route might be to ask them to identify an educating institution that adequately exhibits what the denomination represents and strives for, and then to do a content analysis of the basic assumptions concerning the aims of education that seem to be implicit in that institution's practice.

B. Encourage national denominational institutions to work intensively with one or more carefully selected educating institutions on issues relating to the identification of a vision and its educational implications. Such institutions might, but need not be, located in the three principal lead-communities.

C. The kinds of efforts articulated in A. and B. might be launched via a series of two or more seminars that

involve the denominational leaders in reflecting on these matters, as well as on ways of getting their constituent institutions to take issues of vision and goals seriously. Whether such seminars should be limited to members of any given denomination or should be cross-denominational would have to be decided; conceivably, the initial seminar that launches the project at the denominational level would be inter-denominational, while those that follow would be intra-denominational.

5. Pilot-Projects.

One way to approach the Goals Project, a way which overlaps but is not identical with the approaches discussed above, is to undertake one or more pilot-projects. For example, a pilot-project might take a particular dimension of Jewish education, e.g. the teaching of Bible or the Israel experience, and systematically explore it in relation to issues of underlying vision and goals. This could be done in a variety of ways and at a variety of levels. For example, a community might take it on itself to focus on a particular dimension of Jewish education - say, the Israel experience - and to catalyze serious reflection on the part of all local institutions (across denominations) concerning the foundational and derivative aims of such an experience and the way such aims operate to guide practice. Conceivably, different communities would take different dimensions of Jewish education as their central focus.

One could also imagine national denominational organizations making an agreement to explore one or more dimensions of Jewish education in this way. Such an agreement could give rise to some fascinating results: for one would expect that if the denominations approached any given dimension of Jewish education - from the teaching of Hebrew to the teaching of Israel to the teaching of Bible - seriously and with careful attention to their different visions of a meaningful Jewish existence and the aims of Jewish education, important differences in educational emphasis and direction would emerge.

CONCLUDING COMMENTS

My hope is that the foregoing discussion will suffice to stimulate and guide our discussion at our February meetings. Such discussion might profitably focus on a) unclarities, incompletenesses or mis-statements found in this document; b) the adequacy of the various proposals and ways of improving them; c) pertinent proposals not articulated in this document. Ideally, we will emerge with the rudiments of a strategy at each of the major levels discussed above.

Based on the foregoing, I would recommend the following agenda for our February 10 meeting:

1. Summarizing/refining/rethinking the basics: a) Underlying assumptions and key distinctions that inform and define the goals project; b) the levels at which the goals project is to work; c) considerations pertinent to a decision concerning which strategy or strategies to adopt.

2. A summary and discussion of the major proposals represented in this report, as well as additional proposals that seem promising.

3. Action: a) Decide on one or more proposals to pursue, and b) Develop a plan of action, including a division of labor.

GOALS FOR JEWISH EDUCATION IN LEAD COMMUNITIES

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

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

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

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

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

The Mandel Institute has particularly concentrated efforts in this area through its project on alternative conceptions of "The Educated Jew." The scholars involved in this project are: Professors Moshe Greenberg, Menahem Brinker, Isadore Twersky, Michael Rosenak, Israel Scheffler, Seymour Fox and Daniel Marom. Accompanied by a group of talented educators and social scientists, they have completed several important essays offering alternative approaches to the goals of Jewish education as well

as indications of how these goals should be applied to educational settings and practice. These scholars would be willing to work with the institutions of higher Jewish learning and thus enrich their contribution to this effort in Lead Communities.

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

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

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

Seymour Fox & Daniel Marom

From: "Dan Pekarsky" <PEKARSKY@mail.soemadison.wisc.edu>
Reply-To: PEKARSKY@soemadison.wisc.edu
To: MANDEL@VMS.HUJI.AC.IL
Date: Wed, 05 Jan 1994 12:41:00 -600
Subject: Vision-rvs

Date: 1/02/1994 9:10 am (Sunday)
Subject: Vision-rvs

VISION AND EDUCATIONAL PRACTICE -- PART ONE

I

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

II

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

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

The implication of this for us is that we need to be careful not to assume that "the vision thing" is easily taken care of. Although it would in itself be a significant achievement, it is probably not enough for lay and professional leaders to read a denominational mission statement or the kind of vision propounded by a Moshe Greenberg and to say, "This sounds good; I can identify with this." There also needs to be a high level of personal identification, intellectual and emotional, with the ideal that is propounded -- the kind of identification that reveals itself in the individual's speech and conduct. It would be naive for us to think that it is easy to catalyze this kind of identification.

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

- 1) it takes extraordinary talent to take a vision and translate it meaningfully into an educational design that adequately mirrors and reflects the vision;
- 2) there are probably several distinct models -- which we should be trying to identify (in a way that parallels the Scheffler piece on different ways of understanding the relationship between theory and practice) -- of what the relationship between vision and educational practice optimally is.
- 3) The translation of a vision into educational design requires a host of assumptions concerning the nature of human growth and learning, the power and limits of various social settings, etc. If we are strong on vision but weak on these kinds of matters, our likelihood of success is doubtful.

