



THE JACOB RADER MARCUS CENTER OF THE
AMERICAN JEWISH ARCHIVES

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

Series E: Mandel Foundation Israel, 1984 – 1999.

Box
D-1

Folder
1921

Lead Communities reports. MEF correspondence and reports,
1993-1994.

Pages from this file are restricted and are not available online. Please
contact the [American Jewish Archives](#) for more information.

Mandel Institute

מכון מנדל
מכון מנדל

FAX SENT

CIJE DOCUMENTS
MEF

Tel: 972-2-66 2832/7

טופל ☐

החוקר

לטיפול של

Fax: 972-2-662-837

Facsimile Transmission

David Hirschorn

14.7.94

To: _____ Date: _____

Seymour Fox

No. Pages: 13

From: _____

Fax Number: _____

Dear David,

I am pleased that this letter is signed both by Alan and myself and thus I transfer the baton to the CIJE leadership.. I look forward to the pleasure of working with you and I will be in touch with your secretary with the hope that we can arrange a meeting in August.

I believe that we have included the important corrections that you suggested, particularly the references to Prof. Adam Gamoran as being the leader of the Evaluation Project and the fact that Adam and his team will be available to help lead communities undertake specific programs of monitoring and evaluation. They will also help lead communities develop procedures that could lead to the publication of a manual of successful practices in the area of monitoring and evaluation.

I hope that your Foundation will now be able to conclude the formal commitment with the CIJE for the support of the Monitoring and Evaluation Project.

With best regards.

Sincerely yours,


Seymour Fox


Alan Hoffmann

GOALS, MONITORING, EVALUATION, AND FEEDBACK IN CIJE COMMUNITIES

A THREE YEAR OUTLINE

In late 1990, the Commission on Jewish Education in North America issued *A Time to Act*, a report calling for radical improvement in all aspects of Jewish education. At the center of the report's strategic plan was the establishment of "Lead Communities" -- demonstration sites that would show North American Jews what was possible.

Three to five model communities will be established to demonstrate what can happen when there is an infusion of outstanding personnel into the educational system and its leadership, and when the necessary funds are secured to meet additional costs (p. 67).

The successor to the Commission, the Council for Initiatives in Jewish Education (CIJE), established three lead communities to carry out the strategic plan.

How will we know whether these lead communities have succeeded in creating better structures and processes for Jewish education? On what basis will the CIJE encourage other cities to emulate the programs developed in lead communities? Like any innovation, the lead communities project requires monitoring, evaluation, and feedback to document its efforts and gauge its successes.

At the same time CIJE recognizes that much of what passes for Jewish education today is often lacking in any sense of direction, much less a compelling sense of direction. That is, the enterprise is not informed by a 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, assessing achievement and 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.

This proposal describes a two-pronged plan for monitoring, evaluation and feedback in lead communities and for systematic development of vision-driven institutions through a Goals Project.

A. MONITORING, EVALUATION AND FEEDBACK

MEF emphasizes three aspects of educational change in lead communities:

- (1) What is the process of change in lead communities? This calls for field research in the lead communities. It requires a combination of qualitative and quantitative data, and offers formative as well as summative evaluation -- that is, feedback as well as monitoring for the lead communities.
- (2) What are the outcomes of change in lead communities? Does the project emphasize increased participation? Should we expect a rise in general Jewish literacy? Such questions are especially challenging because the specific outcomes have yet to be defined. By asking about goals (cognitive, emotional and interpersonal) in lead communities the evaluation project will stimulate participants to think about their own vision and establish a standard by which changes can be measured in later years.
- (3) Who are the educational personnel of the lead communities? What is their Jewish background and how they have been trained in Jewish and general education? Do they work full-time or part-time and how are they compensated? How much in-service support do they receive?

Field Research in Lead Communities

Studying the process of change in lead communities is a major component of the CIJE strategy. Documenting the process is especially important because the effects of innovation may not be manifested for several years.

For example, let us suppose community X manages to quadruple its number of full-time, professionally-trained Jewish educators. How long will it take for this change to affect cognitive and affective outcomes for students? Since results cannot be detected immediately, it is important to obtain a qualitative sense of the extent to which the professional educators are being used effectively. Studying the process is also important in the case of unsuccessful innovation.

A team of three full-time field researchers will be hired. Initially, the field researchers will be principally concerned with two questions:

- (a) What is the extent of *community mobilization* for Jewish education? Who is involved, and who is not? How broad is the coalition supporting the CIJE's efforts? How deep is participation within the various agencies? For example, beyond a small core of leaders, is there grass roots involvement in the community? To what extent is the community mobilized financially as well as in human resources? What are the *visions for change* in Jewish education held by members of the communities? How do the visions vary across different individuals or segments of the community?
- (b) What is the nature of the *professional life of educators* in this community? Under what conditions do teachers and principals work? For example, what are their salaries, and their degree of satisfaction with salaries? Are school facilities cohesive, or fragmented? Do principals have offices? What are the physical conditions of classrooms? Is there administrative support for innovation among teachers?

Field researchers will address these questions in the following ways:

1. Supplement community self-studies with additional quantitative data to be determined following a review of the self-studies in all of the lead communities.
2. Use these data, along with interviews and observations in the field, to gain an understanding of the state of Jewish education in the community at the outset of the lead community process.
3. Attend meetings and interview participants in order to monitor the progress of efforts to improve the educational delivery system.
4. Report on a regular basis to provide feedback for participants in the lead communities.
5. Write periodic reports describing and interpreting the process and products of change to date.

6. Replicate the initial data collection a year later and issue a report which would describe educational changes that occurred during the two years, and present an assessment of the extent to which goals are being addressed.

The Educators Survey

A survey instrument will be developed and administered to all educators in CIJE communities in day schools, supplementary schools, pre-school programs and informal educational frameworks.

The survey will provide baseline data in several critical domains:

- a. Total number of educators in each community.
- b. Percentage of part-time vs. full-time educators.
- c. Path of entry to Jewish education as an indication of a career path.
- d. Turnover rates and stability in the Jewish educational profession.
- e. Breakdown of educators (rather than through institutions) among the denomination.
- f. A detailed breakdown of compensation and benefits of Jewish educators in each community.
- g. Professional training of educators in general education and specifically in Jewish education.
- h. Levels of in-service training and their comparison to those in general education in that city, state or nationally.

These data will inevitably raise several critical issues for CIJE communities.

Amongst these are the following questions:

- a. How can the community best ensure that Jewish education is delivered by educators who are not only motivated and committed, but qualified and skilled in their subject matter and in education? This could be remedied by a

coherent, sustained system of in-service education, for which teachers are compensated and rewarded.

- b. What in-service training can be developed, given local, regional, national and Israeli Jewish and general training resources, to ensure ongoing quality training for all teachers? How can such a system address the needs of the different groups of teachers?
- c. What career opportunities can be designed to ensure the retention and advancement of the best teachers in the field of Jewish education?
- d. If positions with increased responsibilities can be created (e.g., lead teachers), will this strategy serve not only to provide career opportunities, but also as a means of continuously upgrading the community's teaching force?
- e. What can be done to increase the number of full-time teachers in various institutions?
- f. What salary and benefit policies and scales should be instituted -- differentially -- to be beneficial to the level of the teaching force and to individual teachers?

Director of Monitoring, Evaluation and Feedback

The field researchers will be guided by a director of monitoring, evaluation and feedback. The director will be responsible for providing leadership, establishing an overall vision for the project. Further responsibilities would include making final decisions in the selection of field researchers; participating in the training of field researchers and in the development of a detailed monitoring and feedback system; overseeing the formal and informal reports from field researchers; and guiding plans for administration of surveys and tests in the lead communities. It will also involve coordination and integration of the work on goals that is being developed. Prof. Adam Gamoran, a leading sociologist of education at the University of Wisconsin, has agreed to direct Monitoring, Evaluation and Feedback for the CIJE.

Consultation to Communities on Evaluation

A further outcome of MEF will be the development of capacity, within CIJE, to provide consultation to an ever-expanding group of communities on the issue of evaluation design. The Professional

Advisory Committee (Prof. James Coleman, chairman, Prof. Seymour Fox, Dr. Adam Gamoran, Prof. Ellen Goldring, Mr. Alan Hoffmann, Mrs. Annette Hochstein, and Prof. Mike Inbar) will supervise the building of that capacity.

B. THE GOALS PROJECT

The Goals Project is an effort to create what might be called "vision-drivenness" in Jewish educational institutions. To refer to an educational 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 meaningful Jewish continuity. The Goals Project will encourage vision-drivenness by educating relevant individuals, groups, and institutions concerning the importance of vision-drivenness. It will develop 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.

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, featuring what kinds of activities, attaining what standards that one would like to bring into being.

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.

The resources of the Mandel Institute-Harvard University Program of Scholarly Collaboration and its Educated Jew Project on alternative conceptions of the educated Jew will be made available by the CIJE to those working on the goals aspects of the monitoring-evaluation-feedback project in the lead communities.

The faculty and staff of the religious denominations have been recruited to assist in this project. Prof. Daniel Pekarsky, a

scholar in the field of philosophy of education at the University of Wisconsin, will coordinate this effort at developing and establishing goals.

Prof. Pekarsky and members of the staff of the CIJE are collecting existing examples of schools and other educational institutions in Jewish and general education that have undertaken thoughtful definitions of their goals.

A. Strategies for working with Lead Community lay and professional leadership:

1. A planning seminar (planned for this summer in Jerusalem):

This seminar would be designed to engage lay and professional leadership, especially within Lead Communities, around the theme of Visions and Educational Practice. The seminar, as now conceptualized, would include the following kinds of elements:

- a. Opportunities for participants to come to appreciate the important role that vision and goals can play in guiding the educational process;
 - b. A chance to begin or continue working through their own visions of a meaningful Jewish existence;
 - c. A chance to encounter other such views, including but not limited to formulations developed in the "Educated Jew" project;
 - d. A chance to develop a strategy for engaging educational institutions in their local communities in the goal-setting process.
2. Consultations to a community's leadership around efforts already underway or accomplished that are concerned with goals;

For example, in a community like Milwaukee that recently went through strategic planning experience that put

"visioning" at the center, CIJE could initiate a serious conversation designed to unearth and develop the substantive ideal, the educational vision, that underlie the proposals that emerged from the Strategic Planning process.

3. As specific projects of lead communities emerge, their goals will be subjected to careful development and scrutiny. This will create the baseline for evaluating future success.
- B. 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. Possible approaches:
1. Encourage the denominations to clarify and more adequately articulate their own guiding visions of a meaningful Jewish existence.
 2. Encourage national denominational institutions to work intensively with one or more carefully selected educational 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. 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.

D. A Coalition of Vision-Driven Institutions

This proposal is that a coalition be established for educational 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.

28
1/11/11

CIJE

MONITORING, EVALUATION AND FEEDBACK PROJECT

INSTITUTIONAL PROFILES

I. DEFINITION

The Institutional Profiles have been conceived as a self-study process (with accompanying instrumentation) by which educational institutions can take stock of their organizational reality, as a necessary prelude for engaging successfully in planned change. It combines the first two steps in CIJE's model of Research to Analysis to Planning.

II. RELATION TO THE GOALS PROJECT

In order for educational institutions to change toward becoming vision-driven, they must nurture the dynamic tension between what is and what (they think) ought to be. A process is needed through which educational institutions can gain accurate perceptions of their systemic realities, acquire a sense of alternative possibilities, and move beyond where they are now.

III. THE INSTITUTIONAL PROFILES WILL ASSIST EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS . . .

1. in gaining accurate systemic perceptions of their institutions;
2. in acquiring a sense of alternative possibilities;
3. in obtaining knowledge about their institutions and their communities that will be needed to engage successfully in observable and sustained change:
 - a. base-line data;
 - b. knowledge of available resources (i.e., financial, physical, and personnel);
 - c. knowledge of limiting conditions in the institution and the community;
4. in nurturing a dynamic tension between what is and what ought to be.

*eg's
anecdotes
✓ families
✓ grades
✓ specific
top*

IV. ISSUES TO ADDRESS

1. Degree of Structure:

Will each educational institution construct (more or less) unique Institutional Profiles based on certain, given principles?

or

Will each educational institution follow a (relatively) structured set of procedures for the creation of analogous Institutional Profiles?

2. Institutional versus communal levels:

Should we develop a process (and accompanying instrumentation) by which communities (i.e., continuity commissions and other communal bodies) can construct communal "Profiles", as a necessary prelude for engaging successfully in planned change?

or

Should we focus solely on the development of Institutional Profiles for individual, educational institutions?

V. WHERE TO GO FROM HERE?

1. Work with CIJE staff to further develop the Institutional Profiles in line with the Goals Project and other CIJE activities.
2. Design the instrumentation for the Institutional Profiles.
3. Pre-test and refine the process and instrumentation.

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO
DEPARTMENT OF SOCIOLOGY
1126 EAST 59TH STREET
CHICAGO · ILLINOIS 60637

James S. Coleman
(312) 702-8696 · FAX: (312) 702-9529
E-mail: mill@cicero.spc.uchicago.edu

July 20, 1994

Professor Adam Gamoran
Department of Sociology
University of Wisconsin, Madison
Madison, Wisconsin 53705

Dear Adam:

I'm sorry to have taken so long to read the report on the Baltimore survey on the CIJE lead communities program. I think it is an excellent report, and I have no comments for changes. The only thing that might have been added is at selected points some comparative percentages from Milwaukee. I presume at some point there will be a comparative report, when all the individual analyses are done. Even so, it would not hurt, and would provide some additional incentive for communities to change, if the individual reports allowed some comparison points with the communities for which the survey had been previously analyzed.

I also presume that at some point there will be an ethnographic report which will give an account of the social structure of each community, for it is such a report that will give insight into the problems that the community will confront in attempting to organize itself to bring about changes in Jewish education.

But these are only ancillary comments. The report is very well done.

Sincerely,



James S. Coleman
University Professor

JSC:dm

University of Wisconsin—Madison

MADISON, WISCONSIN 53706

DEPARTMENT OF SOCIOLOGY
SOCIAL SCIENCE BUILDING
1180 OBSERVATORY DRIVE

TO CALL WRITER DIRECT
PHONE (608) 263-4253

August 22, 1994

Professor James Coleman
Department of Sociology
1126 E. 59th Street
Chicago, IL 60637

Dear Jim,

Many thanks for your response to the report on Jewish teachers in Baltimore. You raised two excellent issues, and I want to tell you how we are addressing them, in case you have further suggestions.

On the issue of cross-community comparisons, we are indeed preparing a comparative report, in at least two phases: First there will be a short "Policy Brief" (modeled after the U.S. Dept. of Education's "Issues in Brief") on the topic of the background and training of teachers in Jewish schools. We expect to complete a draft of this Brief in October. Second, we are writing a more extensive cross-community report, which we expect to have drafted by the end of December.

