



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
1961

CIJE correspondence, meetings, and Best Practices project. MEF
correspondence, reports, and planning documents,
1992-1994.

For more information on this collection, please see the finding aid on the
American Jewish Archives website.

CIJE STAFF MEETING

PROPOSED AGENDA

Time

- ① Workplan for personnel
- ② Launching the goals project
3. Workplan on community mobilizations
- ④ Monitoring, evaluation & feedback 1994/95
5. Summer 1994 in Jerusalem: goals and personnel seminars
6. G.A. and personnel funding

6. [Phone calls to ~~see~~ H.L.]

7. M.L.M. + C.J.F.

5. M.L.M. + E.D. ACHILTZ

CIJE STAFF MEETING

PROPOSED AGENDA

1. Workplan for personnel
2. Launching the goals project
3. Workplan on community mobilizations
4. Monitoring, evaluation & feedback 1994/95
5. Summer 1994 in Jerusalem: goals and personnel seminars
6. G.A. and personnel funding



January 28, 1993

GOALS FOR JEWISH EDUCATION IN LEAD COMMUNITIES

The Commission on Jewish Education in North America avoided dealing with the issue of goals for Jewish education in order to achieve consensus. However, it was clear that when the recommendations of the Commission would be acted upon, it would be impossible to avoid the issue of goals for Jewish education. Now that the work in Lead Communities is beginning, working on goals can no longer be delayed. This is so for several reasons: 1) It is difficult to introduce change without deciding what it is that one wants to achieve; 2) researchers such as Marshall Smith, Sara Lightfoot and David Cohen have effectively argued that impact in education is dependent on a clear vision of goals; 3) the evaluation project in Lead Communities cannot be successfully undertaken without clear articulation of goals.

In Lead Communities goals should be articulated for each of the institutions that are involved in education and for the community as a whole. At present there are very few cases where institutions or communities have undertaken a serious and systematic consideration of goals. It will be necessary to determine what is the state of affairs in the Lead Communities. There may be institutions (schools, JCCs) that have undertaken or completed a serious systematic consideration of their goals. It is important for us to learn from their experience and to check as to whether an attempt has been made to develop their curriculum and teaching methods in a manner that is coherent with their goals. In the case of those institutions where little has been done in this

area, it is crucial that the institutions be encouraged and helped to undertake a process that will lead them to the articulation of goals.

The CIJE should serve as catalyst in this area. It should serve as a broker between the institutions that are to begin such a process and the various resources that exist in the Jewish world. By resources we mean scholars, thinkers and institutions that have concerned themselves and developed expertise in this area. The institutions of higher Jewish learning in North America (Y.U., J.T.S.A. and H.U.C.), the Melton Centre at the Hebrew University and the Mandel Institute in Jerusalem have all been concerned and dealing with this matter. Furthermore, these institutions have been alerted to the fact that the institutions in Lead Communities will probably need to be assisted in this area. They have expressed an interest and a willingness to help.

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

and thus enrich the contribution that these institutions can make to this effort in Lead Communities.

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

1. Encourage the institutions in Lead Communities to consider the importance of undertaking a process that will lead them to an articulation of goals for their institutions.
2. Continue the work that has begun with the institutions of higher Jewish learning so that they will be prepared and ready to undertake consultation if and when they are turned to.
3. Offer seminars whose participants would include representatives from the various Lead Communities where the issues related to undertaking a program to develop goals would be discussed. At such seminars the institutions of higher Jewish learning and the Mandel Institute could offer their help and expertise.

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

MEF -- ADAM GAMORAN

1. Reports -- including Baltimore and Milwaukee Year One Reports
2. Policy-oriented report on personnel
3. 1994 Workplan *and Budget*
 - a. Assess work-to-date
 1. Monitoring
 2. Evaluation
 3. Feedback
 - b. Assess field researchers' outcomes
 - c. Review 1993/4 proposed workplan (document)
 - d. Design 1994 workplan including
 1. Desired outcomes
 2. Methods
 3. Staff -- researchers
 - e. *Budget*
4. MI Role in auditing and evaluating work

January 9, 1994

Dear Adam and Ellen,

I have read the report on Milwaukee (educators) with very great interest. It is a document that provides a great deal of material for thought and for decision. My sense is that your work will both provide the necessary fuel for addressing the personnel issues in an informed way and set a new standard for looking at personnel for Jewish education in North America. Thank you!

I thought it useful to relate to implications more than to the interpretation of the data, which we did in some way on the basis of the preliminary findings and on which others may choose to focus.

I read the document with the leadership of Milwaukee in mind and thought that we should mediate between your analysis and their policy-making needs. My recommendation would be to use variations on your last section (p.19ff. "facing the future") to create *two documents as follows*:

1. A two-tier document consisting of:
 - a. An executive summary (suggestion below) *cum* cover letter (Perhaps by Mort Mandel or E.L.Ritz in her capacity as chairperson of the evaluations committee?) with most powerful highlights + suggested next steps for Milwaukee + blessings and thanks to all involved - including the teachers who participated, the principals etc... but the target audience is the leadership.
 - b. An appendix with some of the data (your dramatic "11% qualified" drawing etc...) plus perhaps the questionnaire with straightforward statistics - simple response figures + your *whole report appended*.
2. A document *to be received upon request* including the data analysis + Roberta's document.