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

I say in the preceding sentence "even conceptually" because we have yet to encounter more practical, or sociological, obstacles that can sabotage the effort to translate vision into reality. Let us suppose that a committed and remarkably able

educational leader, supported by his or her lay and professional leadership, succeeded in translating a vision of a meaningful Jewish existence into a powerful educational vision, a well-developed conception of what an educational institution animated by this Jewish vision would look like. The sad truth is that many such educational conceptions that have been very thoughtfully developed fail miserably when actually implemented. And the reason is that it is at this point that a host of "real world" considerations come into play that are often ignored, or treated cavalierly, in the design phase. I will elaborate in Part Two.

From: "Dan Pekarsky" <PEKARSKY@mail.soemadison.wisc.edu>
Reply-To: PEKARSKY@soemadison.wisc.edu
To: MANDEL@VMS.HUJI.AC.IL
Date: Wed, 05 Jan 1994 12:42:00 -600
Subject: vision-part2rvs

Date: 1/02/1994 9:23 am (Sunday)
Subject: vision-part2rvs

VISION AND EDUCATIONAL PRACTICE -- PART TWO

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

- 1) Are the front-line teachers/educators themselves personally and strongly identified with the vision of Jewish existence and of education that presumably frames their efforts? Given the realities in the field today, one often cannot make this assumption. The solution would seem to be some kind of "in-service" education; but here again, we need to avoid being naive concerning what a few in-service sessions can actually accomplish in the way of generating genuine commitment to a shared vision?
- 2) Is the educational director a person who, in addition to a commitment to a vision, brings a high level of educational talent and a sense of presence to his or her work with front-line educators, parents and children? If the institution's educational leader does not possess these characteristics, implementation is likely to founder.
- 3) What are the values, the beliefs, the concerns - the human outlook - of the community from which the clientele for the educational program will come? The best laid plans of mice and men often go awry because of a failure to take into account this crucial matter -- namely, the readiness of the clientele for the

kind of educational institution and program that have been developed on their behalf. If the gap is substantial between what the educational vision assumes about the nature and the background of the "students" and who they really are, success is highly unlikely. [A curriculum put together by the Educational Development Corporation might be conceptually very well-thought-out, given the assumptions of the developers. But it doesn't follow that the curriculum will be universally effective: even if it's effective in Newton, Mass. (say, because the developers' understanding of what students are like is based on the kinds of students one would encounter in Newton), it doesn't follow that it would work with the kinds of students one would meet up with in Roxbury or Lewiston, Maine.]

What happens all-too-often is this: a teacher - perhaps an old-timer who has over time developed a fairly stable style of teaching, or a new teacher, probably with not a great deal of experience or Judaic knowledge - is informed that the school has developed a new curriculum that is rooted in the institution's larger sense of mission. The teacher is asked to participate in a few in-service sessions, designed to familiarize him or her with the institutional mission and the curriculum that flows from it. Whether at the end of this process the teacher identifies with this enterprise at all, much less in the necessary strong sense, is doubtful. When this teacher finally meets up with the students, he or she finds it very hard to engage the students with the curriculum: the students are bored, they are antsy, they are beginning to act up. Pretty soon, with or without announcing it to the powers-that-be, the teacher abandons the curriculum in favor of "what works" -- where "what works" is defined by what engages the students' energies, or (short of this) by what keeps them under control. "Keeping them under control and interested" become the criterion for success and the basis for determining appropriate learning experiences. So much for the guiding moral and curricular vision!

How might this problem be addressed? One solution might be to make clear to all relevant leaders - lay, rabbinic, and educational - that the vision/educational program that is to be

implemented only has a chance if certain conditions obtain -- for example, an insistence that all educational personnel be "brought on board in a more than perfunctory way, as well as a willingness to re-shape the approach being recommended so that it has a chance of meshing with the particular client-population. Note, though, that the capacity to effect such adaptation requires considerable effort and talent on the part of educational leaders and front-line staff.

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

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

LOCAL CIJE GOALS SEMINARS

The Goals Project is one of several initiatives developed by the Council for Initiatives in Jewish Education that are designed to catalyze, encourage, and support improvement in Jewish Education. The two guiding assumptions of the Goals Project are straight-forward:

1. As significant educational research suggests, educational effectiveness depends substantially on whether or not educating institutions are organized around goals that are clear and compelling to the key stakeholders. Without clear goals, assessment of our efforts is rendered impossible. In addition, goals ought properly to play a critical role in the making of basic decisions concerning personnel, in-service education, curriculum design, pedagogy, and the organization of the physical and social environment in which learning takes place.

2. Educating institutions (both in general and in Jewish education) suffer from a failure to be meaningfully organized around educational goals that are clear and compelling to the major partners in the enterprise - the children, the parents, and even the educators. In the case of Jewish education, the failure is typically of various kinds simultaneously. For example, sometimes the enterprise is not guided by any clear goals; sometimes there are goals but they are only marginally or symbolically represented in day-to-day institutional life; and oftentimes the goals are not identified with even by the educators. Numerous problems flow very naturally from such weaknesses.

