



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
76

Folder
7

JCC Jewish educators project. JCC evaluation, 2002.

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

"transforming/revolutionizing JCCs.

B. The logic informing the initiative – how it purports to help JCC become more serious Jewish educational institutions.

The informing assumption was that the aspiration of helping JCCs become significantly more serious Jewish educational institutions could be forwarded substantially through an educational program aimed at talented JCC educators and designed to achieve the following outcomes:

The participants form a community of support and discourse. A community of JCC educators who feel a sense of collegiality and who share a language of discourse in which both the substantive questions and issues the group takes up, and especially the ideas of vision and implementation, are at the center.

The participants develop an informed, reflective guiding vision. With attention to possible ideals, social realities, and communal challenges, and with the benefit of significant inputs from out of Jewish thought, sociology, history, philosophy educational theory, the arts, and other arenas, participants will have encountered and given thought to more than one powerful ways of understanding the aims of education in the JCC setting and the educational role of the JCC in the larger Jewish community, and they will have developed an articulated perspective of their own concerning these matters.

The participants acquire the capacity to translate a big idea into practice. Participants should have some understanding of the programmatic implications of their larger purposes (e.g., in the core-businesses, in the general environment, and in other arenas). Equally important, they should have had practice moving from idea to practice -- enough to enable them to imaginatively carry new ideas into practice in their own work

The design and completion of an individual project. Each participant will have completed a project which is informed by the idea of vision-driven practice and that has the potential to make a contribution to the local JCC and, in some cases, to the movement as a whole.

Executive support. It is important that executives feel that their agencies have benefited significantly from the participation of their Jewish educators in this initiative.

C. Operationalization of the initiative's logic.

A team of individuals from the JCCA and the Mandel Foundation identified a group of promising JCC educators There are a series of questions that could be asked here:

1. How were JCCs/individual educators chosen to be part of the JEDI seminar? Who was eligible to participate in the program? Who was not? Which JCCs were selected Executive Directors, which Jewish Educators? What were the criteria employed? Who/how were decisions made?
2. Who dropped out and why? How does this compare to the field as a whole, or to comparable fields (Actually, is the JCC world a "field" from the viewpoint of the Jewish educator? If, not, how do they see the field and alternative opportunities?)]

After an initial program aimed at them and their Executive Directors and designed to elicit their buy-in, a group of (16 –18?) educators entered the program. The program took shape as a series of X number of gatherings, most of them 3-4 (days in length in US cities, but also

including two ten-day programs in Israel. [We need an actual history of the program so far] A planning team made up of individuals related to the JCCA and the Mandel Foundation developed the curriculum for these programs, making use of input and feedback from the participants.

D. Evaluation of the logic informing the initiative.

1. What was the conception of what a transformed JCC would look like? Was our conception of what 'a transformed JCC' would look like – or of what it would mean 'to raise the Jewish temperature' in JCCs, or of what it would mean for JCCs to be more serious Jewish educational institutions – sufficiently clear to guide this initiative?

2. Assuming that we had successfully achieved the pedagogical objectives identified above (B, 1 - 5), is there reason to think that we would have succeeded substantially in advancing the larger purpose informing the program (i.e., enabling JCCs to become significantly more serious Jewish educational institutions)?

3. Given our larger purposes, might we have been wiser to identify other (additional and/or different) pedagogical objectives?

4. Given our larger purposes, might it have been wise to consider a very different kind of initiative (for example, one aimed at a different clientele)?

E. Assessment of program's success at achieving the pedagogical objectives identified as central (B, 1 - 5).

1. Using appropriate indicators, to what extent did we achieve the objectives we identified?

To examine these achievements, we will interview all of the educators who began the program (either by phone or face to face), [I think contacting the Executive Directors would be important, too. How feasible is that—how likely are they to cooperate?] The purpose of the interviews is to learn some of the following:

a. Indicators of individual learning (among participants)

- ? How have the educators themselves changed as a result of the program, as judged by themselves, by their Executive Directors
- ? Evidence of conceptual handles, language
- ? Understanding key ideas -- re: vision/translation/suffusion
- ? Vision driven planning...taking careful thinking and evaluation seriously
- ? Development of guiding vision for one's work
- ? Increased awareness of the kinds of things that could be vehicles of Jewish education – architecture, design, arts, nature

b. Indicators of institutional change

- ? Degree of contact/ access between Executive Director and Jewish educator
- ? # of programs with Jewish content? How many come? Who comes?
- ? Indices of suffusion that are congruent with the program's aspirations. For example: has the language of the program come to permeate organizational discourse? Do agency personnel answer the question "What's Jewish about what you do or are trying to do?" differently and more meaningfully than they would have in the past?
- ? Three pertinent domains to look at: a) programs the Jewish educator is responsible for; b) programs/domains organized by individuals the Jewish educators works with; c) overall ambiance.