In these reports, the survey data will sometimes be merged across communities, and sometimes kept separate, depending on whether important differences among communities appear.

In presenting results to the communities, we have not emphasized similarities and differences with the other communities, and had not thought about the possible motivating effects of doing so. At the time we were planning the Baltimore report, we were not at liberty to release the Milwaukee data outside Milwaukee, but that would now be possible; in fact the Milwaukee people sent their report to Baltimore.

On the ethnographic analysis of social structure, there are two relevant reports, both written by Julie Tammivaara, our Baltimore field researcher. One is on "Community Mobilization for Jewish Education in Baltimore," and the second is on "The Professional Lives of Jewish Educators in Baltimore." Both, I think, are contributing to our understanding of the community, and of the place of Jewish education there. (I should add, however, that CLJE staff members have been working so closely with residents of Baltimore that they [CLJE staff] do not perceive the report on mobilization to have added much beyond what they already knew.)

REMINDERS -- JUNE 5, 1994

1. Write memo to Garry Stock summarizing what was -- do it as a fax from AH to Garry Stock:

מספר ☐ תאריך
INTERNAL MEMORANDUM

MEF

RE: CONVERSATION WITH ADAM GAMORAN, 9 MAY 1994

FROM: Annette

DATE: May 10, 1994

The bases for the conversation were Adam's summary of his conversations with Alan Hoffman (memo of May 4 1994) as well as the proposed work plan for MEF of 1 April 1994 through 31 December 1994.

1. The major change between the previous work plan and this one is Alan's request for a decision to move away from a systemic focus on communities into a institution by institution one (particularly focused on the Goals Project). The issue is a very major one since the notion of systemic change was central to the whole approach of the lead communities.

Need to discuss this with Alan and with the Steering Committee.

-
2. We discussed what could be done for the G.A. and agreed upon a printed policy brief that would focus on two or three major issues -- the preparation of educators and in-service training probably being the main ones -- together with a presentation. That is less than the full report but I think is more than what we have and probably the most we can get from them.

3. We discussed what further studies he would like if we were free.

We discussed one: further analysis of the educators' survey which could probably yield a very rich amount of material. Analyses would include matters like: salaries versus positions; preferences in regard to positions; recruitment patterns; and more.

He is still very interested in mobilization patterns and communities and we discussed at length what we might still learn from that.

If we had a magic wand, he would do an addition to the input measures that we're dealing with. He would deal with the process and with outputs and outcomes. He thinks if we could commission major outcomes studies (something he had advocated from the very beginning) to be done by others (because his time is very committed), that would be a real contribution.

4. We should try and back to back the August meeting of the SCAN committee and that of the MEF group; they're available 24, 25, 26 August. I promise to try and give those dates, or at least some of those dates, to the MEF Project. ✓
5. I gave my support for a January meeting in Israel of the MEF group. ✓
6. We agreed that mobilizations would not be dealt with because it is not a priority.
7. We agreed that I would discuss David Cohen and Lee Shulman as additional committee members. I think it is a very good idea. ✓

8. Adam wanted to discuss some staffing issues. However, we decided to defer that topic to a memo he will send me and at then I'll take it to Alan. ✓

All in all, a good serious and straight forward conversation. At the end, Alan explained to me why Jewish Education had to be marginal to the next fifteen years of his career, at least.



Personal GA
Brief

Talk to
Alan

December

Scan

25/26

DKC/LS

yes

presented CJE
Oct 15
Draft

Date: Wed, 4 May 1994 10:58 CDT
From: <GAMORAN@WISCSSC>
Subject: Notes from our meeting of May 1
To: annette@hujivms
Original_To: ALHOFUS, ANNETTE
Original_cc: ELLEN

May 4, 1994

To: Alan Hoffman
From: Adam Gamoran and Ellen Goldring
CC: Annette Hochstein and Steve Hoffman
Re: notes from our meeting with you on 5/1/94

As we decided at the conclusion of our meeting, here are (a) notes from our meeting and (b) a list of potential tasks for us, tentatively prioritized, and a corresponding list of support needed to carry them out.

AGENDA

We were able to discuss four major items on our agenda:

- (1) The board subcommittee on research and evaluation
- (2) the MEF work plan
- (3) the MEF advisory committee
- (4) dissemination beyond Lead Community reports

BOARD SUBCOMMITTEE

We observed two problems with the recent meeting of the board subcommittee:

- (a) Members of the subcommittee were not familiar with MEF, and the linkage between MEF in Lead Communities and CIJE's research mission was ambiguous.
- (b) Members of the subcommittee seemed unaware of CIJE's overall program of promoting Jewish continuity by improving Jewish education; some questioned whether why we were studying personnel (how did we know that would make a difference?) and others, stimulated by Barry Kosmin's presentation, asked whether we should perhaps study identity instead of education.

As you explained, this is a problem of educating the lay board. At the next meeting, we need a serious discussion of what it means to set out a research agenda for Jewish education. This may require a panel of experts. Is there a potential for research on Jewish education in America? If yes, what would

be the role of the Jewish community, and what would be the role of the secular educational research community?

Your view was that the October meeting must be carefully thought through and planned well in advance. You also noted that alternate staffing of Ellen and Adam is problematic in this context.

There are three main tasks to working with a board committee: (1) Working with the chair; (2) Working with other committee members; (3) Working on the content. Of these, the third is the real work.

MEF WORK PLAN

In responding to our work plan of 4/1/94, you raised four concerns at the outset:

- (1) There is not enough attention to informal education.
- (2) You are pleased to see educational leaders addressed, but noted that only the characteristics of leaders, and not leadership itself, will be addressed. That is a concern.
- (3) It is not clear how the work plan moves beyond three communities, as CIJE is planning to do.
- (4) The timing of writing the cross-community report on educations was not satisfactory.

Essentially, you said that the pieces of the work plan are fine in themselves, but the timing and priorities they imply need further discussion.

Mobilization

We discussed our ongoing monitoring of community mobilization, and reached a consensus that the documents produced by the field researchers, though rich in detail, are better seen as raw data than as interpretive reports. We discussed the need for a cross-community report on mobilization with more interpretation. This might be useful for the board subcommittee on mobilization, as well as for CIJE staff. Adam suggested that a comparative report could be helpful in drawing lessons in anticipation of CIJE's likely transformation as envisioned in the 10-year plan.

Institutional Profiles

In light of the emerging centrality of the goals project, an instrument to create institutional profiles will definitely be needed. Our task

now should be to study and design an instrument for the profiles, without necessarily planning to implement them on a community-wide basis next fall. On the contrary, we should move more towards an instrument useful to individual institutions (as opposed to an instrument mainly for community-wide purposes), which would be used by institutions engaged in vision-driven reform. (Note: We raised, but did not have time to discuss, the question of what happens to systemic reform when innovation is driven by individual institutions.) If possible, we should have an instrument ready to be used by institutions that get "on-board" after the goals seminar this summer. The purpose of the instrument would be to permit baseline assessment of the institution(s) so that progress could be assessed over time.

We also discussed the need for deeper profiles that would include data about teachers' sense of mission, unity of purpose, etc. We did not set a time frame for addressing such issues. Moving a step further, we also discussed the need for data on constituencies (and potential constituencies) -- i.e., parents and students. We did not set a time frame for this work either.

We concluded that Bill should go ahead with interviews of experts in Jewish education, with the aim of creating a draft instrument to present at the August MEF advisory committee meeting. The draft would be accompanied by a rationale for each indicator.

Bill needs to talk with Dan Pekarsky to discuss the linkage between the institutional profiles and the goals project. (Probably we'll bring him to Madison for this. He can also meet with Roberta to get her input on the indicators. Ellen's participation in the goals seminar will also be helpful.)

The decision not to try to implement institutional profiles in the Lead Communities, at least not next fall, is a **MAJOR CHANGE** in our work plan.

Reports on Educators

In your ideal schedule, we would have a cross-community report on Jewish educators ready to present at the October board meeting and to release at the November GA. This is not possible. However, we could make a presentation at the GA (and previewed at the board meeting) on a fairly narrow topic -- for example, educational backgrounds and professional development of teachers -- at the GA, to accompany related presentations by leading educational figures. We anticipate having a draft of the full cross-community report to our advisory committee by December 31.

We understand that this project is our **TOP PRIORITY**.

MEF ADVISORY COMMITTEE

We discussed the meetings and composition of our advisory committee. It is desirable to add another educational researcher, especially if Jim Coleman is not able to participate. We discussed a few names but did not reach any conclusion. One possibility is to elevate our committee into an advisory committee for research, for which MEF in Lead Communities is but one component. In that case, we might add David Cohen and Lee Shulman as committee members. We think this is a promising idea that warrants further discussion.

We set a tentative date for our next advisory committee meeting of August 24-25. An alternate would be August 25-26. If you agree, we will ask Ginny to contact the members of our committee to find out if this would work for them.

We also discussed the possibility of a meeting in Israel in the first few days of January, 1995. Adam, Ellen, Alan, Annette, Seymour, and Mike I. would be invited to this meeting, a sort of pre-advisory meeting. The discussion would presumably center on the cross-community report on teachers in Jewish schools, which will just have been drafted. Another topic of discussion at this meeting would be our work plan for 1995.

TASKS FOR ADAM AND ELLEN (in order of priority) (comments follow)
(all dates are for drafts submitted to MEF advisory committee)

TASK	MAIN SUPPORT NEEDED FROM:	ADDITIONAL SUPPORT NEEDED FROM:
Cross-community teacher report (December 31, 1994)	Bill Robinson	Roberta, Julie
Report on Baltimore teaching force (June 30, 1994)	Nancy Hendrix	Julie
Report on Atlanta teaching force (August 31, 1994)	Nancy Hendrix	
"Module" of educator surveys and interviews (May 31, 1995)	Julie, Roberta	

Reports on characteristics of educational leaders in the L.C.s (Fall, 1994)	Bill Robinson	Roberta, Julie
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------	----------------

Instrument for institutional profiles (August, 1994, through 1995)	Bill Robinson	Roberta, Julie
--------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------	----------------

Cross-community mobilizat. report (June, 1995)	Roberta, Julie	Bill
------------------------------------------------	----------------	------

Conceptual paper on Jewish community mobilization (September 30, 1994)	Roberta, Julie	Bill
------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------	------

Instruments developmment for study of informal educators (Winter, 1995-1996)	outside experts	Roberta, Julie, Bill
------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------	----------------------

Participation on the CIJE Steering Committee (Ongoing)

Staffing the CIJE Board Sub-committee on Research & Eval. (Ongoing)	outside experts
---------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------

Comments:

All these tasks seem doable under the schedule indicated, with one important exception: We cannot see a way of adequately staffing the Board Subcommittee on Research and Evaluation, along with all our other work. This, we recognize, is a serious problem.

An important omission from this list is additional meetings and presentations which are frequently asked of us by CIJE and/or Lead Communities. We continue to be very reluctant to add this extra work, because we are too busy with our main agenda.

The longer we have field researchers on staff, the more we'll be able to say in the cross-community report on mobilization. However, we recognize that this report is not the highest priority.

If we drop the cross-community mobilization report, we could prepare the

instruments for studying informal education next year (1995).

The role of the field researchers in preparing the teaching force reports should not be overlooked. We expect they will make substantial contributions to each LC report, and we also expect them to assist us in preparing the cross-community report on educators.

After January 1995, we will still have great need for a data analyst, and we hope Bill Robinson will prove capable in that role. If he also turns out to be effective in preparing instruments for institutional profiles, CIJE may want to hire him as much as 100%. If his work for us will be restricted to data analysis, it is crucial that we have at least 50% of his time for CIJE; 100% would be better but if an accomodation can be made with Atlanta, perhaps they could have 50% of his time and we could have the other 50%.

Finally, a couple of activities we mentioned but which do not appear on the list: A study of leadership in Jewish education; a study of institutional practices (as opposed to profiles of institutional characteriscs); a study of students and/or parents. These items need further discussion.

16
16 GAMORAN@WISCSSC => ANNETTE@HUJIVMS; 04/05/94, 20:42:04; M GAMORAN.MAIL
EBCDIC (<GAMORAN@WISCSSC>)
MIME type: text/plain

Received: by HUIVMS via NJE (HUyMail-V61); Wed, 04 May 94 20:42:03 +0300
Date: Wed, 4 May 1994 10:58 CDT
From: <GAMORAN@WISCSSC>
Subject: Notes from our meeting of May 1
To: annette@hujivms
Original To: ALHOFUS, ANNETTE
Original_cc: ELLEN

May 4, 1994

To: Alan Hoffman
From: Adam Gamoran and Ellen Goldring
CC: Annette Hochstein and Steve Hoffman
Re: notes from our meeting with you on 5/1/94

Hit <CR> for next page, : to skip to next part...
BMAIL>

As we decided at the conclusion of our meeting, here are (a) notes from our meeting and (b) a list of potential tasks for us, tentatively prioritized, and a corresponding list of support needed to carry them out.

AGENDA

We were able to discuss four major items on our agenda:

- (1) The board subcommittee on research and evaluation
- (2) the MEF work plan
- (3) the MEF advisory committee
- (4) dissemination beyond Lead Community reports

BOARD SUBCOMMITTEE

We observed two problems with the recent meeting of the board subcommittee:

- (a) Members of the subcommittee were not familiar with MEF, and the linkage between MEF in Lead Communities and CIJE's research mission was ambiguous.
- (b) Members of the subcommittee seemed unaware of CIJE's overall program of promoting Jewish continuity by improving Jewish education; some questioned whether why we were studying personnel (how did we know that

Hit <R> for next page, : to skip to next part...
BMAIL>

would make a difference?) and others, stimulated by Barry Kosmin's presentation, asked whether we should perhaps study identity instead of education.

As you explained, this is a problem of educating the lay board. At the next meeting, we need a serious discussion of what it means to set out a research agenda for Jewish education. This may require a panel of experts. Is there a potential for research on Jewish education in America? If yes, what would be the role of the Jewish community, and what would be the role of the secular educational research community?

Your view was that the October meeting must be carefully thought through and planned well in advance. You also noted that alternate staffing of Ellen and Adam is problematic in this context.

There are three main tasks to working with a board committee: (1) Working with the chair; (2) Working with other committee members; (3) Working on the content. Of these, the third is the real work.

MEF WORK PLAN

Policy Brief

Are we going to abandon the systemic approach in favor of institutions & goals.

Systemic vs. ad hoc's

Further analyses of the educators' survey
Salary w/ position preferences to match educational patterns
Qualification patterns in this

If Magic wand!
Do Process
Outputs
Outcomes
Just doing - to be CC not accepted +? others + outcome e.g. - Hebrew

Why not Mobilization?

HIS THINKING
JIM'S views
Mike's views
DKC's views

Hit <CR> for next page, : to skip to next part...