Growing out of these twin-assumptions, the Goals Project is an effort to encourage serious attention to goals on the part of educating institutions in the Jewish community. While addressing our weaknesses in this domain is no substitute from addressing other needs such as the personnel crisis, it is essential to any serious effort at educational improvement.

The Goals Project began with a seminar in Jerusalem for lay and professional communal and educational leaders from a number of Jewish communities around the country. In the second, and upcoming, stage of the project, CIJE, in conjunction with these leaders, will sponsor seminars in these communities for the leadership of local educating institutions. These seminars are designed with the following purposes in mind:

1. to offer the representatives of participating institutions an opportunity to develop a heightened appreciation of the important roles that goals can and should be play in education, as well as the conditions

under which goals can effectively play these roles.

2. to provide participants with an opportunity to acquire questions, concepts and tools that will make possible thoughtful institutional self-studies that are sensitive to goals-related issues. Along with this there will be assignments designed to encourage this kind of self-study.

3. to provide participants with a chance to better understand the process that leads from a vision of the kind of person and community one hopes to nurture to a statement of educational goals, and thence to the development of curricular and pedagogical practices. The seminar will include opportunities to work through this process in relationship to concrete cases.

4. to surface and address the difficult issues and dilemmas that must be dealt with if the kinds of institutions many of us work in are to become more effectively organized around a Goals-agenda.

5. finally, to encourage and offer support to efforts to become more effectively organized around a goals-agenda.

In short, CIJE believes that participation in this seminar offers representatives of educating institutions a special opportunity to grow much clearer about what they are fundamentally about, to identify weaknesses, and to work towards the kind of systematic improvement that we need in Jewish education. Through their participation, lay and professional leaders of an educating institution will be helped to approach more effectively many of the difficult decisions they face. In addition, CIJE is prepared to work with a select group of institutions that complete the seminar on a very intensive effort at educational improvement that is organized around a goals-agenda. The nature of this stage and conditions for participation will be discussed in the seminar.

The seminar will consist of four sessions, and participants are expected to be present for all four. While the precise character of each session will depend on a number of variables, including who the participant-institutions are and what transpired at the preceding sessions, the general design of the seminar is to allow for a different theme for each session. The seminar may well look something like this:

Session 1: An examination, with careful attention to examples, of the major ways in which goals figure inadequately in Jewish educating institutions and of the ways in which this undermines their efforts at education. Juxtaposed with this will be an opportunity

to look at the opposite: to examine "vision-driven institutions," that is, educating institutions which are guided by a compelling vision of what they are after, a vision which is reflected in their goals and practice.

Session 2: With the help of homework assignments completed between Sessions 1 and 2, an examination of the way goals do and don't figure in the work of the institutions represented in the seminar. Participants will also have a chance to explore their own personal visions of the aims of Jewish education and how these do and don't fit with the institution's vision and with practical realities.

Session 3: From Vision to Practice. Participants will have a chance to study and reflect on two very powerful but different visions of the aims of Jewish education, and then to consider - indeed, experiment with - what might be involved in a serious and systematic effort to use a vision as a guide to educational practice. Findings from organizational psychology and the field of curriculum will be drawn on.

Session 4: Content will depend on preceding sessions. As projected, however, this session will involve two components: a) a look at research that bears on the difficult problem of arriving at a shared and compelling vision in an institution featuring great diversity, and b) drawing on homework assignments, an examination of efforts planned by participating institutions to forward a Goals Agenda.

TOWARDS AN AGENDA FOR CIJE'S GOALS PROJECT IN 1994-95

Introductory. CIJE's Goals Seminar in Jerusalem in July, 1994 served as an effective launching pad for the Goals Project. It catalyzed substantial interest and gave rise to an agenda for the work ahead. In this report, an attempt is made to summarize this agenda -- along with pertinent questions and issues that need addressing.

Commitments undertaken. As reported in the Proceedings of the Summer Seminar, CIJE has committed itself to working (in the area of Goals) with Baltimore, Cleveland, and Milwaukee. What CIJE has said is that, for those communities that can generate an appropriate clientele representing local educating institutions, CIJE is prepared to sponsor a series of 3 or 4 seminars designed to accomplish two things: first, to initiate them into the work of the Goals Project; and 2) to determine which, if any, of these institutions are prepared, in partnership with CIJE, to work intensively towards becoming more vision-driven than they may now be. Institutions that in their own judgment and that of CIJE are eager and able to engage in this kind of intensive work would move on to the next stage. At this stage, each of these institutions would appoint a coach or a lead-person to oversee its efforts. CIJE would work intensively with these coaches in their efforts to improve the institutions they represent.