2. What obstacles/problems, faulty assumptions impeded our efforts [The team of planners could have this conversation, as well as the one relating to F and G]]

F. Unanticipated consequences

What unanticipated consequences (positive, negative, neither) have resulted from the process of designing and implementing this program?

G. Based on the foregoing, do the larger purposes that gave rise to this initiative still seem clear and worth pursuing, and, if so, what kind(s) of initiatives should be considered?

Pattie Cippi Harte
Assistant Vice President, Program Services
JCC Association
15 East 26th Street
NYC, NY 10010
212 .532 .4958 ext. 275 phone
212 .481 .4174 fax

JCC Association of North America is the leadership network of, and central agency for the Jewish Community Center Movement, which is comprised of more than 275 JCCs, YM-YWHAs and camps in the United States and Canada, which annually serve more than one million members and an additional million non-member users. The JCC Association offers a wide range of services and resources to strengthen the capacity of its affiliates to provide educational, cultural, social, Jewish identity-building, and recreational programs to enhance the lives of North American Jews of all ages and backgrounds. Additionally, the movement fosters and strengthens connections between North American Jews and Israel as well as with world Jewry.

AN EVALUATION CONCEPTION FOR THE JCC INITIATIVE

A. What are the larger purposes that inform the JCC Educators initiative?

Helping JCCs become institutions that more meaningfully make good on their commitment to become serious Jewish educational institutions. The planners of the initiative have articulated this purpose in a number of ways, including "raising the Jewish temperature in JCCs", "transforming/revolutionizing JCCs."

B. The logic informing the initiative - how it purports to help JCC become more serious Jewish educational institutions.

The informing assumption was that the aspiration of helping JCCs become significantly more serious Jewish educational institutions could be forwarded substantially through an educational program aimed at talented JCC educators and designed to achieve the following outcomes:

1. The participants form a community of support and discourse. A community of JCC educators who feel a sense of collegiality and who share a language of discourse in which both the substantive questions and issues the group takes up, and especially the ideas of vision and implementation, are at the center.
2. The participants develop an informed, reflective guiding vision. With attention to possible ideals, social realities, and communal challenges, and with the benefit of significant inputs from out of Jewish thought, sociology, history, philosophy educational theory, the arts, and other arenas, participants will have encountered and given thought to more than one powerful ways of understanding the aims of education in the JCC setting and the educational role of the JCC in the larger Jewish community, and they will have developed an articulated perspective of their own concerning these matters.
3. The participants acquire the capacity to translate a big idea into practice. Participants should have some understanding of the programmatic implications of their larger purposes (e.g., in the core-businesses, in the general environment, and in other arenas). Equally important, they should have had practice moving from idea to practice -- enough to enable them to imaginatively carry new ideas into practice in their own work
4. The design and completion of an individual project. Each participant will have completed a project which is informed by the idea of vision-driven practice and that has the potential to make a contribution to the local JCC and, in some cases, to the movement as a whole.

5. Executive support. It is important that executives feel that their agencies have benefited significantly from the participation of their Jewish educators in this initiative.

C. Operationalization of the initiative's logic.

A team of individuals from the JCCA and the Mandel Foundation identified a group of promising JCC educators. There are a series of questions that could be asked here:

1. How were JCCs/individual educators chosen to be part of the JEDI seminar? Who was eligible to participate in the program? Who was not? Which JCCs were selected Executive Directors, which Jewish Educators? What were the criteria employed? Who/how were decisions made?
2. Who dropped out and why? How does this compare to the field as a whole, or to comparable fields (Actually, is the JCC world a "field" from the viewpoint of the Jewish educator? If not, how do they see the field and alternative opportunities?)