BMAIL>

In responding to our work plan of 4/1/94, you raised four concerns at the outset:

- (1) There is not enough attention to informal education.
- (2) You are pleased to see educational leaders addressed, but noted that only the characteristics of leaders, and not leadership itself, will be addressed. That is a concern.
- (3) It is not clear how the work plan moves beyond three communities, as CIJE is planning to do.
- (4) The timing of writing the cross-community report on educations was not satisfactory.

Essentially, you said that the pieces of the work plan are fine in themselves, but the timing and priorities they imply need further discussion.

Mobilization

We discussed our ongoing monitoring of community mobilization, and reached

Hit <CR> for next page, : to skip to next part...

BMAI

a consensus that the documents produced by the field researchers, though rich in detail, are better seen as raw data than as interpretive reports. We discussed the need for a cross-community report on mobilization with more interpretation. This might be useful for the board subcommittee on mobilization, as well as for CIJE staff. Adam suggested that a comparative report could be helpful in drawing lessons in anticipation of CIJE's likely transformation as envisioned in the 10-year plan.

Institutional Profiles

In light of the emerging centrality of the goals project, an instrument to create institutional profiles will definitely be needed. Our task now should be to study and design an instrument for the profiles, without necessarily planning to implement them on a community-wide basis next fall. On the contrary, we should move more towards an instrument useful to individual institutions (as opposed to an instrument mainly for community-wide purposes), which would be used by institutions engaged in vision-driven reform. (Note: We raised, but did not have time to discuss, the question of what happens to systemic reform when innovation is driven by individual institutions.) If possible, we should have an instrument ready to be used by institutions that get "on-board" after the goals seminar this summer. The purpose of the instrument would be to permit baseline assessment of

Hit <CR> for next page, : to skip to next part...

BMAIL>

the institution(s) so that progress could be assessed over time.

We also discussed the need for deeper profiles that would include data about teachers' sense of mission, unity of purpose, etc. We did not set a time frame for addressing such issues. Moving a step further, we also discussed the need for data on constituencies (and potential constituencies) -- i.e., parents and students. We did not set a time frame for this work either.

We concluded that Bill should go ahead with interviews of experts in Jewish education, with the aim of creating a draft instrument to present at the August MEF advisory committee meeting. The draft would be accompanied by a rationale for each indicator.

Bill needs to talk with Dan Pekarsky to discuss the linkage between the institutional profiles and the goals project. (Probably we'll bring him to Madison for this. He can also meet with Roberta to get her input on the indicators. Ellen's participation in the goals seminar will also be helpful.)

The decision not to try to implement institutional profiles in the Lead

Hit <CR> for next page, : to skip to next part...

BMAIL>

Communities, at least not next fall, is a MAJOR CHANGE in our work plan.

Reports on Educators

In your ideal schedule, we would have a cross-community report on Jewish educators ready to present at the October board meeting and to release at the November GA. This is not possible. However, we could make a presentation at the GA (and previewed at the board meeting) on a fairly narrow topic -- for example, educational backgrounds and professional development of teachers -- at the GA, to accompany related presentations by leading educational figures. We anticipate having a draft of the full cross-community report to our advisory committee by December 31.

We understand that this project is our TOP PRIORITY.

MEF ADVISORY COMMITTEE

We discussed the meetings and composition of our advisory committee. It is desirable to add another educational researcher, especially if Jim Coleman is not able to participate. We discussed a few names but did not reach any conclusion. One possibility is to elevate our committee into an advisory committee for research, for which MEF in Lead Communities

Hit <CR> for next page, : to skip to next part...

BMAIL>

is but one component. In that case, we might add David Cohen and Lee Shulman as committee members. We think this is a promising idea that warrants further discussion.

We set a tentative date for our next advisory committee meeting of August 24-25. An alternate would be August 25-26. If you agree, we will ask Ginny to contact the members of our committee to find out if this would work for them.

We also discussed the possibility of a meeting in Israel in the first few days of January, 1995. Adam, Ellen, Alan, Annette, Seymour, and Mike I. would be invited to this meeting, a sort of pre-advisory meeting. The discussion would presumably center on the cross-community report on teachers in Jewish schools, which will just have been drafted. Another topic of discussion at this meeting would be our work plan for 1995.

TASKS FOR ADAM AND ELLEN (in order of priority) (comments follow)

(a) 'ates are for drafts submitted to MEF advisory committee)

Hit <CR> for next page, : to skip to next part...

BMAIL>

TASK	MAIN SUPPORT NEEDED FROM:	ADDITIONAL SUPPORT NEEDED FROM:
Cross-community teacher report (December 31, 1994)	Bill Robinson	Roberta, Julie
Report on Baltimore teaching force (June 30, 1994)	Nancy Hendrix	Julie
Report on Atlanta teaching force (August 31, 1994)	Nancy Hendrix	
"Module" of educator surveys and interviews (May 31, 1995)	Julie, Roberta	
Reports on characteristics of educational leaders in the L.C.s (Fall, 1994)	Bill Robinson	Roberta, Julie

/ Sad one?

why?

???

Yes

He is!

Good!

Not yet

Yes

Wants Jim
to back to
advisory
group
why?

Hit <CR> for next page, : to skip to next part...

BMAIL>

Instrument for institutional profiles (August, 1994, through 1995)	Bill Robinson	Roberta, Julie
-----------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------	----------------

Cross-community mobilizat. report (June, 1995)	Roberta, Julie	Bill
---------------------------------------------------	----------------	------

Conceptual paper on Jewish community mobilization (September 30, 1994)	Roberta, Julie	Bill
---------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------	------

Instruments development for study of informal educators (Winter, 1995-1996)	outside experts	Roberta, Julie, Bill
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------	----------------------

Participation on the CIJE Steering Committee
(Ongoing)

Staffing the CIJE Board Subcommittee on Research & Eval.	outside experts
----------------------------------------------------------	-----------------

Hit <CR> for next page, : to skip to next part...

BMAIL>

(Ongoing)

Comments:

All these tasks seem doable under the schedule indicated, with one important exception: We cannot see a way of adequately staffing the Board Subcommittee on Research and Evaluation, along with all our other work. This, we recognize, is a serious problem.

what about raise staff/tim?

An important omission from this list is additional meetings and presentations which are frequently asked of us by CIJE and/or Lead Communities. We continue to be very reluctant to add this extra work, because we are too busy with our main agenda.

The longer we have field researchers on staff, the more we'll be able to say in the cross-community report on mobilization. However, we recognize that this report is not the highest priority.

If we drop the cross-community mobilization report, we could prepare the instruments for studying informal education next year (1995).

DO DROP

Hit <CR> for next page, : to skip to next part...

BMAIL>

The role of the field researchers in preparing the teaching force reports should not be overlooked. We expect they will make substantial contributions to each LC report, and we also expect them to assist us in preparing the cross-community report on educators.

After January 1995, we will still have great need for a data analyst, and we hope Bill Robinson will prove capable in that role. If he also turns out to be effective in preparing instruments for institutional profiles, CIJE may want to hire him as much as 100%. If his work for us will be restricted to data analysis, it is crucial that we have at least 50% of his time for CIJE; 100% would be better but if an accommodation can be made with Atlanta, perhaps they could have 50% of his time and we could have the other 50%.

Finally, a couple of activities we mentioned but which do not appear on the list: A study of leadership in Jewish education; a study of institutional practices (as opposed to profiles of institutional characteristics); a study of students and/or parents. These items need further discussion.

Date: Sun, 3 Apr 1994 09:28 CDT
From: <GAMORAN@WISCSSC>
Subject: proposed MEF work plan
To: annette@hujivms
Original_To: ALANHOF, ALHOFUS
Original_cc: ANNETTE, GINNY

CONFIDENTIAL -- FOR DISTRIBUTION ONLY WITHIN CIJE

MEF Work Plan
April 1, 1994 - December 31, 1994

This work plan is an extension of the plan submitted in July 1993, which described work to be performed through July 1994. An important revision to the earlier plan is that the study of goals for educational change now runs through all the components of the work plan.

I. Ongoing Monitoring and Evaluation

A. Monitoring and Evaluation of the Personnel Action Plan

This component of the project will emphasize monitoring and evaluation of the development and implementation of a personnel action plan in each Lead Community. We are concerned with questions such as:

1. How was the plan developed? Who participated, who did not, and what was the process?
2. What information was used to develop the plan? In particular, were MEF reports used, and if so, how? What other data are on record for targeted institutions, programs, and persons?
3. Does the action plan include specific goals for the enhancement of personnel? What are its goals and purposes? How will progress towards the goals be evaluated?
4. In what way is the plan innovative? How will it change the Jewish educator work force in the community?
4. What is the timeline for the plan?
5. What funding provisions have been made or are intended for implementing the plan?

B. Monitoring and Evaluation of Lead Community Projects

As Lead Community Projects are developed (probably beginning with pilot projects), we will work with community leaders to establish standards of scope, quality, and content by which the projects can be evaluated. Subsequently, we will engage in active monitoring leading to the evaluation of Lead Community Projects according to these standards.

C. Monitoring of Community Mobilization

As proposed by our advisory board, we will conduct interviews to develop conceptions and establish criteria by which community mobilization can be evaluated. This will result in a paper outlining the concepts and measures of mobilization.

In addition, we will continue to monitor the emergence of goals for Jewish education in the Lead Communities, through observations at meetings and discussions with educators, lay leaders, and community professionals.

II. Community Profiles

A. Educator Surveys and Interviews

Educators in formal settings have been surveyed in all three communities. Reports on interviews with Milwaukee and Atlanta educators were released last fall, and a report on interviews with Baltimore educators is under preparation. A report integrating interview and survey data on Milwaukee teachers, with guidance for policy, was issued this spring, and analyses of survey data on teachers in Baltimore and Atlanta are underway.

This summer we will prepare reports for Baltimore and Atlanta that combine the survey and interview data on teachers, leading to policy recommendations for these communities.

As soon as the data processing equipment becomes available, we will analyze data from the educational leader surveys, beginning with data from Milwaukee. Assuming the equipment is available no later than June 1, we will analyze the data during the summer. In the fall, we will produce a report for each community that combines interview and survey data on educational leaders.

B. Institutional Profiles

We are preparing to construct profiles of educational institutions in the three Lead Communities, as outlined in the CIJE Planning Guide. This project will gather data about the extent, size, nature, and resources of Jewish educational programs, such as who is served, what programs are offered, how the programs are funded, and so on. The project serves three purposes:

1. To provide information for communal and institutional planning. As goals for Jewish education are identified, information on the current state of Jewish education will make it possible to map out a plan for moving from the current situation towards the desired goals.
2. To establish a baseline so that subsequent changes in the provision of Jewish education can be measured against an initial starting point.
3. To engage the communities and their institutions in a self-study process, nurturing "reflective communities" and helping to foster mobilization.

Both formal and informal educational programs will be included in the institutional profiles. Institutions targeted in community action plans, and institutions participating in Lead Community goal-setting processes, will receive priority for participation in the institutional profiles.

Our current plan of work in this domain is as follows: First, we will elaborate on the three purposes of the project in a more detailed proposal which is currently under preparation. Second, we will conduct telephone interviews with experts, including Jewish educators and administrators of communal agencies, to help us settle on the indicators that should be incorporated into the institutional profiles. (As a starting point, we are thinking about the items listed in Box 4, p. 12, of the Planning Guide). During this period, we will also meet with community leaders to find out what data are already available or routinely collected. Third, we will draft a survey instrument for data collection. Fourth, we will meet with community leaders to obtain their input on the content of the instrument, and to seek their participation in the administration of the survey.

In light of the need for community input into the design, and participation in the implementation of the survey, we expect to administer the survey immediately after the holidays next fall.

Products and Time Line

DATE	PRODUCT	PERSON(S) RESPONSIBLE
April 15	Proposal to develop institutional profiles	Bill Robinson
April 30	Revised report on mobilization in Milwaukee	Roberta Goodman
April 30	Revised report on mobilization in Baltimore	Julie Tammivaara
May 31	Report on mobilization in Atlanta	Roberta Goodman
May 31	Report on professional lives of Jewish educators in Baltimore	Julie Tammivaara
June 30	Draft instrument for institutional profiles	Bill Robinson
June 30	Interview protocol for studying concepts and measures of mobilization	Roberta Julie
June 30	Report on Baltimore teaching force	Adam Ellen Julie
August 31	Report on Atlanta teaching force	Adam Ellen Bill
August 31	Instrument for institutional profiles	Bill Robinson
September 30	Paper on Jewish community mobilization: concepts and measures	Roberta Julie Bill
September 30	Report on educational leaders in Milwaukee	Adam Ellen Roberta Bill
October 31	Report on educational leaders in Baltimore	Adam Ellen Julie Bill
November 30	Report on educational leaders in Atlanta	Adam Ellen Bill

December 31 Reports on progress of personnel action plans in Atlanta, Baltimore, and Milwaukee Julie Roberta Bill

December 31	Paper on teaching force in all three communities	Adam Ellen Roberta Bill Julie
-------------	--------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------

December 31	Proposal to survey institutional practices	Bill Robinson
-------------	--------------------------------------------	---------------

Council for Initiatives
in
Jewish Education

Att.
Abigail/Hil
Fax file X2

Date sent: 1/5/94 Time sent: 5:15 No. of Pages (incl. cover): 12
To: Annette Hochstein, Seymour Fox From: Ginny Levi
Shmuel Wygoda
Organization:
Phone Number: Phone Number:
(216) 391-1852
Fax Number: Fax Number: (216) 391-5430
0119722 619 951
Comments:

Dear Annette,

Alan asked me to fax you the
attached Draft 1994 work plan.

It remains confidential, but MCM
has seen it & thought it was
excellent & Alan wanted you to
have it. Sorry it has some of
my own scribbles on it.

Hope all is well there.

Ginny

If there are any problems receiving
this transmission, please call:
216-391-1852

D R A F T

THE CIJE - 1994 WORKPLAN

The CIJE was created by the North American Commission on Jewish Education with a highly focussed mission which incorporated three major tasks. These are: Building the profession of Jewish education; Mobilizing Community Leadership for Jewish education and Jewish continuity; developing a Research Agenda while at the same time securing funding for Jewish educational research. These so-called 'building blocks' all involve major long-term improvements in infrastructure for the North American Jewish community and so the Commission mandated the creation of Lead Communities. These are development and demonstration sites where, by mobilizing the leadership of the local community and by radically improving the quality of personnel for Jewish education, significant systemic change and impact could be shown to be possible relatively quickly while the national infrastructure was undergoing major reform.

The CIJE is presently in the process of developing a multi-year strategic vision which will articulate clear goals and benchmarks in each of the major areas of its work with specific objectives in each area. This strategic vision will constantly be revisited and revised as CIJE begins to engage its own committees in reviewing both direction and implementation. The first iteration of this multi-year vision should be completed by October 1994 and the 1995 annual workplan of the CIJE will flow directly from this process.