I have doubts as to the usefulness of distributing the latter two reports (data analysis + lives of educators) widely, but don't want to be suspected of censorship.

Since this is the first report of its kind, and one with great possibilities, we are urging you and Alan to get approval from Mort Mandel for the entire process as well as for deciding in whose name the cover letter goes.

What follows this letter are suggestions for a "cover document" or executive summary that could guide Milwaukee's discussions to your paper. If you decide to use the executive summary some figures I left out obviously need to be plugged in and the summary requires editing. I leave resolution of the title-inflation to others.

What do you think?

I am sending this simultaneously for comments to Alan and Gail as well as Mike. Seymour's remarks are incorporated. I would love for Steve to see this and comment too. (Alan could you please forward it to him). The key concerns now are as follows:

- a. are we making a credible and strong case for addressing the personnel issue?
- b. are we giving enough data and direction for the leadership to know what to do next? How do you (CIJE staff) feel about guiding or helping the process along based on these documents?
- c. what are the likely responses to the documents? (responses from the leadership and from the teachers). Will anyone be so hurt as to want to or be able to harm the process we seek -- decisions and plans to address the weaknesses?
- d. are we giving enough material and hope for the planning process to move along?

Assuming everything goes, I would like to recommend that some way be found to test this with E.L.Ritz, Dan Bader and the three leadership people (Ruth etc...) for comments *prior to any further steps*. Face-to-face would be best. This could produce a lot of input as regards likely responses.

If all of this works, assuming no more than minor changes, a presentations/release process should be devised *with the Community* (following MLM's approval) The forum for initial discussion of the findings should be decided upon. It would be very important for you people to be invited together with Alan and CIJE staff to do the initial presentations to leadership - together with the focus on a discussion/planning/decisions process.

Then a more formal publication can be prepared as well as a standard presentation kit (Mort asked for one) with 8-10 dramatically great slides and text. Hopefully the MEF team and CIJE staff will be the people introducing this to a wider audience in Milwaukee. (how does one address the subjects of the study? invite them to presentation/discussion?). However the kit itself should empower the Milwaukee leadership to carry the message and the discussion further.

All of this while time is of the essence...

This work is really an important step forward.

Warm regards to you all,

Annette

draft -- draft -- draft -- draft -- draft

**Council for Initiatives in Jewish Education
The Monitoring, Evaluation and Feedback Project**

***Findings of a Comprehensive Survey of
The Jewish Teaching Force of Milwaukee***

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY FOR THE LEADERSHIP OF MILWAUKEE -
THE LEAD COMMUNITIES PROJECT**

[the box on page 5 of your report "how was this report prepared?" should be inserted - with or without changes. Would it be useful to mention the advisory committee? It should be graphically separate from the text either by being on the inside of the cover page or otherwise.]

1. There are 185 (check figure) educators in Milwaukee, teaching in (number of schools and of teachers) day-schools, () supplementary schools and () early childhood programs (what about informal?). The Jewish teachers in Milwaukee are predominantly female (80%) and American born (89%). 45% of the educators affiliate with the Reform movement, while 24% are orthodox, 19% are conservative and 6% are traditional.

2. The survey reveals that these educators are a dedicated, committed and stable teaching force, devoted to Jewish education and Jewish youth. However the teachers in Milwaukee are overwhelmingly employed part-time, paid low wages without benefits such as pension or health plans, and have little if any options for career advancement in education. Most have insufficient preparation and knowledge in pedagogy or in Jewish subject matters. Very little in-service education is available to remedy this situation. Yet many are interested in pursuing teaching as a career and in teaching more than they do. The majority have been teaching for more than 6 years and plans to continue teaching.

There is potential within the existing teaching force if an investment is made in their development and in the terms of their employment.

3. Most educators in Milwaukee teach part-time. Half teach fewer than 10 hours while only 25% teach full-time. This is true for all settings. Only a third of the day-school teachers work full-time, and nearly a third there teach under 10 hours per week. Even in pre-schools only 46% are full-time, while in supplementary schools nearly 90% work between 1 and 10 hours per week.

This situation is undesirable. The professional demands that can be placed on very part-time people are far less than those to be placed on full time teachers. The involvement, professional development, networking and work conditions of a full time person can be expected to be far greater than those of a part-time one.

Milwaukee's leadership may want to consider ways to increase the proportion of full-time teachers in its community. This could be done many ways - for example by creating full-time positions consisting of work in several cooperating institutions; by developing new positions of lead-teachers who could train many of the existing teachers and induct beginners; by creating positions for curriculum developers, subject matter specialists, etc...