After an initial program aimed at them and their Executive Directors and designed to elicit their buy-in, a group of (16 -18?) educators entered the program. The program took shape as a series of X number of gatherings, most of them 3-4 (days in length in US cities, but also including two ten-day programs in Israel. [We need an actual history of the program so far] A planning team made up of individuals related to the JCCA and the Mandel Foundation developed the curriculum for these programs, making use of input and feedback from the participants.

D. Evaluation of the logic informing the initiative.

1. What was the conception of what a transformed JCC would look like? Was our conception of what 'a transformed JCC' would look like - or of what it would mean 'to raise the Jewish temperature' in JCCs, or of what it would mean for JCCs to be more serious Jewish educational institutions - sufficiently clear to guide this initiative?
2. Assuming that we had successfully achieved the pedagogical objectives identified above (B, 1 - 5), is there reason to think that we would have succeeded substantially in advancing the larger purpose informing the program (i.e., enabling JCCs to become significantly more serious Jewish educational institutions)?
3. Given our larger purposes, might we have been wiser to identify other (additional and/or different) pedagogical objectives?

4. Given our larger purposes, might it have been wise to consider a very different kind of initiative (for example, one aimed at a different clientele)?

E. Assessment of program's success at achieving the pedagogical objectives identified as central (B, 1 - 5).

1. Using appropriate indicators, to what extent did we achieve the objectives we identified?

To examine these achievements, we will interview all of the educators who began the program (either by phone or face to face), [I think contacting the Executive Directors would be important, too. How feasible is that-how likely are they to cooperate?] The purpose of the interviews is to learn some of the following:

a. Indicators of individual learning (among participants)

- How have the educators themselves changed as a result of the program, as judged by themselves, by their Executive Directors
- Evidence of conceptual handles, language
- Understanding key ideas -- re: vision/translation/suffusion
- Vision driven planning*taking careful thinking and evaluation seriously
- Development of guiding vision for one's work
- Increased awareness of the kinds of things that could be vehicles of Jewish education - architecture, design, arts, nature

b. Indicators of institutional change

- Degree of contact/ access between Executive Director and Jewish educator
- # of programs with Jewish content? How many come? Who comes?
- Indices of suffusion that are congruent with the program's aspirations. For example: has the language of the program come to permeate organizational discourse? Do agency personnel answer the question "What's Jewish about what you do or are trying to do?" differently and more meaningfully than they would have in the past?
- Three pertinent domains to look at: a) programs the Jewish educator is responsible for; b) programs/domains organized by individuals the Jewish educators works with; c) overall ambiance.

2. What obstacles/problems, faulty assumptions impeded our efforts [The team of planners could have this conversation, as well as the one relating to F and G]

F. Unanticipated consequences

What unanticipated consequences (positive, negative, neither) have resulted from the process of designing and implementing this program?

G. Based on the foregoing, do the larger purposes that gave rise to this initiative still seem clear and worth pursuing, and, if so, what kind(s) of initiatives should be considered?

AN EVALUATION-CONCEPTION FOR THE JCC INITIATIVE

The challenge is to develop an evaluation design that assesses what we have been doing in relation to our larger purposes and that offers us an opportunity to forward those purposes. With that in mind, here's a way of thinking about the evaluation of the JCC Educators Initiative.

A. What are the larger purposes that inform the JCC Educators initiative?

Two kinds of purposes come to mind.

1. *Helping JCCs become institutions that more meaningfully make good on their commitment to become serious Jewish educational institutions.* We have articulated this purpose in a number of ways, including "raising the Jewish temperature in JCCs", "transforming/revolutionizing JCCs."
2. *Organizational objectives.* [I leave it to Bethamie to spell out what these are – or perhaps the category should be dropped.] What I was thinking about was the Foundation's interest in forging a meaningful working relationship with the JCCA around shared concerns and/or developing a model of collaborative planning with another organization.]