The 1994 Annual Workplan is, therefore, a bridge into this long-range process. It is anchored in the immediate realities of CIJE's present commitments but it also looks towards a much more focussed multi-year perspective.

The second half of 1993 has seen the major investment of the resources of the CIJE in three Lead Communities - Milwaukee, Baltimore and Atlanta - with a clear objective of winning the trust of the communities and accelerating the processes of local coalition-building and of moving towards a Personnel Action Plan in each of the communities.

A working hypothesis of this 1994 workplan is that while the Lead Communities remain the prime arenas for development and exploration of critical issues for North American Jewish education, CIJE's role is also to engage a much wider circle of communities in benefitting from our experience in the Lead Communities. Similarly, our involvement in Lead Communities has already raised and will continue to raise issues where response is most useful at a national level.

During 1994 this principle will direct CIJE into forging new partnerships with an ever-widening circle of communities while brokering with national agencies in providing support to this process. This will lead to a redeployment of staff resources and this process will have to be carefully monitored.

* * *

The present core staff of CIJE has not yet completed one full annual cycle of implementation so that the following workplan must be regarded as somewhat tentative and ungrounded in prior experience. It is an outline for 1994 priorities but doubtless will need modulation and revision as the year unfolds. In [] will appear the date by which action should take place and those responsible for that action.

A. CIJE POLICY-MAKING: STEERING COMMITTEE, COMMITTEE SYSTEM, BOARD, EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE.

1. A Steering Committee will be constituted composed of the Chair of the Board of the CIJE, committee chairs, core full-time staff and consultants. The Steering Committee will meet six times during 1994 and will develop a first iteration of a multi-year strategic vision for the CIJE. The 1995 annual workplan, derived from this strategic vision, will be presented for discussion to the September

g of the Steering Committee and thereupon to the
r 1994 meeting of the CIJE Board. ADH will staff
eering Committee.

n needed:

- . Confirm calendar for Steering Committee for 1994
including meetings at April and October board
meetings.
[1/4/94: VFL]

O
S,

ur CIJE Board Committees will be created and all
s of the CIJE Board will be allocated to at least one
tee. The proposed committees are: Building the
ision, Community Mobilization, Content and Research.
committees will be staffed by the core full-time staff
ome consultants of CIJE and will meet at each Board
ing at least once between each board meeting for a
of four committee meetings during the year. A
an which is a sub-set of this workplan will be
ped for each committee and will be approved for 1995
October board meeting. The 1994 interim workplan
be presented at the first meeting of each committee on
20th.

m

1 needed:

1. Division of Board members into committees
[1/21/94: MLM]
2. Letter from Board Chair informing members about
committee process.
[1/24/94: MLM]
3. Allocation of staff to committees
[1/4/94: Suggestion: Personnel - GZD
Community Mobilization - ADH
Content - BH
Research - AdamG]
4. Letter from committee chairs to members about
specific committee agenda.
[3/8/94: Committee chairs and committee staff]
5. Calendar for individual committee meetings
[Chairs and staff, unsynchronized]

ie

s

s

he CIJE Board will meet twice in New York, April 21st
October 20th. Board meetings will be preceded by a
ng of the Steering Committee in the afternoon (April
and October 21st). For board members, their first
dance at committees will be on April 21st. The
ing committee will serve as a nominating committee for
oard members. Staff will be assigned to all board
rs so that each board member will be individually
ed both before each board meeting and once between each
meeting.

C. LEAD COMMUNITIES PROJECT

A large part of CIJE's work will continue to focus on the lead communities. In 1994 the lead communities will, from CIJE's perspective, be seen as test sites where success and problems will be shared with an ever-widening circle of 'essential' communities.

The work of CIJE as an intermediary catalyst for systemic change in Milwaukee, Baltimore and Atlanta will focus on:

1. Four planning seminars with professional and lay leaders from all three communities to be held in March (Atlanta), May (Milwaukee), September (Baltimore) and at the G.A. in Denver in November. Each of these seminars will focus on a specific area of common implementation.
[Coordinator:GZD]

2. Strengthening the local lead community wall-to-wall coalitions by meeting with lay leaders, rabbis and educators in the community. The community mobilization process will continue to require assistance and trouble shooting. A clear goal for CIJE is to have a fully committed top level inner coalition of Federation exec.-Community champion - LC professional in each community.

3. Developing a process which would lead, by October 1994, to a written agreement between CIJE and each lead community. The exact chronology is still to be determined but a timetable for this joint learning process will be created which will oblige both the communities and the CIJE.

Action needed:

- a. Negotiated timeline towards written agreement with each community.
[3/94:ADH]

4. Moving each community towards a Personnel Action Plan based on the November 1993 training session in Montreal. Final dates for the completion of the action plan are to be set together with the community, including the funding implications.

Action needed:

- a. Individually negotiated written timetable for personnel action plan in each community
[2/15/94:GZD]
- b. ~~Lobbying~~ for funding of personnel action plan
[CIJE lay leadership]

Strategizing

5. Providing expert support and consultation for the implementation of the Personnel Action Plan. Examples are: in-service training programs for early childhood teachers, an Institute for day school and congregational school principals.

6. Working with key lay and professional leadership on the articulation of institutional and community goals (Goals Project). A July seminar on Goals in cooperation with the Mandel Institute will be an important milestone in this area.

Action needed:

- a. Develop plan for goals project after January consultation with Mandel Institute team
[3/94: Dan Pekarsky]

7. Provide guidance to the Monitoring, Evaluation and Feedback support project. By February 1994 all communities will have reports on the Professional Lives of Educators and Educators survey data-gathering will have been completed. The report on community mobilization for 1992-93 will also have been completed.

In January 1994 the first composite community personnel profile will be completed by Adam Gamoran and Ellen Goldring to be followed by Atlanta (date?) and then by Baltimore (date?).

In the light of the new intensive involvement in the communities by the CIJE core staff, the feedback function requires reevaluation. The MEF Advisory Committee will meet in Chicago in February 1994 (Profs. Coleman, Inbar, SHH, Fox, Gamoran, Alan Hoffmann and Annette Hochstein) to discuss this and other issues and to consider the Sept. 1994 - Aug. 1995 workplan for MEF.

For action:

- a. Proposal for MEF Advisory Committee
[2/6/94: AG]
- b. Discussion of plan at CIJE Steering Committee
[3/94: AG]

8. Develop Pilot Projects, or Action-before-the-Action-Plan in each community. These are personnel initiatives which communities will adopt before they have a fully articulated and supported local personnel action plan.

Amongst the options proposed are: planful recruiting of Jerusalem Fellows and Senior Educators; ongoing Leadership Institute for Principals; Basic Jewish literacy for early childhood professional; a seminar on goals in

Adam to redraft #7

mobilization report on Oct.

Israel. The communities have undertaken to inform CIJE by January 15th which of these pilot projects they wish to undertake. At that stage, CIJE will provide expert support both from its own staff and outside experts to build these projects.

D. COALITION OF ESSENTIAL COMMUNITIES

The mission the CIJE is to be a agent for systemic change for North American Jewish education. The working assumptions are that personnel development and community mobilization are key to systemic change. Lead communities are designed as test sites where both the notion of systemic change and the individual components of systemic reform can be developed.

CIJE is committed to sharing its work with the entire North American Jewish community in a way which will impact as early, as quickly, and as effectively as possible.

A new coalition of those communities who have made a major commitment to improving and investing in Jewish education at the local level will:

1. Be a vehicle for CIJE to share its experience and then assist a continually expanding universe of communities to implement those components which meet their needs. Just one example of this is the sequence which leads from Quantitative/Qualitative research on the entire personnel situation in a community through a policy report to a personnel action plan.
2. Mobilize increasing numbers of key lay leadership for Jewish education. *advocate*
3. Become a powerful ~~body~~ *advocate* in directing the training institutions and denominations to provide solutions to the educational needs of communities.
4. Mobilize for changing the funding priorities of the North American Jewish community.
5. Share in developments which may still be on the CIJE drawing boards. An example is the Goals seminar for lay leaders.

This coalition is likely to include many of those communities who initially applied to become Lead communities. Many have made remarkable achievements over this period without CIJE and the coalition will become a place for sharing amongst like-minded 'essential'

communities. Lead communities will automatically be members in the coalition.

A first meeting should take place in February or March with a small group of individuals responsible for Commissions of Jewish Continuity in key communities to explore the notion of the coalition. Staff: ADH with SHH's guidance.

E. BEST PRACTISES PROJECT

A plan for the development of Best Practises anthologies was presented by Dr. Barry Holtz to the Board in August 1993 (appendix 1).

A plan will be developed which relates to the use of the Best Practises materials for personnel and lay leadership development in 1994 and brought to the March Steering Committee.

Turn BP into pilot projects

Action needed:

- a. Plan for use of Best Practises in different contexts.
[3/94:BH]

F. CONTENT

1. **Goals:** The Commission deliberately evaded the issue of the goals of Jewish education. Over the past year in all the lead communities we have had requests for assistance in developing 'mission statements', 'visions', and 'visioning'(!).

In parallel the Mandel Institute in Jerusalem has, over the past 3 years, been engaged in a pathbreaking project which examines different conceptions of the Educated Jew and their implications for a conception of Jewish education. The project is now at the stage where these deliberations can have significant impact on the setting of institutional goals and community goals for Jewish education in North America. Community lay leadership on one hand and the

training institutions on the other need to begin to grapple with this issue in a planful way.

The Mandel Institute has agreed to provide help to CIJE in building this domain and Prof. Daniel Pekarsky will lead the project. After a January consultation in Israel, this will be the key topic of the February staff seminar in Cleveland and should lead to a seminar for selected lay leaders and professionals (lead communities/coalition?) in July.

Action needed:

- a. Develop a plan for the goals project
[3/94: DP]

2. Best Practises: See section E above.

G. RESEARCH

The formulation of a comprehensive agenda for research for North American Jewish education is one of the three major recommendations of the North American Commission. At the moment CIJE is not involved in any planful process leading to building the agenda for research, yet the MEF project is currently the largest research undertaking in Jewish education in North America.

As in several other spheres of the work of CIJE, our work in MEF in the lead communities is raising many generalizable questions which ultimately will become part of the continental agenda for research.

In order to develop a plan for building research and research capacity in this field, CIJE will have to consult with some of the best minds in educational research, sociology and sociology of knowledge. Such a consultation should take place in June and lead to a first cut plan in September. Adam Gamoran and ADH will plan that consultation.

H. CIJE PROFESSIONAL LEADERSHIP

ADH's successor will be identified during 1994, trained (if necessary) in 1995 with a period of overlap in the CIJE in 1996.

The national search will begin in April 1994 with a clearly articulated job description. Candidates should be identified between October-November 1994 and interviews take place at the end of 1994 with a view to announcing an appointment early in 1995.

Action needed:

- a. Search committee appointed and meets
[4/94:MLM]
- b. Job description developed [3/94: ADH]

I. COMMUNICATIONS AND DISSEMINATION

A brochure describing CIJE and intended for general distribution is presently being designed and will be completed at the end of February [Sandee Brawarsky].

In parallel a plan will be developed for telling the story of the CIJE in a wide variety of contexts ranging from key lay leadership through professional educators, rabbis, community professionals, the Jewish press, the non-Jewish press, Jewish journals etc. [Sandee]. This is in addition to the need to develop an internal communication program for the CIJE board referred to in A above.

CIJE will also have to decide at which regional and national Jewish forums - lay and professional - it wishes to appear and how much of our human resources to appropriate to this important but all-consuming area. An outline for 1994 will be proposed to the Steering Committee in March [BH]

The Lilly Foundation has proposed a high-level consultation between CIJE and leaders in American religious education during 1994 which Lilly will convene. We are currently awaiting a response from Lilly about the date.

- a. Plan for written communications
[3/1/94:SB]
- b. Plan for Jewish professional and lay forums
during 1994
[2/15/94: BH]

The 1995 workplan will flow from the work of the Steering Committee and its articulation of a multi-year strategic vision for the CIJE.

- a. Draft workplan [7/94:ADH]
- b. Second draft for Steering Committee [9/94:ADH]
- c. Final draft for October Board Meeting [ADH]

FROM: FAX NO. (216) 391 - 5430

Name Seymour Fox/A. Hockstein

Name Gina Levi

Company _____

Company _____

Street Address _____

Tele. No. () _____ Ext. _____

City

State

Zip

Country

5/11/2000

- a. How can the community best ensure that Jewish education is delivered by teachers who are not only motivated and committed but qualified and skilled in their subject matter and in education? This could be remedied in many ways: for instance, by recruiting high quality new teachers, and by implementing a coherent, sustained system of in-service education, for which teachers are compensated and rewarded.
- b. What in-service training can be developed, given local, regional, national and Israeli Jewish and general training resources, to ensure ongoing quality training for all teachers? How can such a system address the needs of the different groups of teachers?
- c. What career opportunities can be designed to ensure the retention and advancement of the best teachers in the field of Jewish education?
- d. If positions with increased responsibilities can be created (e.g., lead teachers), will this strategy serve not only to provide career opportunities, but also as a means of continuously upgrading Milwaukee's teaching force?
- e. What can be done to increase the number of full-time teachers in the various institutions?
- f. What salary and benefit policies and scales should be instituted -- differentially -- to be beneficial to the level of the teaching force and to individual teachers?

These and other questions emerge from the report and will assist the educators and community leaders of Milwaukee in their efforts to plan the future of Milwaukee's Jewish education system.

< CONFIRMATION REPORT >

[RECEIVE]

NO.	DATE	TIME	DESTINATION	F
29777	2-13	12:18	608 263 6448	

Annette
Milwaukee
Reports



[m

Received: by HUJIVMS (HUyMail-V61); Sat, 23 Oct 93 18:14:35 +0200

Date: Sat, 23 Oct 93 18:14 +0200

From: Automatic answer system <MAILER@HUJIVMS>

To: <ANNETTE@HUJIVMS>

Subject: Problems delivering a message

To: <GAMORAN@WISCSSC>

Cc: Alanhoff@hujivms

Subject: please forward to Ellen

Shavua Tov,

Thanks for your quick reply. Will arrange for the call when you let me know that it is time. The meetings are Really Very good. Steve Hoffman joined Thursday for discussion of relationship with lay leadership, Friday was mostly community mobilization. In other words we are doing what we hoped to do - and if it is challenging, it is at least for real.