4. A corollary of this situation is that salaries and benefits are low, making the contribution of the educators to their households' income a very secondary, often insignificant matter. Only 19% of the teachers earn more than \$20,000 per year. 44% earn less than \$5000. No supplementary school teachers have pension plans and only 30% of full time teachers have. 13% of pre-school teachers have pension plans. 30% of the full-time teachers have health benefits. In all these areas pre-school teachers have consistently less good conditions than the others.

The issue of salaries - the relationship between conditions of employment and remunerations with the ability to attract qualified individuals to positions, should be carefully studied. Among teachers and principals there is a perception of a double problem: while the market for jobs in Milwaukee is limited, so is the pool of candidates. Yet when part-time teachers

were asked what possible incentives would encourage them to work full time in Jewish Education, benefits, salary and job-security/tenure were the most important incentives. At the same time there seems to be little initiative to develop full time attractive positions. For these and other reasons it will be difficult to recruit qualified educators from outside the community unless conditions are changed.

6. In one sense the teachers in Milwaukee are a well educated group. 85% have college degrees. However only under 11% of Milwaukee's Jewish teachers have received appropriate professional training in both education and Jewish content. Only % have cegrees in Jewish subject matters and only 40% in education.

54% of all teachers in Jewish schocls have had no or minimal formal Jewish education after Bar or Bat Mitzvah, and are doing very little by way of in-service training to remedy this situation.

It is not exaggerated to state that most teachers in Milwaukee are not adequately trained and hardly any are receiving the kind of in-service training that would make them well trained. Indeed outside the pre-schools few teachers appear to receive the kind of professional development that is considered adequate for teachers who are already professionally certified. Current levels of in-service training are not sufficient to remedy the background deficiencies. Aside from a twice-annual teachers conference, there essentially is no system of in-service training for day-school and supplementary-school teachers. As regards pre-schools the in-service training situation is better but it should be noted that one fifth of the teachers are not Jewish. (I am assuming that you will carefully edit all of this - some of it may be too tough).

7. 40% of the teachers have been teaching for more than 10 years and an additional 31% between 6 and 10 years, making this a very stable workforce. Yet for most teachers there are no opportunities for advancement.

8. These facts and figures concerning the Teachers of Milwaukee raise many issues for the community's leadership :

* Under the above circumstances what can be reasonably expected from Jewish education? (make the case again and strongly!)

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 by serious and appropriate in-service education.

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 tracks can be designed to ensure the advancement of the best and their retention in the teaching force?

d. How can such people (e.g. Lead Teachers) be used to continuously upgrade Milwaukee's teaching force?

d. 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 many other questions will be considered by Milwaukee's leadership in its effort to plan the future of its educational system.

ELR

①

Her idea of training institutions
The supplementary School as

Career tracks - very important
"The best kind of up as administration
of managerial, etc... responsibilities."

If true. Not treat gingerly.
Lay it on the line. This way.
Even more strongly. Maybe even
a way for spot sampling
elsewhere with carries through
& then lay it out as strongly as
possible. The profession has to
be changed. The preparation has
to be changed. And the standards
there are.

ELR / The Ed Map story. (2)
Education survey Get copy of Maye report Alan ~~Group~~
Crawford = chair. Int. data. Use as
baseline.
Once you know disaster is general.
Could become the basis for reform in
training.

Even more than in the Center
field - Mobility issue - limits interest
in broadening skills.

Multiple choice test to entrants
in senior (w. ed)

Start with as teaching (act)

5 YEAR OUTCOMES (FOR STUDY)

- UNIVERSAL IN-SERVICE TRAINING
- ALL PERSONNEL: RAISED STANDARDS
- ONGOING FLOW OF PEOPLE-IN-TRAINING
- LEADERSHIP INVOLVEMENT
- MATERIAL ASPECTS DEALT WITH:
 - SALARY SCALE
 - UNIVERSAL BENEFITS
- PROFESSIONAL LIFE:
 - FULL-TIME
 - NETWORKING
 - BEST PRACTICES
 - ISRAEL EXPERIENCE

ONE YEAR OUTCOMES

=====

- ⊙ EDUCATORS SURVEY COMPLETED
- ⊙ EDUCATORS SURVEY DISCUSSED
- ⊙ PLANNING COMMITTEE PREPARES ACTION PLAN
- ⊙ PERSONNEL SITUATION DISCUSSED IN COMMUNITY
- ⊙ 2-4 PEOPLE IN FULL-TIME TRAINING
- ⊙ IN-SERVICE PILOT PROJECT
- ⊙ ISRAEL SEMINAR
- ⊙ EDUCATORS INVOLVED
- ⊙ ETC...

PERSONNEL FOR LEAD COMMUNITIES

- 5 YEAR OUTCOME
- 1 YEAR OUTCOME
- MAPPING THE CURRENT SITUATION
- SETTING NORMS AND STANDARDS
- *Mapping* MAPPING RESOURCES
- CRITERIA : WHAT IS SUCCESS
- ACTION PLAN
- EVALUATION

3-7-78
- 3-1-
11-8-78
3-1-78

full-time teachers (p.3)? How widespread is the feeling among teachers that salaries are low because they are stuck in Milwaukee by their spouses' jobs (p.5)? If this is a common belief, why are the teachers so satisfied overall? If this is a small minority view, we need to say so. Are hourly wages really lower than they would be elsewhere? None of us have data on this, but Jane and Louise think the answer is no.