Additional challenges. In addition to commitments undertaken with respect to the three communities identified above, discussions have been raised concerning whether and how CIJE should work with, or should encourage collaborative work among, individual educating institutions that were involved in the Jerusalem Seminar and that have expressed an interest in working seriously on issues of goals. There is also a question concerning what might be the Goals Project's relationship to Atlanta, which was not represented at the Goals Seminar at all.

The up-coming local seminars. The local seminars scheduled for this coming year in Baltimore, Cleveland, and Milwaukee might develop in the following way. In a preliminary meeting, CIJE staff and representatives of the local community would meet to discuss the clientele that has been locally identified for the seminar and to begin a process of planning the direction of the seminar with attention to local concerns. Although what the seminar would look like would depend on this discussion, one could imagine a sequence of three meetings that would look something like this:

Session 1: An introduction to the main ideas and convictions that define the Goals Project, with attention to key-concepts. Session 1 concludes with a homework assignment that asks participating institutions to respond to a series of substantial questions concerning the presence or absence of goals and vision in their work. These questions would direct their attention not only to institutional rhetoric but to the goals that

actually seem to be implicit in practice - and also to educational outcomes.

Session 2: In this session, participants discuss what they have found in their respective self-studies. In preparation for Session 3, participants are asked to study two or three essays that offer competing visions of the aims of Jewish education; they are also asked to define how they personally and their institution stand in relation to these competing visions.

Session 3: In this session participants discuss the essays they have been asked to read, and they also do an exercise designed to learn what might be involved in trying to translate one of these visions into educational practice in a systematic way. At the same time, it is stressed that there are ways other than beginning with vision to become more thoughtful about one's institutional goals, a point that will also be illustrated.

Session 4: Participants craft documents identifying 2 or more strategies for rendering their institutions more vision driven than they now are -- or at least better organized around goals. The pros and cons of different strategies are also included. These documents become the subject for this session. The seminar ends with an invitation to interested institutions to apply to become part of the next stage of the CIJE process.

Conceivably, one of the sessions might be organized around a case-study.

Personnel needs. The foregoing is no more than a sketch of a possible route to go. Its main intent is twofold: 1) to get us thinking concretely about how to proceed; and 2) to focus our attention on the fact that the work in question will be demanding and on the consequent need for us to begin thinking very concretely about who will be able to do what.

While Pekarsky is willing to take on responsibility for some of the local seminar work, he probably cannot organize or attend all sessions in all communities; there will therefore need to be other people on-board willing and able to work in this domain. More specifically, we need to be asking who will be working with each of the communities already on-board. We cannot afford to lose much momentum at this stage.

What should we be doing to initiate Atlanta into this effort? When should this happen -- and who should be doing this?

Who should be working with the educating institutions

that were present at the Jerusalem Seminar? Should one of us have ongoing responsibilities with them?

We've discussed the need to do some more theoretical and strategic thinking about how to approach becoming more vision- and goals-driven. In this connection, we've talked about speaking with Levin, Sizer, etc. We need to decide who will be involved with this -- who will coordinate the effort, who will participate, whether we would want to include representatives of Lead Communities in such discussions, etc.

At various points we've discussed the advisability of identifying and bringing on board a group of talented coaches that will work with CIJE, local communities, and educating institutions in various phases of the work ahead. If this is to happen, one of us will need to identify and reach out to the appropriate individuals -- but I'm not sure we can do this effectively until we have a somewhat clearer plan of action.

Concluding comments. The foregoing represents an attempt to stimulate some thinking concerning issues and decisions on our immediate horizon. One last thought: perhaps we should be considering the possibility of one or more regional seminars during the year (as part of "the local seminar" idea) -- for example, bringing a group from several communities together during the winter-break for some intensive work.

THE GOALS PROJECT OF THE COUNCIL ON INITIATIVES IN JEWISH EDUCATION

THE GOALS PROJECT: the Goals Project is a CIJE initiative designed to foster an appreciation of the critical role that Vision, Goals, and Objectives play in Jewish education, and to collaborate with the lay and professional leadership of local communities to catalyze meaningful efforts to translate this appreciation into educational practice. The Goals Project is an effort to encourage Jewish educational institutions, in Lead communities and elsewhere, to become vision-driven.

The key-terms used in this description are explained below:

"VISION": The term "vision" is used to refer to a substantive conception of a meaningful Jewish existence. There are many such conceptions, and the essential thing is for an institution to decide which such conception will guide its educational efforts. A "vision-driven institution" is an educating institution whose work is significantly guided by an animating vision.

"GOALS": The term "Goals", as we use the term in the Goals Project, refers to general statements of purpose which guide the educational enterprise and which are anchored in a vision of a meaningful Jewish existence. "The development of a proficient knowledge of Hebrew," "the love of God," "the love of Jewish study", "the observance of Mitzvot" are all examples of educational goals. Notice that even when spokespersons for different visions seem to converge on an educational goal, their interpretation of that goal and the importance they attach to it may well differ because of differences in their underlying visions.