B. The logic informing the initiative – how it purports to achieve A,1.

The informing assumption was that the aspiration of helping JCCs become significantly more serious Jewish educational institutions could be forwarded substantially through an educational program aimed at talented JCC educators and designed to achieve the following outcomes:

1. **A community of support and discourse.** A community of JCC educators who feel a sense of collegiality and who share a language of discourse in which both the substantive questions and issues the group takes up, and especially the ideas of vision and implementation, are at the center.
2. **An informed, reflective guiding vision.** With attention to possible ideals, social realities, and communal challenges, and with the benefit of significant inputs from out of Jewish thought, sociology, history, philosophy educational theory, the arts, and other arenas, participants will have encountered and given thought to more than one powerful ways of understanding the aims of education in the JCC setting and the educational role of the JCC in the larger Jewish community, and they will have developed an articulated perspective of their own concerning these matters.
3. **The capacity to translate a big idea.** Participants should have some understanding of the programmatic implications of their larger purposes (e.g., in the core-businesses, in the general environment, and in other arenas).

Equally important, they should have had practice moving from idea to practice -- enough to enable them to imaginatively carry new ideas into practice in their own work.

4. **Individual project.** Each participant will have completed a project which is informed by the idea of vision-driven practice and that has the potential to make a contribution to the local JCC and, in some cases, to the movement as a whole.
5. **Executive support.** It is important that executives feel that their agencies have benefited significantly from the participation of their Jewish educators in this initiative.

C. Operationalization of the initiative's logic.

A team of individuals from the JCCA and the Mandel Foundation identified a group of promising JCC educators, and after an initial program aimed at them and their Executive Directors and designed to elicit their buy-in, a group of 16 (or 17) educators entered the program.. The program took shape as a series of X number of gatherings, most of them three days in length in US. Cities, but also including two ten-day programs in Israel. A planning team made up of individuals related to the JCCA and the Mandel Foundation developed the curriculum for these programs, making use of input and feedback from the participants. [It may be that a much fuller description would be useful in this section].

D. Evaluation of the logic informing the initiative.

1. Was our conception of what 'a transformed JCC' would look like – or of what it would mean 'to raise the Jewish temperature' in JCCs, or of what it would mean for JCCs to be more serious Jewish educational institutions – sufficiently clear to guide this initiative?
2. Assuming that we had successfully achieved the pedagogical objectives identified above (B,1.), is there reason to think that we would have succeeded substantially forwarding the larger purpose informing the program (i.e., enabling JCCs to become significantly more serious Jewish educational institutions)?
3. Given our larger purposes, might we have been wiser to identify other (additional and/or different) pedagogical objectives?
4. Given our larger purposes, might it have been wise to consider a very different kind of initiative (for example, one aimed at a different clientele)?

E. Assessment of program's success at achieving the pedagogical objectives identified as central (B, 1 – 5).

1. Using appropriate indicators, to what extent did we achieve the objectives w identified?
2. What obstacles/problems, faulty assumptions impeded our efforts?

F. Planning/implementation/formative evaluation

What was the planning/implementation process, what forms of formative evaluation were employed, and how did these contribute to and/or retard the success of the initiative?

G. Unanticipated consequences

What unanticipated consequences (positive, negative, neither) have resulted from the process of designing and implementing this program?

H. Based on the foregoing, do the larger purposes that gave rise to this initiative still seem clear and worth pursuing, and, if so, what kind(s) of initiatives should be considered?

EVALUATING THE JCC EDUCATORS INITIATIVE

A Working Document

Introduction. There is one pretty obvious reason for developing a strategy for evaluating the JCC Educators Initiative: we will want to know whether, as judged by criteria that seem meaningful, the program has been successful, and we will want to use the information gathered through the evaluation to improve succeeding iterations of the program. That said, it's important to develop our approach to evaluation as soon as possible (and we are, unfortunately, already late!) for two additional reasons:

- 1) To the extent that we need baseline data in order to judge improvement, it is important that we collect that data very early on. The further into the program we are, the greater the likelihood that the baseline data will, in part, reflect the program's inputs.
- 2) The second reason is that the clearer we are about those outcomes that are most important to us (as reflected in the evaluation-protocol), the better able we will be to guide the development of the program intelligently. We will be enabled to ask concerning any programmatic proposal: how does the proposed program-element contribute to the accomplishment of our principal purposes?

As a way of pushing our work further, three critical questions concerning evaluation are articulated below: a) what are the domains in which outcomes should be identified? b) what outcomes are appropriate in each domain? c) what is the best way to approach the challenge of judging the extent to which these outcomes have been achieved?