Both Louise and Jane felt we had mis-cast the benefits section. Currently it emphasizes the lack of benefits overall. Instead, it should emphasize the availability of benefits for full-time workers. They also felt the report needs to incorporate more clearly the recognition that the vast majority of supplementary school teachers are satisfied with part-time work.

Jane's major concern is that the report over-emphasizes formal training in Judaism, and ignores non-formal Jewish learning, such as home experiences, summer camps, synagogue adult programming, Israel experiences, etc. Judaica and Hebrew as instructional subjects are not like math, because formal education is not the only place one can obtain a solid background. In response, I will qualify the findings by saying that they mainly address formal Jewish education, and add

that we know that substantial proportions of teachers have been to Israel, many have summer camp backgrounds, and these informal experiences also contributed substantially to their Jewish training.

Despite these concerns about the report, all of us agreed that improving staff development in Judaic content is a high priority need. In general I'd say that Jane and Louise are very much with us in seeing the problems, recognizing the magnitude of the challenge, and being willing to confront it. As a tool for reform, they are concerned that the report should be absolutely credible -- no one should be able to dismiss it by identifying overstatements or errors. All of us recognized the tension between identifying serious deficiencies, but not being so negative as to lead people to say it's not worth it to invest.

I proposed to them -- and I believe this is in keeping with your thinking -- that the next version of the report will also be called a draft, and that they, together with CIJE, will plot a strategy for using it. If the use of the report requires further revision beforehand, we will do so.

Alan

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

BMAIL>

Unregistered | VT102 | 4800-N81 FDX | | | Online 00:01

2 GAMORAN@WISCSSC => ANNETTE@HUJIVMS; 25/01/94, 07:03:37; M GAMORAN.MAIL
EBCDIC (<GAMORAN@WISCSSC>)
MIME type: text/plain

Received: by HUJIVMS via NJE (HUyMail-V61); Tue, 25 Jan 94 07:03:37 +0200
Date: Mon, 24 Jan 1994 23:04 CDT
From: <GAMORAN@WISCSSC>
Subject: the reaction from Milwaukee
To: annette@hujivms
Original-To: ALHOFUS, ALANHOF, GAIL, BARRY, ELLEN, ANNETTE

Alan,

I had an excellent phone conversation today with Ruth, Jane, and Louise. They raised a number of important criticisms and concerns about the report, to which I hope we will respond in our revision.

MONITORING, EVALUATION, AND FEEDBACK IN LEAD COMMUNITIES: A THREE-YEAR OUTLINE

Adam Gamoran

University of Wisconsin, Madison

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, when the importance of Jewish education is recognized by the community 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 (CIE), is mobilizing to establish lead communities and to carry out the strategic plan.

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

This proposal describes a plan for monitoring, evaluation, and feedback in lead communities. It emphasizes two aspects of educational change in lead communities:

- (1) What is the *process* of change in lead communities? This question 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 in lead communities, the evaluation project will stimulate participants to think about their own visions and establish a standard by which changes can be measured in later years.

Field Research In Lead Communities

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

Suppose, despite the best-laid plans, Community X is unable to increase its professional teaching force. Learning from this experience would require knowledge of the points at which the innovation broke down.

Field researchers: A team of three full-time field researchers would be hired to carry out the field research in three lead communities. During the first year, the field researchers will be principally concerned with three questions:

- (a) 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? How vague or specific are these visions? How are the visions being translated into specific goals for schools, community centers, trips to Israel, etc.? To what extent do these visions and goals crystallize as programs are being planned?
- (b) What is the extent of *community mobilization* for Jewish education? Who is involved, and who is not? How broad is the coalition supporting the CJE'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?
- (c) 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?

The first question is essential for establishing that specific goals exist for improving Jewish education, and for uncovering what these goals are. The second and third questions concern the "enabling options" described in *A Time to Act*, the areas of improvement which are essential to

the success of lead communities: mobilizing community support, and building a profession of Jewish education.

Field researchers will address these questions in the following way:

1. Supplement community self-studies with additional quantitative data, as determined following a review of the self-studies in all of the lead communities. For example, what are the educational backgrounds of Jewish teachers? How much turnover exists among educators in the community?
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, broadly conceived.
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. An important contribution to the report would be to discuss the operative goals of programs in the lead community. The report would also assess progress toward the Commission's goals, and would speak frankly about barriers to implementing the plans of the local commission. In this way, the report would serve as formative evaluation for the community and the CDE.
6. Replicate the initial data collection a year later, and continue monitoring progress toward the commission plan.
7. 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 report would include the following:
 - (a) Description of the goals that have been decided upon.