"OBJECTIVES": The term "objectives" refers to educational purposes (or desired outcomes) associated with a particular learning experience or sequence of learning experiences. Educational objectives are rooted in goals (which are themselves rooted in an underlying vision).

THE EDUCATED JEW PROJECT: the Educated Jew Project is a long-term research project of the Mandel Institute. This project invites leading Jewish thinkers to articulate their respective visions of an educated Jew and then to work with educators to translate their visions into terms that will make them usable in educational settings. Although this is a long-term research project that is distinct from the Goals Project, some of the human and intellectual resources associated with the Educated Jew Project will be made available to the Goals Project.

SUMMER SEMINAR IN JERUSALEM: the Summer Seminar will bring to Israel lay and professional leaders in Jewish education, primarily but not exclusively from Lead Communities, for an intensive period of study and planning. The seminar is designed to educate this leadership concerning the critical role that vision and goals play in education, to give them a chance to examine a number of powerful visions of a meaningful Jewish existence with attention to their educational implications, and to stimulate thinking about the challenges and obstacles that need to be addressed in encouraging vision-drivenness in educating institutions. It is expected that on their return from the seminar participants will collaborate with CIJE in its efforts to encourage various efforts in this arena in their home-communities. These efforts include but are not limited to the local, Goals Project Seminars described below.

LOCAL GOALS PROJECT SEMINARS (1994-95): In each Lead Community that generates an appropriate clientele, CIJE will offer a set of seminars designed to educate the leadership of local educating institutions concerning the nature and importance of vision-drivenness and to encourage efforts to move in that direction.

THE GOALS PROJECT'S AGENDA

The Goals Project will be spearheading a number of efforts to encourage vision-drivenness in Jewish education.

A library of educational resources. The Goals Project has begun a process of gathering materials, both theoretical and practical, that speak to the importance of vision and its relationship to educational goals and practice, as well as to the process of becoming vision-driven. This library of materials will be made available to communities and educating institutions that are interested in fostering vision-drivenness.

A Summer Seminar in Jerusalem. The Summer Seminar will bring to Israel lay and professional leaders in Jewish education, primarily but not exclusively from Lead Communities, for an intensive period of study and planning. The seminar is designed to foster in participants an appreciation for the critical role that vision plays in Jewish education and to think through various issues that must be addressed if Jewish educating institutions, in general and in their local communities, are to become more vision-driven than they typically are. The seminar is designed with the expectation that on their return from the seminar, participants will collaborate with CIJE in its efforts to encourage work in this arena in their home-communities.

Although details of the Summer Seminar are still being worked out, the following elements will be included:

1. Opportunities to develop an understanding of the ways in which having a vision can contribute to the design and effectiveness of an educating institution, as well as a chance to look at empirical studies that suggest the power of vision.

2. A chance to read articles by and to meet with some exceptionally thoughtful individuals who have long pondered the question of what is an educated Jew, of what Jewish education should be educating towards. Encountering and wrestling with the visions propounded by these individuals is designed not only to clarify for participants what it means to have a vision of a meaningful Jewish existence, but also to encourage them to develop or refine their own visions.

3. A chance to think through the educational implications of one or more of the visions encountered in the seminar: what implications does a given vision have for the determination and interpretation of educational priorities, as well as for such matters as the design of the educational setting, the training of educators, and so forth? The road from vision to education design is by no means an easy one, and the seminar will try to illuminate the kinds of knowledge that are necessary to make this journey, as well as significant challenges that need to be addressed along the way.

4. A chance to wrestle with the difficult question: how stimulate the relevant stake-holders of an educating institution to work towards being vision-driven? How approach the task of developing a compelling and widely shared vision?

5. A chance to visit, via literature, via film, and/or via direct encounter, educating institutions that are vision-driven and to see the way the vision functions to given coherence and direction to their efforts.

6. A chance to develop concrete, practical strategies for engaging local educating institutions in the process of becoming more vision-driven.

Local seminars in Lead Communities (and beyond). CIJE will sponsor a series of seminars in each Lead Community next year for the representatives of local educating institutions. To participate an institution will need to agree to come to all of the sessions and to have in attendance the key stakeholders from its professional and educational leadership (typically, the Rabbi, the educational director, the Chairperson of the Board of Education, and a teacher). The seminars are designed to encourage local educating institutions to begin the process of becoming, or becoming more, vision-driven. It is the responsibility of the community's lay and professional leadership to develop the clientele for these seminars.

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 "the vision thing" among educating institutions in Lead Communities and elsewhere.

{ca July 1994}

C.I.J.E.'S SUMMER SEMINAR ON GOALS

The Goals Project of the Council on Initiatives in Jewish Education grows out of the conviction that effectiveness in Jewish education depends substantially on the ability of Jewish educating institutions to become significantly more vision-driven than they typically are. 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. A vision-driven institution is one that is clear about its answers to the following questions: "What kind of a Jewish person, featuring what constellation of beliefs, attitudes, knowledge, commitments and skills, are we trying to cultivate? What form of Jewish community, characterized by what sense of purpose, ethos, patterns of activity, norms, customs, and forms of relationship are we trying to encourage?" Equally important, a vision-driven educating institution is one that has found meaningful ways of embodying its answers to these questions in its daily workings.