A. Outcome-domains to be evaluated. The best way to explain what is intended by the term 'outcome-domain' is to identify possible domains in which evaluation of outcomes might reasonably go on. They are: a) the educators themselves; b) the JCCs in which the educators are working; c) the JCC movement as a whole; d) the clients/the Jewish community.

It may not be realistic or otherwise appropriate to attempt an evaluation at the d)-level. But it would seem reasonable to do some kind of evaluation at the other three levels.

B. Domain-specific outcomes. Having specified the principal domains, we need to be as clear as possible concerning the kinds of outcomes we hope to achieve in each of them, i.e., what we would count as 'success' at each of these levels. As an example, at the first level ('the educators themselves'), we might consider outcomes like the following:

- a) Possess and appropriately use a vocabulary of concepts, ideas and questions that reflect the program's guiding educational ideas and the content engaged with in the course of the program.
- b) Have developed an educational plan for their institution that is grounded in a thoughtfully conceptualized, informed vision that identifies the role and aims of the JCC as a Jewish educating institution.

- c) Believe that they have grown as Jewish educators through the program and are enthusiastic ambassadors for the program.

Similar kinds of outcome-characteristics need to be developed in the other domains as well. In developing an appropriate set of outcomes, careful attention should be paid to the list of outcomes that were identified in the document entitled: The JCCA Jewish Educators Initiative.

C. Developing strategies for assessing whether the critical outcomes have been achieved.

Once we have settled on a set of outcome-domains and identified appropriate outcomes in each domain, the evaluation challenge is to develop ways of judging whether these various outcomes have been achieved. In some cases, it may be possible to develop some pretty direct measures; in others, the measures will be more indirect (and more like 'leading indicators' of success).

The need for formative evaluation. The preceding conception embodies an approach to evaluation that focuses on the principal outcomes the program is designed to achieve. This is as it should be. Nonetheless, such an approach risks missing certain important dimensions of the program that ought to be evaluated. 'Formative evaluation' is to be understood (in this paper) not as an attempt to judge the program's impact along critical dimensions but as an attempt to judge, midstream, how the program is going, with an eye towards remedying weaknesses and otherwise improving it. Formative evaluation may, in part, be focused on whether the program seems to be moving towards the achievement of its outcomes; but it can also usefully focus on a number of other matters, including:

- the effectiveness and efficiency of the planning-process;
- the implementation of particular programmatic elements (e.g., Mentoring; Projects; Reading Groups; Seminars – content, pedagogy, logistics/accommodations; adequacy of responses to problems that surface, etc.)
- Morale/satisfaction of critical constituencies, including clients, faculty, JCC A and Mandel Foundation planning teams.

Next steps. The foregoing represents a cluster of ideas relating to the evaluation of the program. We need to decide whether any, some, or all of them are worth further developing. In doing so, we may want to take into account such matters as relative importance, cost, time, and feasibility.

The first step is perhaps to review the conception sketched out above, with an eye towards judging its usefulness and revising it, as appropriate. Once a revised conception is in place (ideally, very soon), we need to flesh it out much more concretely. Ideally, a group of appropriate individuals will gather for an intensive day-long effort to accomplish this. They might usefully include, in addition to core program-staff, Bethamie Horowitz and perhaps Adam Gamoran.

**SOME IMPORTANT DIMENSIONS OF OUR EVALUATION DISCUSSION
WITH BETHAMIE HOROWITZ
JERUSALEM, JUNE 2002**

1. Why evaluate? Reasons identified included:

- learning things that would be valuable for future initiatives (especially since this is the first of our new efforts to develop North American projects);
- a chance to examine the Foundation's way of working with other institutions - perhaps there's a prototype from which can learn at work here; or perhaps we'll discover that it's better to work with executives, or with teams, and so forth.
- "Is it worth it?" -- Do the results warrant the investment?

2. Possible dimensions of evaluation

- Track participants' development
- Track relationship between participants and their institutions: how does the initiative reverberate in the agency? What obstacles/supports, etc. affect what happens?
- Measuring 'the Jewish temperature' of the agency.