This will include cognitive goals such as desired achievements in subject matter areas (e.g., Jewish history, Bible, Hebrew). Where appropriate, it will describe and attempt to measure attitudinal and behavioural goals (e.g., measures of Jewish identity, involvement in synagogue life, attitudes to Israel and to Jews throughout the world).

Every effort will be made to discover goals for a community as a whole. They will range from quantitative goals (e.g., participation rates in post-bar/bat-mitzvah education, family involvement in family education programs), as well as elements that will be agreed upon by the community-at-large (e.g., involvement in the destiny of the State

of Israel and of Jews throughout the world, increased religious observances [according to specific denominational interpretations], changing the climate of the community concerning Jewish education, increased rates of involvement in community affairs).

- (b) Monitor initial steps taken toward reaching these goals.
- (c) Qualitative assessment of program implementation.
- (d) Tabulation of changes in rates of participation in Jewish education, which may be associated with new programs.
- (e) The resources of the Mandel Institute-Harvard University Program of Scholarly Collaboration and its project on alternative conceptions of the educated Jew will be made available by the CJE to those working on the goals aspect 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 CJE are collecting existing examples of schools and other educational institutions in Jewish and general education, that have undertaken thoughtful definitions of their goals.

It may be possible to compare changes in rates of participation to changes that do or do not occur in other North American Jewish communities. For example, suppose the lead communities show increases in rates of supplementary school attendance after Bar Mitzvah. Did these rates change in other communities during the same period? If not, one may have greater confidence in the impact of the efforts of the lead communities. (Even so, it is important to remember that the impact of the programs in lead communities cannot be disentangled from the overall impact of lead communities by this method. Thus, we must be cautious in our generalizations about the effects of the programs.)

The reports would serve as both formative and summative evaluation for the local commissions and the CJE. In other words, they would not only encourage improvement in ongoing programs, but would also inform decisions about whether programs should be maintained or discontinued.

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 led by Prof. Pekarsky.

Collection of achievement and attitudinal data: Although specific goals for education in lead communities will now be developed, it is essential to make the best possible effort to collect rudimentary quantitative data to use as a baseline upon which to build. As an example, we might administer a Hebrew test to seventh graders in all educational institutions in the community. Seventh grade would be chosen because it is the grade that probably captures the widest participation of students who study Hebrew. The test would need to be highly inclusive, covering, for example, biblical, prayerbook, and conversational Hebrew. It may not be restricted to multiple-choice answers, in order to allow respondents to demonstrate capacity to use Hebrew as a language. The test would be accompanied by a limited survey questionnaire of perhaps twelve items, which would gauge students' attitudes and participation levels. Similar efforts will be undertaken to discover appropriate achievement tests wherever they may exist. First efforts will be undertaken to encourage teams of educators to develop additional achievement tests. This data collection effort would be led by a survey researcher, with assistance from the field researchers, from community members who would be hired to help administer the surveys and from specialists who would score the tests.

Mike
OLD *version*
super
Dear Adam and Ellen,

I have read the report on Milwaukee (educators) with very great interest. It is a document that provides a great deal of material for thought and for decision. My sense is that your work will both provide the necessary fuel for addressing the personnel issues in an informed way and set a new standard for looking at personnel for Jewish education in North America. Thank you!

I thought it useful to relate to implications more than to the interpretation of the data, which we did in some way on the basis of the preliminary findings and on which others may choose to focus.

I read the document with the leadership of Milwaukee in mind and thought that we should mediate between your analysis and their policy-making needs. My recommendation would be to use variations on your last section (p.19ff. "facing the future") to create two documents as follows:

1. A two-tier document consisting of:
 - a. An executive summary (suggestion below) cum cover letter (Perhaps by E.L.Ritz in her capacity as chairperson of the evaluations committee? or by Adam/Ellen or by Alan?) with most powerful highlights + suggested next steps for Milwaukee + blessings and thanks to all involved - including the teachers who participated, the principals etc... but the target is on leadership.
 - b. An appendix with some of the data (your dramatic "11% qualified" drawing etc...) plus perhaps the questionnaire with straightforward statistics - simple response figures.
or (alternative) your whole report appended.
2. A document to be received upon request including your full report + the data analysis + Roberta's document. If your report is incorporated in the first document don't repeat it here.

I have doubts as to the usefulness of distributing the latter two reports (data analysis + lives of educators) widely, but don't want to be suspected of censorship.

What follows this letter are suggestions for a "cover document" or executive summary that could guide Milwaukee's discussions + some comments to your paper. If you decide to use the executive summary some data obviously needs to be plugged in and it must be just as obviously be edited by a pro. I leave resolution of the title-inflation to others.

What do you think?

I am sending this simultaneously for comments to Alan and Gail as well as to Seymour and Mike - I would love for Steve to see this

and comment too. (Alan could you please forward it to him). The key concerns now are as follows:

a. are we making a credible and strong case for addressing the personnel issue?

b. are we giving enough data and direction for the leadership to know what to do next? How do you (CIJE staff) feel about guiding or helping the process along based on these documents?

c. what are the likely responses to the documents? (responses from the leadership and from the teachers). Will anyone be so hurt as to want to or be able to harm the process we seek -- decisions and plans to address the weaknesses?

d. are we giving enough material and hope for the planning process to move along?

e. worst case scenarios?

f. best case scenarios?