In its efforts to encourage Jewish educating institutions to become vision-driven, C.I.J.E. 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 C.I.J.E.'S Goals Project has been and will continue to be invaluable.

The Summer Seminar on Goals is one of several activities developed by C.I.J.E. in order to foster a climate and initiatives that will encourage Jewish educating institutions to become vision-driven. Planned in collaboration with the staff of the Mandel Institute and the Goals Project, the seminar brings to Israel lay and professional leaders in Jewish education, primarily but not exclusively from Lead Communities, for a period of intensive study and planning. The seminar is designed to foster an appreciation for the important role that vision should, but too often does not, play in Jewish education and to provide an opportunity to think through critical issues that must be addressed if Jewish educating institutions are to become more vision-driven. Topics include: what visions are and how they give coherence and direction to the educational process; the challenge, at the local level, of arriving at a vision that is shared, compelling, and concrete enough to guide practice; the process of devising educational arrangements

that are informed by a designated vision; strategies for engaging local educating institutions in the effort to become vision-driven. The seminar is designed with the expectation that on their return to their local communities, participants will collaborate with C.I.J.E. in its efforts to encourage local initiatives in this important area.

C.I.J.E.'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.

This importance of vision-drivenness can be defended on theoretical grounds, but not only on such grounds. There is also a body of research from general education that identifies the presence of a substantive guiding vision as indispensable to an educating institution's success.

The contention that vision is indispensable is, of course, not

intended to suggest the desirability of any particular vision. It is intended to suggest that it is important for each educating institution to identify or refine the vision appropriate to it and to look for ways to embody, or to better embody, this vision in its everyday workings. It is this effort that the Goals Project hopes to encourage.

The development of 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. It requires careful thinking, educational expertise of varied kinds, ingenuity, soul-searching, and study. And because it is likely that participants in this process will bring with them diverse and sometimes conflicting convictions, some serious deliberation and negotiation will need to go on among them. Not only is the work hard, it must be acknowledged that there are no 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, C.I.J.E. 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 C.I.J.E.'S Goals Project has been and will continue to be invaluable.

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

A library of educational resources. The Goals Project has begun a process of gathering materials, both theoretical and practical, that speak to the importance of vision and its relationship to educational goals and practice, as well as to the process of becoming vision-driven. This library of materials will be made available to communities and educating institutions that are interested in fostering vision-drivenness.

A Summer Seminar in Jerusalem. The Summer Seminar will bring to Israel lay and professional leaders in Jewish education, primarily but not exclusively from Lead Communities, for an intensive period of study and planning. The seminar is designed to foster in participants an appreciation for the critical role that vision plays in Jewish education and to think through various issues that must be addressed if Jewish educating institutions, in general and in their local communities, are to become more vision-driven than they typically are. The seminar is designed with the expectation that on their return from the seminar, participants will collaborate with CIJE in its efforts to encourage work in this arena in their home-communities.

Local seminars in Lead Communities (and beyond). CIJE will sponsor a series of seminars in each Lead Community next year for the representatives of local educating institutions. To participate an institution will need to agree to come to all of the sessions and to have in attendance the key stakeholders from its professional and educational leadership. The seminars are designed to encourage local educating institutions to begin the process of becoming, or becoming more, vision-driven. It is the responsibility of the community's lay and professional leadership to develop the clientele for these seminars.

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 "the vision thing" among educating institutions in Lead Communities and elsewhere.

CIJE'S GOALS PROJECT

WHAT IS THE GOALS PROJECT?

The Goals Project is a multi-pronged effort to catalyze vision-drivenness in Jewish educating institutions. A vision-driven educating institution is one that is guided by a substantive vision of what it wants to achieve, of the kinds of human beings it is trying to cultivate. To speak of 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 it is trying to cultivate, that is, by a vision of a meaningful Jewish existence. The Goals Project will encourage vision-drivenness through efforts to foster an appreciation among relevant constituencies of the importance of being vision-driven and through strategies designed to encourage educating institutions to work towards the articulation of 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 curricular 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 bring into being. To know what it is about, what it is really after, an institution must have a compelling answer to the following question: what kind of a Jewish person, featuring what constellation of beliefs, attitudes, skills, commitments, and dispositions, should we be cultivating? An adequate guiding vision does not only offer a laundry-list of such characteristics but also 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 curricular goals hard to reasonably make, so too are decisions concerning the organization of the physical and social environment, appropriate forms of pedagogy, the background and skills desirable in educators, etc. In addition, the absence of a vision of the kind of human beings one is hoping to cultivate deprives an educational institution of the most important basis for evaluating the success of its efforts.