I cc Alan on this correspondance and forgot to note so yesterday,

Best regards,

Annette

Received: by HUJIVMS via NJE (HUyMail-V61); Wed, 20 Oct 93 20:41:20 +0200
Date: Wed, 20 Oct 1993 13:36 CDT
From: <GAMORAN@WISCSSC>
Subject: message to Alan Hoffman and Annette Hochstein
To: annette@hujivms
Original_To: ALANHOF, ANNETTE
Original_cc: MANDEL, ELLEN, GAMORAN

October 20, 1993

To: Alan Hoffmann and Annette Hochstein
From: Adam Gamoran and Ellen Goldring

Re: procedures and composition of advisory committee

We are sending you three short proposals. The first is to set a policy for distributing MEF Updates to CIJE, the brief memos we prepare every month or so. The second concerns MEF Reports, e.g., on professional lives of educators, on mobilization, etc. The third proposal is about the composition of our advisory board.

Procedure for MEF Updates

1. Update memos are faxed to Ginny, for distribution to to Alan, Gail, Barry, and Annette. Alan will decide whether a given memo should receive wider distribution, e.g. to Dan Pekarsky, Steve Hoffman, etc., and will ask Ginny to distribute as appropriate.

2. As advisor for MEF, Annette provides ongoing feedback on the quality and content of update memos, as the need arises.

Procedure for MEF Reports

1. Field researchers discuss tentative findings (not written reports) with community members, i.e. Chaim, Ruth, Lauren.

Draft reports are provided to Annette and other members of our advisory group (Coleman, Fox, Inbar, and others to be added), with 2 weeks for response. Alan would also receive a report at this stage.

3. MEF team revises reports on the basis of comments, and provides reports to Chaim, Lauren, and Ruth, allowing 2 weeks for response.
4. Final revisions made on the basis of feedback from the Chaim, Lauren, and Ruth.
5. Release reports to the audience for which they are intended. This will vary, but generally it means CIJE and/or the communities. In some cases we may want to distribute reports beyond CIJE and the LC's. These decisions will be made on a case by case basis until we are ready to formulate a policy.

Composition of Advisory Board

At present, the advisory board consists of James Coleman (chair), Seymour Fox, Annette Hochstein, and Mike Inbar. We would like to add to this group Steve Hoffman, for his expertise in Jewish communal organization, and Sharon Feiman-Nemser, for her expertise on teachers and teacher education.

We will asking our advisory board for assistance of two sorts:

- (1) Read and provide comments on periodic reports -- approximately 9-12 per year, in batches of three.
- (2) Attend one meeting per year, probably in Chicago if Coleman is able to participate, and probably in February since that's when Annette and Seymour are coming to the US, to discuss general policy issues related to our project.

I have not yet approached either Steve or Sharon about this yet. Is it all right to call on Steve in this role? After interacting with him in August, I think he would be extremely helpful. We need someone knowledgeable on the inner workings of Jewish communities to help with our interpretations. This is our weakest area, and it has turned out to be the main subject of our monitoring so far.

What are the appropriate financial arrangements to offer to Sharon? An appropriate figure might be \$150 for each report on which she provides comments, plus \$500 and travel expenses for attending the meeting. This amount is included covered in our budget. Does CIJE have a policy on consulting fees?

What should I say to Steve? Could this be worked into whatever arrangement you already have with him?

Received: by HUJIVMS via NJE (HUyMail-V61); Wed, 20 Oct 93 18:49:12 +0200
Date: Wed, 20 Oct 1993 11:43 CDT
From: <GAMORAN@WISCSSC>
Subject: I'd be grateful if you could check to make sure Alan
received this
To: MANDEL@HUJIVMS
Original_To: MANDEL

From: GAMO::GAMORAN 19-OCT-1993 09:20:51.57
To: ALANHOF
CC: GAMORAN
Subj: oops

.st a quick note to apologize for the delay in getting you the October 6 update on Baltimore. This was my mistake, not Julie's. We delivered it by hand to Gail, but I was confused about who was sending it to Ginny and neglected to do so. By now I hope you have received it, as well as the Milwaukee and Atlanta updates from the same period.

I hope the updates are useful in your current deliberations. From our standpoint, the issues raised in the Baltimore update about what constitutes a Lead Community Project, and how the field researcher's role is defined with respect to a particular community endeavor, are especially pressing.

Received: by HUJIVMS via NJE (HUyMail-V61); Thu, 07 Oct 93 15:45:44
+0200

Date: Thu, 7 Oct 1993 08:47 CDT

From: <GAMORAN@WISCSSC>

Subject: mobilization reports

To: annette@hujivms

Original_To: ANNETTE

Original_cc: GAMORAN

Thanks very much for your letter on our mobilization/visions report. I appreciate the broader concerns you have raised, and will try to adhere to high standards. I guess the only additional point I'd raise is that we may need to grow towards high standards rather than

making it all in one leap. Thanks also for the excellent suggestions on our reports; we will take them into account.

Happy New Year,

Adam

Received: by HUJIVMS via NJE (HUyMail-V61); Wed, 06 Oct 93 23:03:39 +0200
Date: Wed, 6 Oct 1993 16:03 CDT
From: <GAMORAN@WISCSSC>
Subject: Atlanta search
To: ALANHOF@HUJIVMS
Original_To: ALANHOF

Alan,

I'm writing to tell you about our progress in the search for a field researcher for Atlanta. I think we have a serious candidate.

William Robinson is a Ph.D. candidate in Political Science and Anthropology at Rutgers, writing his dissertation on rabbinic authority in the progressive movement in Israel. He is interested in Jewish religious movements in the United States as well, and

sees the CIJE as an opportunity to pursue these interests. Although education is not central to his research, he speaks thoughtfully about Jewish education and recognizes its centrality for understanding the American Jewish community. He has five years' teaching experience in reform Jewish religious schools.

I have read the completed portion of his dissertation, which is entirely theoretical, and found it intelligent and lucid. His empirical work, which is not yet written up, is both qualitative and quantitative; the quantitative work centers on a survey he administered to about 150 congregants of progressive congregations in Israel. The survey instrument, which he created, appears reasonable, and although I would not call him a survey expert, I think he is competent enough to run surveys under supervision from Ellen and me. (He created both English and Hebrew versions of the instrument; I've only seen the English version.) Samples of pre-dissertation quantitative work he has sent indicate he would be capable of the straightforward analyses of data required by our project.

I spoke with his advisor, Myron (Mike) Aronoff, who attested to Robinson's positive qualities: Bright, a quick learner, a self-starter, creative, broadly trained, strong interest in modern Jewish life, and

solid knowledge of the institutional organization of Jewish communities.

The main advantage for our project is that Robinson is both interested in and knowledgeable about Jewish communities and institutions; not Atlanta specifically, of course, but communities in general. This would be a big plus for us, since as you'll recall one of our weaknesses last year was that the project turned out not to be about education, but about communities, yet our staff (especially Ellen and I) mainly know about education and not communities. While the balance of emphasis will presumably shift over time, community dynamics will undoubtedly be central to CIJE for some time to come, far more than I had originally anticipated. The down side is that Robinson is less knowledgeable about education; but he does have experience as a Jewish educator, and he knows about the place of education in the Jewish community.

As for the rest of our search, I believe we have searched Atlanta exhaustively, through our canvassing of all the local institutions of higher education. However, our search has probably not been exhaustive on a national level (we placed one ad in the Chronicle, which generated about 15 applications, including Robinson's), so if we decide not to hire Robinson, we should reopen the search nationally.

I am now sending materials to Robinson to help him better understand the CIJE, its mission, and the role of the Atlanta field researcher, including the survey responsibilities we envision. I want him to understand the job, and I want to make sure he recognizes the applied nature of the work. If I am satisfied on this point, and he is still interested, I would like to interview him, and I would like your permission to do so. I would fund the cost of the interview out of the "salaries" category in the MEF budget, which is under budget since we have only been paying two field researchers. I would try to schedule the interview for November 7, when the MEF team is scheduled to meet in Nashville to work on our reports on mobilization and visions. That way he would have an opportunity to interact with all members of the team. The candidate's ability to work in a team is an important quality for our staff.

Please let me know what you think, and also let me know if you'd like any additional information at this time.

Yours,

Adam

BMAIL>

Received: by HUJIVMS (HUyMail-V61); Tue, 05 Oct 93 14:28:29 +0200
Date: Tue, 5 Oct 93 14:16 +0200
Message-id: <05100093141621@HUJIVMS>
From: <MANDEL@HUJIVMS>
To: <GAMORAN@WISCSSC>
Cc: annette@hujivms
Subject: Re: call to Alan Hoffmann

Dear Adam,

I hope this finds you and your whole family well with your daughter fully recovered and the New Year starting happily.

Many thanks for your memo of September 15th. Before dealing with it directly I would like to refer to our last telephone conversation -- that which took place with you in the New World and me in Edinburgh. First let me thank you for your touring advice.

We followed it closely and were well-rewarded: Scotland was a wonderful discovery. In addition to Edinburgh, we spent a week in the Highlands -- in their most western part (Wester Ross), a wild and rugged country with only very sparse population and extraordinary landscape of lochs and glens. Found Edinburgh a most friendly and congenial city. Certainly can understand why you and your family would love the area. That's it for the ism report.

Some of the themes of our phone conversation have been with me since then. I believe we touched upon part of the key motivation and hope that led us to turn to you a couple of years ago and upon why we pin such important hopes in future joint work. Allow me to stay with this briefly:

Jewish education is a field in deep trouble. Probably for profound philo/socio/historico/psychological reasons, maybe also for simple ones (not abiding by minimal necessary conditions for succeeding).

A field whose low quality, weak content and poor reputation are

often deserved. At the same time, it is the only means available to deal with the question of meaningful Jewish continuity that faces us collectively. Our bet -- or rather the bet led by Seymour in this generation in North America and in Israel -- is that the greatness of Judaism, its intellectual, ethical, behavioral, communal, content aspects -- can be appropriately conveyed by educators if they are well-prepared, adequately trained, duly knowledgeable. You know the story.

For this bet to get a fair chance, the qualitative dimension of all our endeavors must not ever be compromised. As soon as it is -- if we ever allow ourselves to relate to the Jewish educational endeavor the way it is commonly related to -- as a poor relative that receives the leftover time, the remaining energy, the last thought -- we won't have tried and there is no reason to assume that matters will change for the better.

Why this sermon by a non-sermonizer and yet to the converted!
Because while we don't have the answers --
we don't claim to know what will work -- we

do believe that a careful, thoughtful, thorough approach to anything we try is a prerequisite to its minimal chance for success. But that is not the culture of the universe of Jewish education. Therefore, part of our work must involve turning around the notion that if it is Jewish education it
suffer less exacting efforts, less exact attempts. Our bet is that if endeavors (programs, people, ideas) stick by uncompromising standards, Jewish education may get a fair chance. At the very least it may be competitive.

That is why we need you and have turned to you. We are counting on you to raise the levels, the self-expectations, the demands of the CIJE's implementation work. And to change the terms of the deliberation on Jewish education. It is clear to us now that we need -- this project needs -- to get as much of your time as you can give. I am uncomfortable writing this in light of the salary you get. If increased salary can mean more of your time do know that we will grab it!

Now to your memo - let's consider some of the points you raise:

1. The topics outlined -- mobilization and visions -- are obviously fine. However I wonder if they do justice to all the work done. You guys have discovered important matters concerning the launch, matters that would be of importance and interest to the wider Community or to additional local communities. I mean matters as obvious as the need for the CIJE (or any such organization) to have a full time exec from the first day on; or as complex as understanding what it means to convey an idea and mobilize a community for it - or the whole complex of agenda setting between two levels (local-central). Your report on your meeting with Esther-Leah Ritz expressed some of that powerfully. (You may have intended to introduce it in the mobilization stuff anyway).

2. Wouldn't it be useful to indicate in this document too key findings from the reports on the lives of educators?

3. We have learned from you the importance of the issue of the restructuring of central educational services. This topic would probably be of importance for many in North America as numerous communities are dealing with - and doing - varieties of restructuring. Did you plan to include the topic? By the way the article that Walter Ackerman wrote for the commission on the structure of Jewish education in North America may be useful to you or this topic. Do you know it? If not you may want to ask Ginny for a copy.

Finally to logistical matters:

a. As regards the audience for the reports, ultimately they should be as you suggest. I assume that the mode to get there will be as we outlined on August 26th: a review of the draft by and response by Seymour, Mike Inbar, Jim Coleman, and myself. Alan should get a copy simultaneously with us. Following their response, copies should go to Mort, Esther-Leah Ritz and Chuck Ratner. We would then decide on dissemination - I assume as per your very

appropriate suggestion.

I look forward to your memo on the process of consultation and of course if there will be additional people to the advisory board they would be asked to read the draft too.

c. Let's have another try about what to do concerning Atlanta-in-the-report. Seymour and I failed to figure out how to explain this to Mort and to Hirshhorn. Maybe one of the researchers together with Ellen and you might write a report based on what you know and the work that Claire has left behind.

Well I guess that's it for today. Life at the Mandel Institute right now reflects the major changes with the CIJE workload: we are turning towards next parts of our agenda, with a major focus on senior personnel training and the recruitment of scholarly and professional talent to the field. It is ultimately here that we look forward to a very significant contribution by you.

Seymour and I will visit the U.S. in February. If there is any chance for you to be available for a consultation in Jerusalem prior to that, we would certainly welcome such an opportunity.

Mandel Institute headquarters have moved. We are now located at Hovevei Tzion Street #8 right next to the Jerusalem Theater; phone numbers are: 662832 and 662837 with the latter being also the direct fax to Seymour and myself. BITNET remains of course unchanged.

Take very good care.

Best regards,

Annette

P.S. I've asked Alan to share with you an excellent confidential

internal report by Gail Dorph, discussing her visits to the lead communities -- including meetings with the field researchers. It is for your eyes only (You may want to share it with Ellen. This is up to you).

PS2:regarding the educators' survey - if that is still an issue, I strongly recommend to go with the current questionnaire and learn about changes for the future. I would not delay distribution at all. Do you agree with this?

Annette

Received: by HUJIVMS via NJE (HUyMail-V61); Mon, 27 Sep 93 16:45:18 +0200
Date: Mon, 27 Sep 1993 09:40 CDT
From: <GAMORAN@WISCSSC>
Subject: this is a message for Alan Hoffmann
To: MANDEL@HUJIVMS
Original_To: ALANHOF
Original_cc: MANDEL, ELLEN, GAMORAN

Alan,

Sorry we haven't connected by phone. I'm not sure what you wanted to discuss -- perhaps you had some reactions to my memo of Sept. 15? I did want to get back to you on the advice you requested on the educators survey.

I have found no concrete reason to hold up the administration of the survey in Atlanta and Baltimore, and I urge you to allow it to proceed as planned. At this point, both Gail and Julie's concerns were that they were not sure what topics were covered, aside from a list of questions, and how the questions addressed the main issues of interest to CIJE (e.g., the areas in A Time to Act). In response, Ellen will be faxing them the outline of the report we are preparing for Milwaukee, with some analyses. In a conversation with Gail, Ellen found that this seemed to clear things up with her.

pendently of our inquiries, Gail had already asked Mark Gurvis for a memo on what the folks in Cleveland objected to. It may be just that some topics they're interested in were not covered; if so this will be interesting to us but no reason to pause our efforts now.