Assuming everything goes, I would like to recommend that this be tested with E.L.Ritz, Dan Bader and the three leadership people (Ruth etc...) for comments *prior to any further steps*. Face-to-face would be best. This could produce a lot of input as regards likely responses.

If all of this works, assuming no more than minor changes, a presentations/release process should be devised *with the Community*. The forum for initial discussion of the findings should be decided upon. It would be very important for you people to be invited to do the initial presentations to leadership - together with the focus on a discussion/planning/decisions process.

Then a more formal publication can be prepared as well as a standard presentation kit (Mort asked for one) with 8-10 dramatically great slides and text. Hopefully the MEF team and CIJE staff will be the people introducing this to a wider audience in Milwaukee. (how does one address the subjects of the study? invite them to presentation/discussion?). However the kit itself should empower the Milwaukee leadership to carry the message and the discussion further.

All of this while time is of the essence...

This work is really an important step forward.

Warm regards to you all,

Annette

Michaelson has added
the following strongly endorsed in suggested see
draft -- draft -- draft -- draft -- draft by
Simon
but
added
the day

Council for Initiatives in Jewish Education
The Monitoring, Evaluation and Feedback Project

Findings of a Comprehensive Survey of
The Jewish Teaching Force of Milwaukee

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY FOR THE LEADERSHIP OF MILWAUKEE -
THE LEAD COMMUNITIES PROJECT

[the box on page 5 of your report "how was this report prepared?" should be inserted - with or without changes. It should be graphically separate from the text either by being on the inside of the cover page or otherwise.]

1. There are 185 (check figure) educators in Milwaukee, teaching in (number of schools and of teachers) day-schools, () supplementary schools and () early childhood programs (what about informal?). The Jewish teachers in Milwaukee are predominantly female (80%) and American born (89%). 45% of the educators affiliate with the Reform movement, while 24% are orthodox, 19% are conservative and 6% are traditional.

2. The survey reveals that these educators are a dedicated, committed and stable teaching force, devoted to Jewish education and Jewish youth. However the teachers in Milwaukee are overwhelmingly employed part-time, paid low wages without benefits such as pension or health plans, and have little if any options for career advancement in education. Most have insufficient preparation and knowledge in pedagogy or Jewish subject matters and very little in-service training is available to remedy this situation. Yet many are interested in pursuing teaching as a career and in teaching more than they do. The majority have been teaching for more than 6 years and plans to continue teaching.

There is potential within the existing teaching force and appropriate policies could be developed to address the shortage of qualified educators in Milwaukee's Jewish schools. However without appropriate knowledge

and qualifications the teachers - however well motivated will not be able to teach and inspire the children and youth of Milwaukee.

Mike As noted above

3. Most educators in Milwaukee teach part-time. Half teach fewer than 10 hours while only 25% teach full-time. This is true for all settings. Only a third of the day-school teachers work full-time, and nearly a third there teach under 10 hours per week. Even in pre-schools only 46% are full-time, while in supplementary schools nearly 90% work between 1 and 10 hours per week.

This situation is obviously undesirable for many reasons. The professional demands that can be placed on very part-time people are far less than those to be placed on full time teachers. The involvement, professional development, networking and work conditions of a full time person can be expected to be far greater than those of a part-time one.

improves
Milwaukee's leadership may want to consider ways to increase the proportion of full-time teachers in its community. This could be done many ways - for example by creating full-time positions consisting of work in several cooperating institutions, by developing new positions of lead-teachers, of master-teachers who train novices, subject matter experts and more *have*

M: 4
(existing) (- as indicated -)
4. A corollary of this situation is that salaries and benefits are low, making the contribution of the educators to their households' income a very secondary, often insignificant matter. Only 19% of the teachers earn more than \$20,000 per year. 44% earn less than \$5000. No supplementary school teachers have pension plans and only 30% of full time teachers have. 13% of pre-school teachers have pension plans. 30% of the full-time teachers have health benefits. In all these areas pre-school teachers have consistently less good conditions than the others.

The issue of salaries - the relationship between conditions of employment and remunerations with the

ability to attract qualified individuals to positions, should be carefully studied. Among teachers and principals there is a perception of a double problem: while the market for jobs in Milwaukee is limited, so is the pool of candidates. Yet when part-time teachers were asked what possible incentives would encourage them to work full time in Jewish Education, benefits, salary and job-security/tenure were the most important incentives. Yet there seems to be little initiative to develop good positions. On the other hand the search for qualified candidates outside the community is limited - but under the present conditions it would not be likely to succeed. The salary/benefit situation seems to encourage stagnation in these areas.