3. Dimensions along which participants might grow

1. Our discussion of evaluation (with Bethamie Horowitz) surfaced a number of interesting points. One of them focused on the dimensions along which we might hope to see change in the participants. These include:
 - Collegiality
 - Conceptual handles/language
 - Understanding of key ideas relating to vision/translation/suffusion, etc.
 - An approach to planning that is vision-driven, takes careful thinking and evaluation seriously
 - Progress in the development of a guiding vision
 - An increased awareness of the kinds of things that could be vehicles of Jewish education -- for example, architecture/interior design, the arts, nature.
4. **A deep assumption of the initiative.** Discussion of the dimensions of evaluation identified in #10 brought us to recognize that a deep assumption of our program would appear to be this: if the participants can grow along the dimensions specified in #10, we are likely to see 'the Jewish temperature' of their agencies raised in ways we would be happy with. But, as #12 (below) suggests, this is not necessarily a reasonable assumption.
5. **The (possible) insufficiency of cultivating more thoughtful educators.** Supposing that our program succeeds in cultivating educators who have the ability, as exhibited in their projects, to be more thoughtful in their educational planning than they previously had been. We need to acknowledge the possibility that this will not translate into a thoughtful approach to planning in daily life or into much influence at the local level *if* their job-descriptions and/or the demands of their jobs are not congruent with the kind of thoughtful approach to planning that we are trying to

encourage. Serious change may also require re-defining jobs - another reason for seriously engaging the executives!

6. **Indices of a 'higher Jewish temperature.** Our preliminary, and unsystematic, discussion identified the following:

- **# of programs with Jewish content? How many come? Who comes?**
- **Indices of suffusion that are congruent with our aspirations.** For example: has the language of the program come to permeate organizational discourse? Do agency personnel answer the question "What's Jewish about what you do or are trying to do?" differently and more meaningfully than they would have in the past?
- **Three pertinent domains to look at:** a) programs the Jewish educator is responsible for; b) programs/domains organized by individuals the Jewish educators works with; c) overall ambiance.
- **How have the educators themselves changed as a result of the program, as judged by themselves, by their supervisors, by those they work with/supervise?**

Dear Annette,

Thank you again for your recent New Year greetings. I hope that, spiritually and otherwise, you are finding the holidays meaningful this year. I wanted to touch base with you on a number of matters.

First, the Foundation's Advisory Board is due to meet in about two months, and I was wondering whether you think it would be useful for us to have some preliminary conversations concerning the agenda of these meetings. I also wondered whether, prior to the meetings, it might be useful to send out to the participants the notes from the last meeting. Even if they only reviewed them on the plane to Boston, they might create a fruitful context for the next set of discussions. Then again, perhaps this will depend on what the agenda for the meetings will be.

Second, a few comments about the JCC initiative. A number of good things are happening through this initiative. Among them I would count the development of a useful social/professional network on the part of the participants, seminars which have stimulated and challenged the participants to be more thoughtful about what they are doing, and the development, unless I am misreading things, of a much better working relationship between the JCCA and the Mandel Foundation. Though I do not yet entirely understand how Alvin Mars fits into the ecology of the JCC and how he will attempt to situate his work in relation to the Foundation's educational concerns and agenda, my initial sense is that he is very interested in working in concert with us. This could be a very promising development.

Although as, just noted, some good things are emerging from the JCC initiative, there are also some troubling concerns, some of which we have discussed on earlier occasions. Among them I would include: the attrition of several participants (most of them leaving because they are abandoning the field); some of the planning complexities introduced by the need to coordinate the planning of the program with our colleagues in the JCC world; the difficulty mentors appear to be having integrating the additional responsibilities associated with this work into their already very busy professional lives; and, perhaps most importantly, the difficulty of getting the participants to consistently attend our gatherings and to engage their projects and assignments at the level of seriousness we associate with Mandel programs. This last problem may reflect the complexities associated with the launch of this initiative in the first place and our inability at that early stage to establish admissions criteria and requirements that would select for a clientele which we could count on to enthusiastically embrace an intellectually challenging and demanding program.