After using the survey in the three lead communities, we can revise it for wider dissemination.

Received: by HUJIVMS via NJE (HUyMail-V61); Tue, 26 Oct 93 15:37:49 +0200
Date: Tue, 26 Oct 1993 08:39 CDT
From: <GAMORAN@NISCSSC>
Subject: updates/reports
To: annette@hujivms
Original_To: ANNETTE
Original_cc: ALANHOF, ELLEN, GAMORAN

Thanks for the response to our memo on updates & reports. We'll learn as we go, as you say. It would be great if Steve could participate as part of his general involvement. Perhaps Alan should ask him on our behalf? Or do you want me to ask him? For the time being I will wait on this, and on the other potential addition.

By the way, did you have any advice for me on whether I should contact Lauren or someone in Atlanta to let them know we are interviewing a candidate? I asked this earlier (I may have asked Alan and not Annette).

Received: by HUJIVMS (HUyMail-V61); Sat, 23 Oct 93 23:12:07 +0200
Date: Sat, 23 Oct 93 23:12 +0200
Message-id: <23100093231207@HUJIVMS>
From: <ANNETTE@HUJIVMS>
To: mandel@hujivms

Received: by HUJIVMS (HUyMail-V61); Sat, 23 Oct 93 23:05:11 +0200
Date: Sat, 23 Oct 93 23:05 +0200
Message-id: <23100093230508@HUJIVMS>
From: <ANNETTE@HUJIVMS>
To: <GAMORAN@WISCSSC>
Cc: alanhof,
annette@hujivms
Subject: Re: message to Alan Hoffman and Annette Hochstein

Dear Ellen and Adam,
Read your suggested procedures for distribution of MEF
with interest.

1. As regards MEF updates your procedures should be
implemented as described.

2. The matter is far more complex as regards MEF reports.
Our discussions here have highlighted the extent to
which judicious dissemination policies could heighten
the impact of your work. They also pointed to the politics
of evaluation - and how cognizant we need to be of
the various roles evaluation could have or the uses it could
be put to. (how are these for generalities...).

In sum, I believe that we better learn this together,
that Alan, Annette and others on the advisory group
take ad hoc decisions with you on the first reports prior
to discussion with communities and that release policies
be decided upon at that time.

Alan will decide if he wants to involve Gail and Barry at
the initial decision level too.

3. As regards the composition of the advisory group - your suggestions seem fine. I'd like to clear them with Seymour and Mike before action is taken. As regards the financial arrangement the fees seem to me fine. Alan may know more about consulting fee policy. Steve would probably do this as part of his general involvement with us. The confidential nature of the drafts sent will need to be pointed out on each report.

That's it for today.

Adam could you please forward this to Ellen -- some of my machines are set up for easy access of other addresses - some are not.

Annette

cc. Alan Hoffmann

p.s. yes alan received your memo

Received: by HUJIVMS via NJE (HUyMail-V61); Wed, 20 Oct 93 20:41:20 +0200
Date: Wed, 20 Oct 1993 13:36 CDT
From: <GAMORAN@WISCSSC>
Subject: message to Alan Hoffman and Annette Hochstein
To: annette@hujivms
Original_To: ALANHOF, ANNETTE
Original_cc: MANDEL, ELLEN, GAMORAN

October 20, 1993

To: Alan Hoffmann and Annette Hochstein
From: Adam Gamoran and Ellen Goldring

Re: procedures and composition of advisory committee

We are sending you three short proposals. The first is to set a policy for distributing MEF Updates to CIJE, the brief memos we prepare every month or so. The second concerns MEF Reports, e.g., on professional lives of educators, on mobilization, etc. The third proposal is about the composition of our advisory board.

Procedure for MEF Updates

1. Update memos are faxed to Ginny, for distribution to Alan, Gail, Barry, and Annette. Alan will decide whether a given memo should receive wider distribution, e.g. to Dan Pekarsky, Steve Hoffman, etc., and will ask Ginny to distribute as appropriate.

2. As advisor for MEF, Annette provides ongoing feedback on the quality and content of update memos, as the need arises.

Procedure for MEF Reports

1. Field researchers discuss tentative findings (not written reports) with community members, i.e. Chaim, Ruth, Lauren.

Draft reports are provided to Annette and other members of our advisory group (Coleman, Fox, Inbar, and others to be added), with 2 weeks for response. Alan would also receive a report at this stage.

3. MEF team revises reports on the basis of comments, and provides reports to Chaim, Lauren, and Ruth, allowing 2 weeks for response.
4. Final revisions made on the basis of feedback from the Chaim, Lauren, and Ruth.
5. Release reports to the audience for which they are intended. This will vary, but generally it means CIJE and/or the communities. In some cases we may want to distribute reports beyond CIJE and the LC's. These decisions will be made on a case by case basis until we are ready to formulate a policy.

Composition of Advisory Board

At present, the advisory board consists of James Coleman (chair), Seymour Fox, Annette Hochstein, and Mike Inbar. We would like to add to this group Steve Hoffman, for his expertise in Jewish communal organization, and Sharon Feiman-Nemser, for her expertise on teachers and teacher education.

We will asking our advisory board for assistance of two sorts:

- (1) Read and provide comments on periodic reports -- approximately 9-12 per year, in batches of three.
- (2) Attend one meeting per year, probably in Chicago if Coleman is able to participate, and probably in February since that's when Annette and Seymour are coming to the US, to discuss general policy issues related to our project.

I have not yet approached either Steve or Sharon about this yet. Is it all right to call on Steve in this role? After interacting with him in August, I think he would be extremely helpful. We need someone knowledgeable on the inner workings of Jewish communities to help with our interpretations. This is our weakest area, and it has turned out to be the main subject of our monitoring so far.

What are the appropriate financial arrangements to offer to Sharon? An appropriate figure might be \$150 for each report on which she provides comments, plus \$500 and travel expenses for attending the meeting. This amount is included covered in our budget. Does CIJE have a policy on consulting fees?

What should I say to Steve? Could this be worked into whatever arrangement you already have with him?

*Where they
① Draw*

*at
from Aug Tomorrow
Send to Kere
with questions*

Topics addressed by the Educator Survey

1. Profiles of Teachers:

A. General Background-Who are the teachers in our community?

(Background section: Q 38-56)

For example: Gender, Jewish affiliation, ritual observance, income, etc.

B. Training: What is the educational background and training of the teachers in our community? To what extent are they formally trained?

(Q 57-60)

For example: What degrees do they hold? In what subjects? How many hold teaching certificates?

C. Previous Work Experience: What work experiences do our teachers have?

(Q6-11)

For example: How stable is our workforce? (Q9,10)

How experienced is our workforce? (Q11)

What socializing experiences do teachers have? Do most teachers have experience as youth group leaders and camp counselors?

(Q6)

**These sections can also be part of the discussion on careers.

D. Present Work Settings: What is the nature of our teachers work? (20-28, 33-35)

For example: How many schools do they teach in?

Are they full time or part time? Would they like to be full time?

Which benefits are available? Which do they receive?

Advantages and disadvantages of working in more than one school?

2. Careers in Jewish Education

A. Recruitment: How are teachers recruited and attracted?

(Q 1, 29, 32, 35, 37)

For example: Why did the teachers first become Jewish educators?

How did they find their positions?

What affected their decision to work at a particular school?

B. Retention: What are the teachers' future plans?

(Q2, 61)

3. Professional Development: What are the opportunities for teacher professional development?

(Q 12-19, 30)

For example: To what extent do teachers participate in different types of professional development activities?

What is their assessment of these activities?

What skills and knowledge would they like to develop further?

Who is providing help and support?

4. Sentiments About Work as a Jewish Educator: How do the teachers feel about their work?

(Q 3, 4, 5)

For example: What is their level of satisfaction?

Do they feel respected by others in their community?

Questions Milwaukee will be addressing:

The following issues pertain to Careers and will suggest implications regarding retention:

What is relationship between a teacher's perception that s/he has a career in Jewish Education (Q2) and:

Q 36 working full or part time

Q 56 importance of income from Jewish education

Q 33 benefits

Q 5 overall job satisfaction

Q 26 work setting

Q 8 having experience in general education

Q 61 future career plans

Q 22 hours of work

These analyses will address such questions as: Do teachers who perceive they have a career in Jewish education typically work in day schools? Are there supplementary school teachers that perceive they have a career in Jewish education? Is a teacher's perception of having a career related to the hours he/she works, having experience in general education, or being offered certain benefits?

What is the relationship between future career plans (Q61) and:

Q 26 setting

Q 36 working full or part time

What is the relationship between the importance of the income from Jewish education (Q56) and:

Q 36 working full time or part time

Q 26 setting

Q 33 benefits

Q 5 overall satisfaction

What is the relationship between receiving certain benefits (Q 33) and:

- Q 36 working full or part time
- Q 26 setting

What is the relationship between seniority at the present school (Q9) and:

- Q 5 overall satisfaction
- Q 2 perceptions of having a career
- Q 36 working full or part time

The following belongs to the section on Careers-Recruitment:

What is the relationship between having experience in general education (Q 8) and:

- Q 36 working full or part time
- Q 5 job satisfaction
- Q 26 setting
- Q 56 importance of income from Jewish education

Q What is the relationship between educational training (Q58 or Q 60) and:

- Q 2 perception of having a career
- Q 26 setting
- Q 36 working full time or part time

The following issues pertain to Settings:

What is the relationship between working in a particular setting (Q26) and:

- Q 22 hours of work
- Q 36 full/part time educator
- 5 overall satisfaction scale

The following analyses pertain to the Professional Development section of the report:

What is the relationship between seniority (Q 9)and:

- Q14 overall helpfulness of workshops
- Q 30 overall help and support received
- Q 16 areas desired for skill development
- Q 17 areas desired to increase knowledge

For instance: Are veteran teachers more likely than novice teachers to indicate that in-service opportunities were not helpful? Do the teachers' perceived needs of skill development and knowledge differ by teacher seniority?

What is the relationship between overall helpfulness of workshops (Q 14) and:

Q 26 setting

Q 58 or 60 educational training

For instance: Do day school, supplementary school and pre-school teachers view the adequacy of inservice differentially? Do teachers with higher levels of formal education view in-service differently than teachers with lower levels of formal education?

What is the relationship between level of help and support received and (Q30) and:

Q26 setting

Q 58 or 60 educational training

What is the relationship between holding a license in Jewish or general education (Q60) and:

Q 16 areas desired for skill development

Q 17 areas desired for increase knowledge

What is the relationship between setting (Q 26) and:

Q16 areas desired for skill development

Q17 areas desired for increase knowledge

Q12 whether or not in-service is required

CC: Adam Gamoran
Robertta Goodman
Julie Tammivaara

LEAD COMMUNITY OUTCOMES 1993-94

By July 31st 1994

By April 1, 1994

By January 1, 1994

- a. Wall-to-Wall Leadership Coalition (pro. and lay)
 - established in each LC with defined 'concentric rings' as discussed Jerusalem/Cleveland
- b. Calendar:
 - Fully fleshed-out operating calendar for each LC both 'within' and 'across' Joint action plan in place.
 - Fine-tuned calendar for 1994-5
 - Gross calendar 1995-6
- c. Mission
 - Local LC staff, Local Commission, Federation key pros., Federation leaders, rabbis and educators ALL understand the mission and role of CIJE. (Probably by several seminars in LC's)
 - "Enabling options"; "scope"; "systemic change".
- d. Staff
 - Core team developed for each LC from CIJE, local commission, federation, MEF - meets regularly.
 - Gail Dorph is 'project officer' to that team.

By July 31st 1994

By April 1, 1994 | By January 1, 1994

- e. Personnel
- MEF professional survey results in diagnostic profile of all personnel personnel needs leading to a multi-year plan for personnel devl.
 - Summer 1994: Summer Institute for targetted strategic personnel groups.
 - At least two Senior Educators or Jerusalem Fellows from each LC to be trained in 1994-5.
 - Projection of future pre-service needs and fleshed-out plan with training institutions.
 - Graduates of Senior Educators, JF and training institutions to fill key positions.
- e. Staff
- Ongoing monthly seminar in LC's with CIJE core staff, local pros.
- f. Lay Leadership
- Wall to wall commission in each LC in place
 - Seminar on Goals has taken place in each community for the local Commission and maybe for the wider educator/ Rabbi/ pro..community.
 - Development of a 'community 'champion' and hooking him/her into CIJE leadership ('Vaulting over' the local pros)
 - July seminar in Israel for LC lay leadership

By July 31, 1994 By April 1, 1994 By January 1, 1994

g. Pilot Projects

- One project at least underway in each LC and full completion of planning of additional projects for 1994-95
- CIJE consultants engaged for pilot projects
- Israel summer seminar for pilot projects
- System in place for networking between 3 LC's on pilot projects
- MEF in place on projects

h. MEF

- Educators survey completed and analyzed with detailed policy recommendations.
- Feedback loop designed and implemented in individual communities and feedback system created for CIJE core staff
- mid-year report presented and summative year-end report processed through staff, consultants, MI and CIJE lay subcommittee

i. Goals Project

- Seminar with CIJE staff so that they understand the project.
- Seminar in each lead community on "Goals" for local Commission

November 8, 1993

To: Annette
From: Adam and Ellen
CC: Alan
Re: agenda for Nov. 9 telecon

We are looking forward to tomorrow's teleconference. Here's the agenda that we worked out with Alan:

- (1) MEF work plan for 1993-94 (see July 1993 memo).
- (2) Schedule for data and policy papers.
- (3) Tentative agenda for Nov. 14 meeting in Milwaukee on MEF (see attached).
- (4) Advisory committee: scheduling a meeting in February. Time permitting, we will also discuss the composition and tasks of the advisory committee.

Post-It™ brand fax transmittal memo 7671 # of pages 2

To: Annette Hochstein	From: Adam Garmoran
Co. Mandel Institute	Co. Univ of Wisconsin
Dept.	Phone #
Fax # 608-265-2140	Fax # 608-265-2140

Very good meetings with MCM through Korbay
night + MCM & SHH.
Elaine Katz on Education in the
Survey - get.

CIJE Staff Meeting
Sunday Morning, Nov. 14 1993
9:00am - noon

Tentative Agenda

- I. Introduction and overview -- 30 minutes (Adam)
- II. Methods for MEF
 - A. The narrative method -- 5-10 minutes (Julie)
 - B. Surveys as a policy tool -- 5-10 minutes (Ellen)
- III. The feedback loop -- 5-10 minutes (Roberta)

We are allowing about one hour for presentation, during which we will address questions of clarification; questions of substance will be written on a flip chart and addressed subsequently. We expect that the presentations will stimulate many important questions, and we will have about 2 hours to discuss them. At the outset, we consider the following four questions to be critical:

(1) How do we reconcile our need to serve the communities, when our agendas are set by CIJE?