76. *6. The teachers in Milwaukee are a well educated group generally. 85% have college degrees. However Just under 11% of Milwaukee Jewish teachers are well trained, having professional training in both education and Jewish content. Only % have degrees in Jewish subject matters and only 40% in education.*

54% of all teachers in Jewish schools have had no or minimal formal Jewish education after Bar or Bat Mitzvah, and are doing very little by way of in-service training to remedy this situation.

It is not exaggerated to state that most teachers in Milwaukee are not adequately trained and hardly any are receiving the kind of in-service training that would make them well trained. Indeed outside the pre-schools few teachers appear to receive the kind of professional development that is considered adequate for teachers who are already professionally certified. Current levels of in-service training are not sufficient to remedy the background deficiencies. Aside from a twice-annual teachers conference, there essentially is no system of in-service training for day-school and supplementary-school teachers. As regards pre-schools the in-service training situation is better but it should be noted that one fifth of the teachers are not Jewish.

7. 40% of the teachers have been teaching for more

than 10 years and an additional 31% between 6 and 10 years, making this a very stable workforce. Yet for most teachers there are no opportunities for advancement.

M1 *This provides an excellent basis to build upon. One way to take advantage of this*
8. These facts and figures concerning the Teachers of Milwaukee raise many issues for the community's leadership : *IS by developing opportunities for advancement*

* Under the above circumstances what can be reasonably expected from Jewish education? (make the case again and strongly!)

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?

b. what in-service training can be developed given regional 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 tracks can be designed to ensure the advancement of the best and their retention in the teaching force?

d. what can be done to increase the number of full-time teachers in the various institutions?'

e. what can be done to raise the knowledge and skills of many part-time teachers who are dedicated and intend to remain in their profession?

f. what salary and benefit policies and scales should be instituted to be beneficial to the level of the teaching force?

These and many other questions will be considered by Milwaukee's leadership in its effort to plan the future of its educational system.

January 28, 1993

GOALS FOR JEWISH EDUCATION IN LEAD COMMUNITIES

FOR
INTERNAL
USE ONLY

The Commission on Jewish Education in North America avoided dealing with the issue of goals for Jewish education in order to achieve consensus. However, it was clear that when the recommendations of the Commission would be acted upon, it would be impossible to avoid the issue of goals for Jewish education. Now that the work in Lead Communities is beginning, working on goals can no longer be delayed. This is so for several reasons: 1) It is difficult to introduce change without deciding what it is that one wants to achieve; 2) researchers such as Marshall Smith, Sara Lightfoot and David Cohen have effectively argued that impact in education is dependent on a clear vision of goals; 3) the evaluation project in Lead Communities cannot be successfully undertaken without clear articulation of goals.

— To
JB4
doc.

In Lead Communities goals should be articulated for each of the institutions that are involved in education and for the community as a whole. At present there are very few cases where institutions or communities have undertaken a serious and systematic consideration of goals. (It will be necessary to determine what is the state of affairs in the Lead Communities.) There may be institutions (schools, JCCs) that have undertaken or completed a serious systematic consideration of their goals. (It is important for us to learn from their experience and to check as to whether an attempt has been made to develop their curriculum and teaching methods in a manner that is coherent with their goals.) In the case of those institutions where little has been done in this

more

more

area, it is crucial that the institutions be encouraged and helped to undertake a process that will lead them to the articulation of goals.

The CIJE should serve as catalyst in this area. It should serve as a broker between the institutions that are to begin such a process and the various resources that exist in the Jewish world. By resources we mean scholars, thinkers and institutions that have concerned themselves and developed expertise in this area. The institutions of higher Jewish learning in North America (Y.U., J.T.S.A. and H.U.C.), the Melton Centre at the Hebrew University and the Mandel Institute in Jerusalem have all been concerned and dealing with this matter. Furthermore, these institutions have been alerted to the fact that the institutions in Lead Communities will probably need to be assisted in this area. They have expressed an interest and a willingness to help.

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

and thus enrich the contribution that these institutions can make to this effort in Lead Communities.

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

1. Encourage the institutions in Lead Communities to consider the importance of undertaking a process that will lead them to an articulation of goals for their institutions.
2. Continue the work that has begun with the institutions of higher Jewish learning so that they will be prepared and ready to undertake consultation if and when they are turned to.
3. Offer seminars whose participants would include representatives from the various Lead Communities where the issues related to undertaking a program to develop goals would be discussed. At such seminars the institutions of higher Jewish learning and the Mandel Institute could offer their help and expertise.

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

Do

MEMO: 23/1/94
TO: SEYMOUR FOX
FROM: DANIEL MAROM
RE: REPORT ON MEETINGS WITH PROFESSOR DANNY PEKARSKY
ON THE CIJE'S GOALS PROJECT

Dear Seymour:

The following is a report on the meetings we held with Professor Danny Pekarisky on the Goals Project. These meetings were convened at the Institute in the period between Wednesday, January 12 and Sunday, January 16. You, Shmuel, Danny and I met for over twenty hours during this period in order to assist Danny and the CIJE in considering various aspects in the planning and implementation of the Goals Project in Lead Communities ("LC's").