All of these matters (if they prove to be on the mark) may be worthy of our attention when we do a systematic evaluation of the program; but I am hopeful that the discussions that surround this assessment will, in the spirit of a couple of earlier conversations, address broader questions concerning what we are hoping to accomplish through our work with the JCC movement and what strategy or strategies would be most likely to bring us closer to the realization of these aspirations. Based on my conversations with

her, I think Bethamie shares this sense that we should be thinking about the evaluation in this broader way (while not ignoring more conventional evaluation dimensions), and she and I have tentatively agreed to work together to articulate an evaluation-design that takes the larger issues into account. Ideally, the questions organizing the evaluation itself can then serve as a basis for some conversations concerning the direction of future initiatives. I would love your thoughts about whether this is a sound way to be proceeding at this stage.

All the best.

Dan

How was the program devised and designed? For what purposes?

The multiple goals of the program:

Mandel Foundation:

- collaboration as a principle.
- Partnering with JCCA as positive in Mort Mandel's eye, given his history of involvement with JCCA)

Mandel School

- Interest in teaching a particular educational vision, developing a pedagogical approach

JCCA

- interest in intensifying the Jewishness of JCCA movement as a whole

Individual JCCs and their executive directors

Jewish educators resident at these JCCs

- Help create/ define a "profession" (within the JCC world)
- Find colleagues and professional support

Recruitment (and retention)

How were JCC/educators chosen to be part of the JEDI seminar? What were the criteria employed? Who/how were decisions made?

Who was eligible to participate in the program? Who was not?

Which Executive Directors, which Jewish Educators?

Who dropped out and why? How does this compare to the field as a whole, or to comparable fields (Actually, is the JCC world a field from the viewpoint of the Jewish educator? If, not, how do they see the field and alternative opportunities?)

The Pedagogical Agenda of the program

What was it?

- To encourage the development of?
- We hoped people would become better at what they do –
- Become part of a community/ network.

What were the pedagogical aspirations in relation to this population?

Indicators

- *Evidence of conceptual handles, language*
- *Understanding key ideas -- re: vision/translation/suffusion*
- *Vision driven planning...taking careful thinking and evaluation seriously*
- *Development of guiding vision for one's work*
- *Increased awareness of the kinds of things that could be vehicles of Jewish education – architecture, design, arts, nature*

What was accomplished? What were the obstacles?

The Larger purpose of the Program

Transforming/ Revolutionizing the JCC as an educational institution

Raising the Jewish temperature of the place

Indicators –

- Degree of contact/ access between Executive Director and Jewish educator
- # of programs with Jewish content? How many come? Who comes?
- Indices of suffusion that are congruent with our aspirations. For example: has the language of the program come to permeate organizational discourse? Do agency personnel answer the question "What's Jewish about what you do or are trying to do?" differently and more meaningfully than they would have in the past?
- Three pertinent domains to look at: a) programs the Jewish educator is responsible for; b) programs/domains organized by individuals the Jewish educators works with; c) overall ambiance.
- How have the educators themselves changed as a result of the program, as judged by themselves, by their supervisors, by those they work with/supervise?

Is the pedagogical program effective for achieving these purposes?

Is there a better way to accomplish this – another approach for cutting into this problem?

What are we hoping to accomplish with existing realities of the JCC world?

What strategies are most likely to be effective?