(2) What constitutes a Lead Community Project, and what determines whether a given project should be monitored and evaluated by the MEF team?

(3) How do we determine the boundaries of responsibility between MEF and implementation, with particular respect to the use of knowledge produced by MEF?

(4) What are our policies and procedures for disseminating MEF products (a) within CIJE; (b) within the communities; (c) beyond CIJE and the communities?

Special Topics as report

*Review
Adam for
Special Topics
Report*

Received: by HUJIVMS (HUyMail-V61); Sat, 23 Oct 93 17:54:17 +0200
Date: Sat, 23 Oct 93 17:54 +0200
Message-id: <23100093175415@HUJIVMS>
From: <ANNETTE@HUJIVMS>
To: Mandel@hujivms
Cc: ahof@hujivms

Received: by HUJIVMS (HUyMail-V61); Fri, 22 Oct 93 07:25:37 +0200
Date: Fri, 22 Oct 93 7:25 +0200
Message-id: <22100093072503@HUJIVMS>
From: <ANNETTE@HUJIVMS>
To: GOLDRIEB@VUCTRVAX
gamoran@wiscssc,
annette@hujivms
Subject: Re: (Annette, could you pass this on to Seymour also? Thanks.)

Dear Ellen and Adam,

We miss you dearly at the CIJE seminar, and I wanted to share with you some of what is being discussed and worked on - even as the seminar is going on.

The meetings began with a report on implementation by Gail. She framed the report in terms of 6 or
xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx

or major implementation questions such as:
"what is our role: facilitator, initiator, implementor"? "what is our place vis-a-vis the local community's strategic planning process?"
"let's re-visit our goals - now that we know more about the field".

These were presented as an outcome of real-life experience and heightened the sense that we are finally dealing with the implementation situation and its complexities - rather than having some foreplay. Her questions shaped the agenda - and we have been struggling for

two days now with our personnel and enabling options as they are being played out by real people and real communities. Most interesting is the fact that our assessment of the three communities is being shaken and altered. For example it is now felt that Atlanta holds most promises, while Milwaukee has serious professional and lay leadership weaknesses.

We dealt with the educators survey at very great length. Our feeling is that if used judiciously it could be a fantastic tool for community mobilization (placing several major issues such as minimum training or knowledge on the community agenda), for negotiation of improvements (e.g. working with specific groups of institutions at an in-service training program based on evidence concerning the their current personnel's weaknesses and the absence of in-service training) and -- mainly -- to guide the preparation of a comprehensive plan for the personnel of each community by their personnel committees - based on the findings.

It was felt that the policy orientation of analysis will provide a powerful tool for all of these. It was also felt that the critical policy questions we or rather you may want to focus on should perhaps be such that offer "self-evident" truths or highlight "self-evident educational truths" (e.g. judaics teachers having no judaics schooling can't teach judaics because we know that you better know something about what you teach... Same for pedagogic training, etc...). This would make a powerful tool for initiating the debate on change.

We were wondering whether this sort of thinking is helpful to you as you prepare the report? Whether you had in mind a report that would have such a strong policy focus or whether in fact this is a further translation of findings?

It also became clear in the discussions that the educators survey could afford multiple uses with multiple audiences, that we may want a whole spectrum of releases -- some of them being oral presentations, other being a variety of a executive summary to a main policy oriented to document to a complete analysis.

I've asked Mike Inbar to share some wisdom on this - he has helped me in the past with the rhetorical aspects of policy documents -- his field is argumentation. I was wondering whether you would be interested in a conference call with him on this topic -- whenever you are ready for it.

It will call one of you do report more fully on the meetings and on our discussions about the survey -- It is clear to us all that we must in the future avoid having such meetings without at least one of you present.

Hope you are doing well. Saw yesterday a bitnet come off the machine as I was leaving the office -- will respond as soon as I read it.

Best Regards,

Annette

Received: by HUJIVMS (HUyMail-V61); Sat, 23 Oct 93 17:57:57 +0200
Date: Sat, 23 Oct 93 17:57 +0200
Message-id: <23100093175757@HUJIVMS>
From: <ANNETTE@HUJIVMS>
To: mandel@hujivms
Cc: ahoff@hujivms
Subject: response from Adma-Ellen

Received: by HUJIVMS via NJE (HUyMail-V61); Fri, 22 Oct 93 19:41:19 +0200
Date: Fri, 22 Oct 1993 12:43 CDT
From: <GAMORAN@WISCSSC>
Subject: policy report
.o: annette@hujivms
Original_To: ANNETTE
Original_cc: ELLEN, ALANHOF, GAMORAN

Dear Annette,

Thanks very much for the update. The meetings sound very productive. We're glad to hear some optimism about Atlanta, although one of us (Adam) says he'll believe it when he sees it. Regarding Milwaukee, there is no doubt of the weaknesses. The question is whether CIJE will be able to nurture what the community has to offer, building on their energy but subtly shifting their ideas and processes towards more solid, substantive changes. If MEF can play a role by supplying information needed to shake things up -- both regarding personnel and on the issue of mobilization processes -- then we will be doing our job.

The sort of policy report you describe sounds like just what we have in mind. In the report, we will draw on both sources of data (interview and survey) to identify what we see are the most pressing problems and possibilities of personnel. The lack of prior training combined with haphazard inservice, evident in both data sources, is an excellent case in point. An example on the positive side is the stability of the teaching workforce in Milwaukee, which indicates that investments in current personnel (e.g. serious inservice) would have a chance to pay off. In our view, documenting and explaining this type of information is what a policy-oriented report can do. What we cannot do, however, is come up with a

list of specific proposals for addressing the problems. That will have to come from the implementation side of CIJE, and from the communities themselves.

We would be very pleased to discuss these plans in a conference call with you and Mike I. Let's wait until we have a more complete idea of the issues we'd like to address in the report. That would be the most fruitful time for the conversation.

We agree in principle that multiple releases of information are warranted. We will have to prioritize, and allow enough time for us to get the work done, but in principle we are willing to do the work.

We look forward to hearing more about the seminar from Gail.

Best,

Adam and Ellen

Memorandum

To: Adam Gamoran, Ellen Goldring, Roberta Goodman
From: Julie Tammivaara
Date: October 6, 1993
Subject: Lead Community Update: September, 1993

CIJE Lead Community Kick-Off: Phase One

Perhaps the most significant event since the last Baltimore update was the inaugural meeting of the Center for the Advancement of Jewish Education [CAJE], which occurred on 21 September 1993. The meeting was attended by some three dozen people, all members of the Commission on Jewish Education, and Dr. Peter Geffen who was present representing the CRB Foundation. This group is similar in membership to the previous Commission on Jewish Education; some additional members have been added. There are 29 members-at-large [including the chair and vice-chair of the LC committee], 12 delegates representing various agencies and councils, two ex-officio members, and four observers [including myself]. A half dozen professional staff of The Associated also attend. All [or, at least most] of the major federation donors are represented on the Commission including the Meyerhoff, Blaustein, Strauss, Hoffberger, Rosenbloom, and Genet [sp?] foundations, the latter being one directed by Genine Macks Fidler. Additional lay leaders include Samuel K. Himmelrich, Richard Manekin, and Louis Glick, among others. Agencies and Councils represented by delegates and include: Synagogue Council, Baltimore Jewish Council, Council on Jewish Day School Education, Jewish Community Center, Jewish Historical Society, Baltimore Hebrew University, and Jewish Family Services.

The purpose of the meeting was to inform members of the new structure. Opening remarks were given by the new chair, Mr. Alvin D. Katz, who succeeds Mr. LeRoy Hoffberger. Mr. Katz noted that CAJE is a response to the challenge of Baltimore being selected a lead community by the CIJE. [While the idea of restructuring preceded Baltimore's selection as a lead community, the emphasis on educational personnel, wide scope of programs, and evaluation of programs has been influenced by the CIJE. In addition, the inclusion of a Lead Community Committee is a response to the CIJE.] He noted Mr. David Hirschhorn's participation in this and commended him on behalf of the group. He further noted that the Center group would be the "decision-making body," charged with approving [or not] all of the Center's plans, recommendations, and initiatives. In addition, they would serve to oversee the work of the committees, which include: educational planning and service delivery, budget and grants review, financial resources development, and lead communities project. Each Center member is on at least one committee.

Lead Community Update: September, 1993 10/06/93

Page 2

Dr. Chaim Botwinick followed with a conceptual overview of the Center. Following his overview, co-chairs of each of the committees briefly outlined their responsibilities. They are as follows.

- **Educational Planning and Service Delivery:** Rabbi Joel Zaiman spoke of his sense of encouragement about the importance of Jewish education in Baltimore. He noted that it was finally being taken very seriously on a community-wide basis as evidenced by 1) the selection of an individual who was both an educator and a planner to head the Center, i.e., Dr. Chaim Botwinick; 2) the participation of Mr. LeRoy Hoffberger and Ms. Lee Hendler which ensures the efforts will be well funded, and, 3) the fact that the people on the committees and task forces represent the "best and brightest" from among Baltimore's Jewish population. This committee is expected to be the most labor intensive, according to Dr. Botwinick. They are responsible for prioritizing the recommendations put forward in the Strategic Plan for Jewish Education. Three task forces are under this committee's purview: Personnel, Educational Programs and Initiatives, and Special Populations. These three task forces and the Lead Community Committee will generate initiatives, which this committee will consider. Once validated, a proposal will go to the Financial Resource Development Committee for funding consideration. [I am not clear what happens next.]
- **Budget and Grants Review:** Mr. Harry Shapiro reported that this committee is mandated to coordinate and complete the budget hearing process. Members will be making site visits to schools and other institutions to which money is allocated. Requests for grants will be coordinated by this committee. They will develop and implement procedures for fiscal accountability. They will ensure implementation is consistent with the Center's purpose and policies. It is not the job of this committee to run programs but to make sure money is spent wisely.
- **Financial Resource Development:** Ms. Lee Hendler reported that she and LeRoy Hoffberger will chair the committee whose job is the most straightforward: to raise money. The Association has been funding Jewish education in Baltimore on borrowed funds. It is the job of this committee to develop the case for endowed funds to meet current unmet and undermet needs of Jewish education. They are committed to raising \$20 million from among members of the Commission and others. They will strongly encourage donors to give unrestricted funds. They will coordinate their work with that of the Budget and Grants Committee and the people who implement programs to ensure everything "makes sense." Besides the two co-chairs, there are eight members on this committee including a former president of The Association's board. All are major donors or representatives of major donors.
- **Lead Communities Project:** The CIJE is an integral part of the planning process in Baltimore as evidenced by the presence of this committee. In addition to serving on the Commission, Ilene Vogelstein, chair of the LC Committee serves on the Personnel Task Force and Gerine Fidler will serve on the Programs and

Lead Community Update: September, 1993 10/06/93

Page 3

Initiatives Task Force, so they are integrated into the important [for the LC project] committees. Ms. Fidler reported that her committee represents a wall-to-wall coalition of interests. She noted that the co-chairs had met with Alan and Gail and that Gail would be present at their first two meetings, the first of which will occur on 13 October 1993. She mentioned the educators survey and announced it would be conducted in October.

The organizational chart of the Center does not convey the interrelationships of the pieces of the Center. They will be intertwined in a fairly complicated way with Dr. Botwinick being the common thread running throughout. He is mandated to attend all meetings of all committees and task forces. Since this is a new structure, precisely how the relationships will develop is not known but will evolve. Questions arising from this meeting include:

Where will initiatives originate? Will it be possible for initiatives to arise from outside the structure, for example, within a congregation or a movement? If so, how will outsiders learn of this possibility and how can these initiatives be brought to the attention of the Center? To what extent and how will the committees and task forces articulate to produce program and personnel initiatives?

The Lead Communities Committee

The LC Committee has some 35 members at the moment and includes at least three major financial givers including one of the two co-chairs of the Financial Resources Development Committee. [I wish to note here that it is the custom in Baltimore for lay people who serve on such committees to preface their involvement with a significant donation, as did Mr. Hirschhorn when he participated as a member of the Commission on Jewish Education in North America.] The Committee represents a spectrum of people including educational directors [3], one congregational school teacher, rabbis [5], various agency people [CJES board, the JCC board president, Ner Israel, BHU, Etz Chaim, JFS board] and educators outside the circle of groups receiving money from The Associated, for example, a provost from Johns Hopkins University, the director of development from the University of Baltimore, Baltimore Jewish Council, Hadassah, and ZOA.

The next few months will be devoted to Committee and Task Force work. By February, each will have in hand proposals which will be considered by the Commission. Action on the proposals will occur by April and in May the budget recommendations will be made. The last meeting of the Commission for the current fiscal year will occur in June. It is clear Chaim, Ilene and Genine have worked to include a variety of constituencies in the Lead Community Committee. *What mechanism will ensure that those whom these members represent are kept current with the Committee's efforts? How will initiatives arise from this committee? Will it be possible for this committee to process initiatives arising from outside itself? How does this committee relate to the task forces, at least two of which deal with content areas relevant to the CIJE? How will Ilene and Genine's participation on these task forces be coordinated with their work on the committee?*

Lead Community Update: September, 1993 10/06/93

Page 4

The bulk of the free discussion following the formal presentations focused on evaluation of Jewish education. The issue was raised by Mr. Hoffberger and Mr. Hirschhorn joined him. He noted that the term "evaluation" did not appear on the organizational chart. Genine answered that evaluation was my [Julie's] job. Chaim noted that all the committees and task forces will be subject to evaluation. Mr. Hirschhorn noted that according to me, the CIJE was to assist in evaluation, not do all of it; every group has to build evaluation into their work. Marshall noted that evaluation was key to the concept of accountability and that no money would be given to an initiative that did not have an evaluation component. Evaluation plans must be connected with an initiative's goals and include monitoring of the project. Mr. Hoffberger responded that such might result in fragmentation; he argued that there should be some central evaluation effort that can take all the pieces and put them together. This is not the job of the Commission. Ms. Hendler pointed out that good evaluation is very expensive; it can take up to 50% of a projects resources. She noted the Commission may have to cut back on the number of initiatives to ensure proper evaluation is carried out. Mr. Samuel Himmelrich noted that the evaluators should not be the same as the implementers, but a third and relatively disinterested party. Marshall said this was a good point and one they should think about further. *Both the CIJE and Baltimore are interested in evaluation. To what extent does their interest overlap and where is it distinct?*

The Role of the MEF Project

The issue of the role of the MEF project is problematic for me. For example, one initiative I mentioned in a previous update is the *Machon L'Morim* program. This is an effort proposed by Chaim since Baltimore's becoming a lead community and funded by Lee Hendler's family [the Meyerhoff children]. It is specifically focused on personnel in that the project is funding the participation of teachers from the three major movements in day and afternoon schools. The goal of this program is to enhance the Judaic and leadership skills of educators by providing them with an opportunity to increase their pedagogical skills, broaden their knowledge of Judaica, and afford them an opportunity to mentor other educators. Lee has asked me to assist the project in designing the specifics of the evaluation. I have attended two meetings regarding this, one of the advisory board, which consists of the rabbis and educational directors of the day and afternoon schools involved; and one attended by Chaim, Lee, and Dr. Shulamith Elster, the program's director. Following the latter meeting, Chaim talked with Gail regarding my participation, and he understood her to say that I should not be further involved until she had a chance to review the proposal; Chaim has sent a copy to her, and she has promised to get back to him soon. This example raises again the issue our project has struggled so long over, that is, *what is a LC project and what is the mechanism to be named one? Who participates in naming a project a Lead Community Project? What is Alan and Gail's role in developing and/or naming a Lead Community Project? Can an institutional based or movement based initiative ever be considered "systemic"?*

Whatever the answers to these questions, I need direction as to how I can and should be involved in both CIJE [i.e., lead community projects] and non-CIJE [e.g., self-study type efforts] endeavors so I can more effectively interpret my role to the community.

red
highlighted

The Educators Survey

On 15 September she sent out letters to all educational directors explaining the educators survey and arranged to meet with each group: preschool directors, religious school directors, and day school directors. The following week she met with the latter two groups and distributed the surveys, while Rena Rotenberg, the early childhood specialist at the CJES met with the preschool directors. Chaim has been in communication with Ellen regarding the survey and has initiated the agreement process with the people in Nashville who will be doing the computer analyses. *Who will participate in determining what analyses will be carried out once frequencies are produced? Who in Baltimore will work with the author[s] of the report on the educators survey?*

What is Involvement?