Given the important role that a vision plays in guiding the work of an educating institution, it is very unfortunate - but also unfortunately true - that many Jewish educating institutions lack the sense of direction that grows out of having a clear and compelling vision of what they want to accomplish. True, educating institutions do often seem to have visions of sorts in the form of mission-statements; but typically, these mission-statements are too vague to offer any guidance, not very compelling to the institution's lay and professional leaders, and rarely even known in any serious way by the front-line educators. In the absence of compelling visions, many Jewish educating institutions evaluate

their success by answers to questions like the following: Do students continue coming? Do they seem engaged? Are they non-disruptive? These are, of course, vital matters, but they do not offer a sufficient basis for determining or evaluating educational practice.

The guiding principle of the Goals Project is that enhancing the effectiveness of Jewish education in America will depend substantially on whether educating institutions can become significantly more vision-driven than most now are. This principle can be defended on theoretical grounds, but not only on such grounds. There is ample empirically grounded literature from general education that identifies the presence of a substantive guiding vision as indispensable to an educating institution's success.

The contention that vision is indispensable is, of course, not intended to suggest the desirability of any particular vision. It is intended to suggest that it is important for each educating institution to identify or refine the vision appropriate to it and to look for ways to embody, or to better embody, this vision in its everyday workings. It is this effort that the Goals Project hopes to encourage.

THE ROAD LESS TRAVELLED

The Goals Project does not assume that it is easy for an educating institution to become vision-driven. In fact, the opposite is the case. For an institution to develop a vision that is not only shared but also genuinely compelling to the key stakeholders is itself a very significant and difficult. But as important as it is to achieve a vision that captures the imagination of critical stakeholders, it is but one step in the process of becoming vision-driven, and there is hard work ahead. One reason for this is that there is no formula that takes one from a vision of the kind of human beings or community one is hoping to bring into being to a picture of the educational environment that will correspond to and support this vision. Various understandings (concerning, for example, teaching, learning, human nature, human growth, the power of the social environment, and the characteristics of the parent and student community) enter into the effort to trace out the vision's educational implications and to understand how they might be embodied in practice.

In other words, the development of a vision that is compelling to the relevant stakeholders and whose educational implications have been worked out is a labor-intensive, intellectually and Jewishly demanding activity. It requires careful thinking, ingenuity, soul-searching, study, and a measure of negotiation among the participants. It is also true that there are no guarantees of success; but 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 OF THE COUNCIL ON INITIATIVES IN JEWISH EDUCATION

THE GOALS PROJECT: the Goals Project is a CIJE initiative designed to foster an appreciation of the critical role that Vision, Goals, and Objectives play in Jewish education, and to collaborate with the lay and professional leadership of local communities to catalyze meaningful efforts to translate this appreciation into educational practice. The Goals Project is an effort to encourage Jewish educational institutions, in Lead communities and elsewhere, to become vision-driven.

The key-terms used in this description are explained below:

"VISION": The term "vision" is used to refer to a substantive conception of a meaningful Jewish existence. There are many such conceptions, and the essential thing is for an institution to decide which such conception will guide its educational efforts. A "vision-driven institution" is an educating institution whose work is significantly guided by an animating vision.

"GOALS": The term "Goals", as we use the term in the Goals Project, refers to general statements of purpose which guide the educational enterprise and which are anchored in a vision of a meaningful Jewish existence. "The development of a proficient knowledge of Hebrew," "the love of God," "the love of Jewish study", "the observance of Mitzvot" are all examples of educational goals. Notice that even when spokespersons for different visions seem to converge on an educational goal, their interpretation of that goal and the importance they attach to it may well differ because of differences in their underlying visions.

"OBJECTIVES": The term "objectives" refers to educational purposes (or desired outcomes) associated with a particular learning experience or sequence of learning experiences. Educational objectives are rooted in goals (which are themselves rooted in an underlying vision).

THE EDUCATED JEW PROJECT: the Educated Jew Project is a long-term research project of the Mandel Institute. This project invites leading Jewish thinkers to articulate their respective visions of an educated Jew and then to work with educators to translate their visions into terms that will make them usable in educational settings. Although this is a long-term research project that is distinct from the Goals Project, some of the human and intellectual resources associated with the Educated Jew Project will be made available to the Goals Project.

SUMMER SEMINAR IN JERUSALEM: the Summer Seminar will bring to Israel lay and professional leaders in Jewish education, primarily but not exclusively from Lead Communities, for an intensive period of study and planning. The seminar is designed to educate this leadership concerning the critical role that vision and goals play in education, to give them a chance to examine a number of powerful visions of a meaningful Jewish existence with attention to their educational implications, and to stimulate thinking about the challenges and obstacles that need to be addressed in encouraging vision-drivenness in educating institutions. It is expected that on their return from the seminar participants will collaborate with CIJE in its efforts to encourage various efforts in this arena in their home-communities. These efforts include but are not limited to the local, Goals Project Seminars described below.

LOCAL GOALS PROJECT SEMINARS (1994-95): In each Lead Community that generates an appropriate clientele, CIJE will offer a set of seminars designed to educate the leadership of local educating institutions concerning the nature and importance of vision-drivenness and to encourage efforts to move in that direction.