Jewish Educators' Initiative
January 7th – 17th, 2002
Jerusalem, Israel

Monday January 7	Tuesday January 8	Wednesday January 9	Thursday January 10	Friday January 11	Shabbat January 12
<p>Opening Dinner</p>	<p>Session 1 Social Capital →Memory Link between Oct seminar and Israel seminar. Linking social capital to this seminar.</p> <p>Session 2 Constructing Collective Memory + Beit Midrash #1 - 2 objectives: (A) Introducing conceptual tool-kit around collective memory, (B) Exploration of this through biblical text (which also serves as preparation for afternoon tyul) (A) Conceptual lexicon*: memory as (i) 'Remembrance of things past', and (ii) Enacted memory (*see (ii) in the conceptual outline of the program) (B)Exploration of collective memory: (i) as represented in text study itself, (ii) as it is enacted in the text we are studying, and then (iii) through walking the text on tyul.</p> <p><i>(may do all of this through the text, or may do it in 2 parts - introducing/consolidating conceptual map separately from the Beit Midrash experience)</i></p> <p>Afternoon Tiyyul /Bible in Hand Entrance of tabernacle into Jerusalem - Beit Shemesh - Kiriath Yearim - Old City. Shmuel 1 & Shmuel 2</p> <p>(Myth of David in Israeli Collective memory - Howard Deitcher ?)</p>	<p>Session 3 Mapping of way that society constructs collective memory (Zeev M.) Expanding conceptual lexicon around collective memory - Including (i) Israeli example and (ii) Diasporan Example</p> <p>Session 4 [working session based on session 3]</p> <p>Session 5 (afternoon) Film : Unetane Tokef (Amir Lieblich) Viewing and discussing 30 minute version of the film with Amir re: memory and identity.</p> <p>Session 6 Collective memory in the JCC (Seymour Fox #1) First of Seymour's sessions - linking Collective memory with JCC world.</p>	<p>Field Trip "Israel & Jewish Collective Memory" Beginning with Classical Zionism & Collective memory (1) Museum of Hagganah (2) Independence Hall (3)The Slicks Moving on to exploration of relations between place and memory - transition of the way individual & collective memory plays out in relation to place over time (the way memory is captured in place). (4) Kikar Rabin from 1995 - 2001 + Beit Midrash #2 [+ Free time] [+ Reflection session#1] Yekef for the evening (back at 1:30 a.m.)</p>	<p>Late morning (9:30) (5) Museum of the Tefer (museum of co-existence) Continuing theme begun on Thursday - transformation of collective memory (collective narrative) over time:</p> <p>Session 7 Constructing Collective Memory - Identity and memory (Jen Glaser?) Expanding Conceptual lexicon* - mapping the way collective memory links to personal & collective identity: drawing from (i) Yael Tamir's article "The Quest for Identity" and the experiences of Thursday / Fri morning (*see (i), (iii), and (iv) in the conceptual outline of the program)</p> <p>Free for Shabbat</p>	

Sunday January 13	Monday January 14	Tuesday January 15	Wednesday January 16	Thursday January 17	Others Elements to Think About
<p>Session 8 Beit Midrash #3 Initiation into Collective Memory (Melilah)</p> <p>Session 9 Creating Symbols and Power of Symbolism Yoram Bilu – (Hebrew University) Expanding the Lexicon</p> <p>Session 10 Seymour Fox #2 Linking Collective memory with JCC world.</p>	<p>2 day field trip to the North “Building identity through initiation into collective memory”</p> <p>Tel Aviv</p> <p>(1) Memory and Identity Yael Tamir (Yael as philosopher) Building on Friday’s session</p> <p>(2) Meir Azari, Rabbi of Beit Daniel Initiating Israelis into the religious conversation</p> <p>Galil</p> <p>(3) Muki Tzur - Beit Elon What did he want to achieve by building this museum? (interactive museum of modern Zionist period)</p> <p>[+ reflection session]</p> <p>Tzfat ???</p>	<p>(4) Ein HaNatziv, Midrashah, Orthodox women and their attempt to build identity / address their marginalization within the collective memory (both Army and Religion) - Rahel Tzur</p> <p>(5) Possibility of choice - different tracks - (i) Arab Israeli piece, Building identity through initiation into collective memory (ii) Kibbutz (failure of initiation into collective memory and new thoughts about building identity on kibbutz) (iii) Arts option</p> <p>Return to Jerusalem via:</p> <p>(6) Hillel Halkin in Zikhron Continuation of letter to American Jewish Friend</p> <p>[Other options for field trip: Oranim, Beit ha-Shitah, Ruth Calderon]</p>	<p>Morning off, begin program at 11:30</p> <p>Session 11 Construction of new symbols and memory Bridge to Ari Goldman for June</p> <p>Session 12 Construction of new symbols and memory - Creating secular Jewish identity – to re-own and shape something at the same time.</p> <p>Session 13 (afternoon) Seymour Fox #3</p> <p>[Session 14? Beit Midrash #4?]</p>	<p>Session 14? [Beit Midrash #4?]</p> <p>Session 15 Process and Evaluation</p> <p>Session 16 ‘Big Bang’ Program Top speaker</p> <p>Closing Luncheon at 1:00 p.m.</p>	<p>Meeting with Fellows Meeting with Faculty Barry Chazan Steven Cohen Debbie W. Neri H (re the Matzav) Yad Vashem?</p>