In casual as well as formal conversations with Baltimoreans, there is a perception that most are not being kept current with the lead community process and project. In probing their understanding, however, I am discovering that their understanding is consistent with what is known by others, and they are being kept current. It is as if they think there must be more going on than there really is at this point. Others, for example, at least one rabbi, feel they are not being sufficiently included and heard. This raises the issue of representation. While rabbis, agencies, and so forth are represented on committees and task forces, what mechanisms need to be developed to ensure that the word is spread to those whom they represent?

On 23 September 1993 I met with Marci Dickman, Director of Educational Services of the Council on Jewish Educational Services [formerly the BJE]. She noted that the community at large is still untutored as to what the LC Project is; she recommends that information be more widely shared so that the ownership of the project is increased. *How and when will Baltimore move toward increasing the support for and ownership of Jewish education in their community?*

My current work

My interviews with educational directors and teachers ground to a halt during the holidays; I will be gearing up for more in the near future but am focusing on the mobilization and visions report at the present. Roberta may come to Baltimore later this month to assist me. Bonnie Moore, the transcriber in Nashville, is terrific. She works quickly and is becoming proficient at deciphering the Hebrew and Yiddish terms sprinkled throughout the interviews. She is a real find.

At the Commission meeting I introduced myself to one of my fellow observers, Dr. Howell Baum, who has been researching the planning process at The Associated for the last two years. He is a professor at the University of Maryland, College Park. His research project includes, as well, observing community planning in the Fells Point neighborhood of Baltimore, which includes the bulk of the Italian and Polish residents of Baltimore and is home to Barbara Mikulski one of the US senators from Maryland. At the meeting, I arranged to meet with him and subsequently spent several hours discussing the LC project with him. I think, perhaps, he will be a good colleague, in that his work can serve to triangulate with mine.

Alan - This is what we
University of Wisconsin—Madison
discovered
yesterday
F.Y.I.

MADISON, WISCONSIN 53706

DEPARTMENT OF SOCIOLOGY
SOCIAL SCIENCE BUILDING
1180 OBSERVATORY DRIVE

TO CALL WRITER DIRECT
PHONE (608) 263-4253

MEMORANDUM

September 15, 1993

To: Alan Hoffmann and Annette Hochstein
From: Adam, Ellen, Julie, and Roberta
Re: report on mobilization and visions, in progress

The MEF team is working on cumulative reports on mobilization and visions in the lead communities, for the period of September, 1992 through August, 1993. Although the primary audience for these reports is CUE staff, we assume that they will be shared with the local CUE project directors (i.e., Chaim, Ruth, and Lauren should see the reports about their own communities), and that selected portions of the report will probably have wider distribution.

A separate memo will describe the process of consultation with our advisory board in which we will engage prior to releasing the reports to any of these audiences.

Because of our staffing situation we are not sure we will have a report on Atlanta, but let's assume for the moment that we will.

The purpose of this memo is to describe the issues we are addressing, so that you may provide input at this stage. The reports will have three parts: Mobilization, Visions, and the relations between the two. We will also address the implications of these findings for systemic change.

The mobilization section will address questions such as:

- (a) To what extent has the lay leadership of the community been galvanized in support of Jewish education?
- (b) What lay leaders are actually participating in the lead community process? What is the extent of their participation -- e.g., how often do they meet, what do they know, are they really concerned about this or just showing up?
- (c) Besides lay leaders, what other leaders have been recruited? In particular, what about federation professionals, and educators?
- (d) What institutions, organizations, and movements have been drawn into the lead community process, or otherwise become involved in community mobilization for education?

(e) Considering these leaders and institutions, is there a wall-to-wall coalition in the community?

(f) What new financial resources have been mobilized for new initiatives in Jewish education?

(g) What is the interplay of lead-community and grass-roots action regarding educational innovation?

Throughout this first section, we will present information on people involved in the lead community project, on key events, and on process issues such as the extent of consensus, dealing with ambiguity, and so on. CIJE's role in the communities will be addressed, but we will not deal with the evolution of CIJE per se, except through its contact with the communities.

The section on visions will address the following:

(a) What is the content of visions expressed by community members?

(b) What is the process of "visioning"? Whose voices are being heard? At what level -- substantively and organizationally -- are discussions taking place?

(c) What are the links between community-wide visioning on the one hand, and articulation of goals for particular institutions and programs on the other?

(d) What is the relation between emerging visions in the communities and their "strategic planning" processes?

The final section will present the links between mobilization and visions, and we will conclude by presenting implications of our findings.

I look forward to any comments you may have on this outline.

הקבצים הר"מ נמחקו

תוצאה	דפים	פקס,מס,	אפשרויות שדור	סוג הקובץ	קובץ
מאושר	02	C.I.J.E. ISRAEL		שדור רגיל	099

.....(C) כל הזכויות לתרגום העברי שמורות לאלקטריס.....
מקרא לקודי שינוש:

- לא נוצר קשר למסוף המרוחה (4) איו תשובה (3) תפוס (2) ניתוק או שינוש בקשר (1)

Memorandum

To: Adam Gamoran, Ellen Goldring, Roberta Goodman
From: Julie Tammivaara
Date: August 17, 1993
Subject: Community Update, Baltimore, MD

The following is the regular monthly update for August, 1993. In it I will address the issues raised in the May 26 memorandum from Adam and Ellen to Annette, Seymour, and Shmuel as well as other issues. The items include:

- Mobilization
- CIJE-Lead Community Relationship
- The Educators' Survey
- Professional Lives of Educators Interviews

Due to annual vacations of some of the principals in this project, the following information is necessarily limited.

Mobilization. As you know, Baltimore has not yet officially "kicked off" the project on a community-wide basis and remains a reality amongst a fairly small group of people. There has been talk of a kick-off in the fall, but I am unaware of any particular date for this or of any specific plans. When Dr. Botwinick returns from his holiday, I will ask him of the status of this effort.

The Lead Community Project is an integral part of the Center for the Advancement of Jewish Education [CAJE]. A chair and vice-chair have been appointed by Mr. Alvin Katz, chairman of CAJE. Ilene Vogelstein, who is affiliated with a large Conservative synagogue, will serve as chair and Genene Fiddler, affiliated with a large Orthodox synagogue, will serve as vice-chair. Ms. Vogelstein is the immediate past president of the Board of Jewish Education [which has been renamed the Council on Jewish Education Services (CJES)]. She is a speech therapist with a small private practice and an adjunct professor at Towson State University. Dr. Chaim Botwinick, executive director of CAJE, is the professional member of the Lead Community Project team.

Ms. Vogelstein has informed me that 25 people will be selected serve on the Lead Community Project Committee. Efforts are being made to establish a politically broad-based committee as well as one that is strongly represented by educators. The team are recruiting people from all movement affiliations, people representing organizations both associated with the Council on Jewish Education Services [the former BJE] and not associated with them, Jewish persons in secular as well as Jewish educational settings, and people representing educational organizations across the life span. Ms. Vogelstein has informed me she expects this committee to be solidified by the end of August. She stressed that this committee is not a federation committee and that representatives from

Community Update, Baltimore, MD 08/17/93

Page 2

organizations not under the auspices of the federation would be selected, for example, Hadassah, B'nai Brith, ORT, etc. She does not want this to be a committee of the "usual federation crowd." The committee is also not primarily a lay committee, she stated. She is not sure whether teachers will be included although educational directors and rabbis are targeted at this point.

She sees as a principal function of this committee the implementation of exciting and important educational programs. She envisions the committee being able to implement innovative programs more quickly than would occur through regular federation channels. The committee will meet in September, and I have been placed on the mailing list and will attend.

CIJE-Community Relationship. Communication between the CIJE and the lead communities remains the number one challenge as far as people in Baltimore are concerned. No one is without ideas as to what the function of the CIJE should be or what the relationship should look like, but none I have talked to recently can articulate what either of these actually are. The consensus is that the relationship should be a partnership in which the community decides the direction[s] it wants to go and the CIJE provides the expertise to help them get there. This would entail representatives from the CIJE sitting in on brainstorming sessions as well as providing concrete assistance for implementation.

There is still a deep dissatisfaction with the Best Practices Project; participants agree that it is a good idea but state that the current document does not contain within it any implications for implementation. Beyond serving as a resource for expertise, the community would like to see CIJE help connect them to sources of funding that would not otherwise be available to them. There is agreement as well that the CIJE should not dictate activities, but assist in those the community feels would help them move toward their goals as specified in the Strategic Plan for Jewish Education and as agreed upon in future meetings of the Lead Community Project Committee.

All with whom I have talked recently believe there should be a specific and well understood system of communication so that ambiguities can be addressed. For example, even though there will be a lead community meeting involving participants from all three lead communities, the team from Israel, etc. in one week, many of the principals in Baltimore know little more than the dates. They do not know who else is coming, what the agenda is, etc., which is a frustration for them.

Educators' Survey. To my knowledge, information regarding the educators' survey has not been circulated. The educational directors and lay leaders with whom I have spoken recently are not aware of the survey, nor was Ms. Vogelstein. Since most educators are on a summer break, I am assuming this is the reason and that they will be brought up to date soon. I will be sharing this feedback memo with Dr. Botwinick when he returns. At that time I will have further information on this matter.

Professional Lives of Educators. On 16 July 1993 Dr. Chaim Botwinick and Alvin Katz sent a letter to 50 principals and educational directors of Jewish pre-schools, religious, and day schools introducing me to them as the Baltimore's CIJE field researcher [see attachment]. Dr. Botwinick provided me with the mailing list and from this list, I

asked Chaim to select twelve people he felt I should certainly interview. Using the double criteria of movement representation and those who were particularly knowledgeable, he did so. I randomly selected 15 more to raise the total to 27. By the end of August, most of these persons will have been interviewed at least once.

I am asking each educational director I interview to provide me with a roster of his or her teachers from which I will interview approximately 30 people. I will not be able to interview teachers from all the schools whose educational directors I have interviewed. Among the schools I will randomly choose, I hope to interview at least two teachers: one selected by the director, one selected by me. I will use the criteria of movement affiliation and type of school to select the sample of schools.

The interviews have proceeded well, but I have had to deal with some scheduling obstacles: people on holiday, at the CAJE conference in San Antonio, and a week-long course for Reform educators in late August. I have averaged two persons per day Monday through Thursday during the month of August. I am also picking up interviews for the mobilization and vision paper which involves lay leaders and other professionals as well as educators. Roberta Goodman will extend her stay in Baltimore 2 1/2 days to help me interview.

To conclude, among those who are aware of the CIJE-Baltimore Jewish community relationship are excited at the potential for enhancement of Jewish education in their city. Educational directors have been most accommodating in granting me interviews, indeed, they seem eager to share their ideas. Many people in Baltimore are frustrated that the reciprocal obligations of the partnership have not yet been delineated; others are frustrated at the slow progress of Baltimore's involvement in this endeavor.

CENTER FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF JEWISH EDUCATION



THE ASSOCIATED
JEWISH COMMUNITY FEDERATION OF BALTIMORE

FOR YOUR INFORMATION

July 16, 1993

ALVIN D. KATZ
Chairman
DR. CHAIM Y. BOTWINICK
Executive Director

Dear Principal/Director of Education:

As you know, Baltimore has been designated a lead community by the Council for Initiatives in Jewish Education (CIJE). As part of the relationship between Baltimore and the CIJE, a field researcher, Dr. Julie Tammivaara, has been assigned to our community. Her duties include interviewing people who participate in the field of Jewish education, observing meetings related to education, engaging in ongoing conversations with community members, providing feedback to interested parties and collecting and analyzing printed documents related to Baltimore's Jewish community.

Julie brings considerable experience and expertise to her position. She has worked with diverse cultural and ethnic communities with an eye toward discovering, documenting and understanding them. She has written accounts of these communities in order that they could learn about themselves and make more informed decisions about their own lives.

This summer, Julie will be assisting the Baltimore Jewish community by interviewing educators and educational directors of both day and congregational/communal religious schools. The interviews will focus on educators' stories as to how they became involved in service to the Jewish community, what they have learned since becoming involved, what rewards and challenges they face, with whom and how they relate to others professionally, and their visions and aspirations as Jewish educators. We hope this undertaking will positively strengthen our grasp of Jewish education as we work toward the enhancement of Jewish education in our community.

Julie will be contacting you in the near future to arrange an interview and discuss who, among your teaching staff, should also be interviewed. Your participation and the voices of your teachers are important, so we hope you will provide the time to work with her. The average interview lasts about one hour but she is willing to spend more time with you, should you desire.

On behalf of the Center for the Advancement of Jewish Education, we would like to express our sincere appreciation to you for taking the time out of your busy schedule to meet with Julie.

With best wishes for an enjoyable summer.

Alvin D. Katz

Alvin D. Katz
Chairman

Sincerely yours,

Chaim Y. Botwinick

Dr. Chaim Y. Botwinick
Executive Director

cc: Darrell D. Friedman
Nancy R. Kutler
Marshall S. Levin