A COALITION OF VISION-DRIVEN INSTITUTIONS: Institutions that meet CIJE's admission-standards and that have a serious interest will be invited to become part of a Coalition of Vision-Driven Institutions which will come into being in the fall of 1995. Member-institutions, to be selected from among those who have participated in the local Goals Project Seminars, commit themselves to serious and systematic efforts to become vision-driven. Their lead-staff will have available to them various CIJE-resources to facilitate their work.

WHAT IS THE GOALS PROJECT?

The Goals Project is a multi-pronged effort to encourage Jewish educating institutions to become substantially more vision-driven than most typically are. 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 it is trying to cultivate. The Goals Project will encourage vision-drivenness through efforts to foster an appreciation among relevant constituencies of the importance of being vision-driven and through strategies designed to encourage educating institutions to work towards the articulation of 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 curricular 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 a compelling answer to the following question: what kind of a Jewish person, featuring what constellation of beliefs, attitudes, skills, commitments, and dispositions, should we be cultivating? An adequate guiding vision does not offer a laundry-list of such characteristics 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 curricular 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 it is hoping to cultivate deprives an educational institution of an important basis for evaluating the success of its efforts.

The guiding principle of the Goals Project is that if Jewish educating institutions can become significantly more vision-driven than they typically are, the quality of Jewish education in the United States will be substantially enhanced. This principle can be defended on theoretical grounds, but not only on such grounds. There is also empirically grounded literature from general education that identifies the presence of a substantive guiding vision as indispensable to an educating institution's success.

The contention that vision is indispensable is, of course, not intended to suggest the desirability of any particular vision. It is intended to suggest that it is important for each educating institution to identify or refine the vision appropriate to it and to look for ways to embody, or to better embody, this vision in its

everyday workings. It is this effort that the Goals Project hopes to encourage.

The development of 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. It requires careful thinking, educational expertise of varied kinds, ingenuity, soul-searching, and study. And because it is likely that participants in this process will bring with them diverse and sometimes conflicting convictions, some serious deliberation and negotiation will need to go on among them. Not only is the work hard, it must be acknowledged that there are no 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 AGENDA

The Goals Project will be spearheading a number of efforts to encourage vision-drivenness in Jewish education.

A library of educational resources. The Goals Project has begun a process of gathering materials, both theoretical and practical, that speak to the importance of vision and its relationship to educational goals and practice, as well as to the process of becoming vision-driven. This library of materials will be made available to communities and educating institutions that are interested in fostering vision-drivenness.

A Summer Seminar in Jerusalem. The Summer Seminar will bring to Israel lay and professional leaders in Jewish education, primarily but not exclusively from Lead Communities, for an intensive period of study and planning. The seminar is designed to foster in participants an appreciation for the critical role that vision plays in Jewish education and to think through various issues that must be addressed if Jewish educating institutions, in general and in their local communities, are to become more vision-driven than they typically are. The seminar is designed with the expectation that on their return from the seminar, participants will collaborate with CIJE in its efforts to encourage work in this arena in their home-communities.

The summer seminar will include the following elements:

1. Opportunities to develop an understanding of the ways in which having a vision can contribute to the design and effectiveness of an educating institution, as well as a chance to look at empirical studies that suggest the power of vision.

2. A chance to read articles by and to meet with some exceptionally thoughtful individuals who have long pondered the question of what is an educated Jew, of what Jewish education

should be educating towards. Encountering and wrestling with the visions propounded by these individuals is designed not only to clarify for participants what it means to have a vision of a meaningful Jewish existence, but also to encourage them to develop or refine their own visions.

3. A chance to think through the educational implications of one or more of the visions encountered in the seminar: what implications does a given vision have for the determination and interpretation of educational priorities, as well as for such matters as the design of the educational setting, the training of educators, and so forth? The road from vision to education design is by no means an easy one, and the seminar will try to illuminate the kinds of knowledge that are necessary to make this journey, as well as significant challenges that need to be addressed along the way.

4. A chance to visit, via literature, via film, and/or via direct encounter, educating institutions that are vision-driven and to see the way the vision functions to give coherence and direction to their efforts.

5. A chance to wrestle with the difficult question: What kinds of techniques, processes and activities show promise of leading the relevant stakeholders in an educating institution to the development of a vision that will be compelling, shared, and concrete enough to offer practical educational guidance?

6. A chance to develop concrete, practical strategies for stimulating local educating institutions in the coming year to become engaged in the process of becoming more vision-driven.

Local seminars in Lead Communities (and beyond). CIJE will sponsor a series of seminars in each Lead Community next year for the representatives of local educating institutions. To participate an institution will need to agree to come to all of the sessions and to have in attendance the key stakeholders from its professional and educational leadership. The seminars are designed to encourage local educating institutions to begin the process of becoming, or becoming more, vision-driven. It is the responsibility of the community's lay and professional leadership to develop the clientele for these seminars.

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 "the vision thing" among educating institutions in Lead Communities and elsewhere.