The deliberations were focused in four major areas:

1) Establishing a common understanding of the theoretical basis of the Goals Project:

We began the deliberations by attempting to arrive at a common formulation of the theoretical basis of the Goals Project. The reasoning here was that discrepancies in this understanding would keep us from moving into a detailed discussion of possibilities for implementation. As it turned out, though each of us had studied the documents and written communications which summarize and refine the theory of the Goals Project, there was still much room for "setting the ground rules straight." Indeed, it took almost half of our meeting time to ensure an appropriate level of common understanding.

The following are major points which emerged from this effort:

- a) The central thesis of the Goals Project is that effective education derives from an ongoing attempt to implement a profound and informed philosophical vision of the desired aims or ends of the educational process.
- b) This thesis has two aspects. On the one hand, there is a technical aspect. The thesis assumes that educational aims which are the product of thorough philosophical inquiry and which are clearly and distinctly formulated will guide those who must implement them more effectively. Such aims will focus educators' creative energies and provide them with a criteria by which to evaluate the success of their activities. On the other hand is an organizational aspect. The assumption here is that by developing consensus and mobilizing the efforts of various players within an educational institution around a common vision, one can develop in that institution an atmosphere or culture whose impact will be that of a whole which is greater than its parts. In such an environment, the educational message will have a chance to engage students in multiple modes and contexts and will thereby have a greater capacity for impact.

c) Ideally, progressing from the formulation of a philosophical vision to its actual implementation would happen in a number of stages. Stage #1 would be to develop the philosophical vision of the desired ends of education. Stage #2 would be to "translate" this philosophical vision into an actual description of an educational institution at work. Stage #3 would be to derive operative principles, guidelines, or goals from this description. Stage #4 would be to design educational programs which attempt to achieve these goals and to train staff to work with them accordingly. Stage # 5 would be to actually implement these programs. This would be followed by an evaluation of the implementation. This evaluation would seek out ways of improving practice by locating difficulties and errors at any one of the above stages. This development would then be transformed into an ongoing attempt at implementing the vision or refining its formulation.

d) Since what should emerge from this ideal is an ongoing process, the task of setting the ideal into motion can begin at any one of the above stages. Where to set up or enter this process is a matter for deliberation in relation to the specific resources, players, and circumstances who are involved with a given educational setting or initiative.

2) Considering the resources, players and obstacles involved in implementing the Goals Project:

After generating a common understanding around these points, we then moved on to discuss the realities with which the Goals Project should be concerned. The deliberations on this topic were focused in four areas and can be summarized as follows:

a) The audiences: The Goals Project will deal with three audiences:

- lay leaders, planners, and educational leaders (Rabbis, Bureau of Jewish Education staff, etc.) in LC's;
- decisionmakers, administrators & educators in individual educational settings (formal and informal) in LC's;
- leadership and staff of the denominations (including JCCA and possible others on the national level).

The decisionmaking process will vary with each audience. Though it is important to consider each audience in terms of the realities of these decisionmaking processes, it would be mistaken to lose sight of the larger picture when planning initiatives and activities. It was agreed that planning for the Goals Project would necessitate prior research and assessment of where each of these audiences are today vis-a-vis goals development and what could be done with each one of them in short and long-term perspective.

b) The resources: The range of resources for the Goals Project is very wide. One axis includes *people*. Danny Pekarsky and the staff of the CIJE will have to decide how much of their total time and energy they will want to devote to the Goals Project. Since it is they who will be working with and in LC's on an ongoing basis, their decision will determine the scope of the Goals Project. The Institute staff will be available for consultation and special inputs. This applies as well to special consultants such as the scholars of the Educated Jew Project and experts on goals in education (both those who have studied this topic and those who have created success in working with goals in their institutions). Finally, there is a group of talented senior educators who, for an appropriate fee, could be trained to work closely with those in individual educational settings in order to develop their goals.

Another axis relates to the task of presenting the rationale for goals development to the various audiences. On this axis would be *printed matter* such as historical and contemporary descriptions of vision driven educational practices and institutions (including from the materials on best practices); narratives of successful attempts to introduce reform in education through goals development; the published papers of the Educated Jew project; vivid and imaginative "future histories" of vision-driven Jewish educational practices and institutions; research which points out the necessity of addressing goals in order to develop effective educational practice; etc.

A third axis relates to the task of engaging the respective audiences in a process of seeking out and working with their goals. On this axis would be *moments or situations* which can naturally serve as "springboards" to the discussion of goals. Examples would be: lay leaders' demand of educators for accountability in achieving common goals; a request for assistance in goals development made by individual settings in LC's to the denominations; a study or evaluation of current educational practice which points to a significant discrepancy between actual and desired outcomes; an impassioned and informed call for action in education by leaders in the community; a fresh and energetic initiative made by an inspired educational leader; a public debate on an issue in education; etc.

It was stated that planning for the Goals Project would seem to necessitate the amassing of specific names, materials, and strategies on each of these axes. Such a pool of resources would facilitate the implementation of the project as well.

c) The perception of the project: Despite the fact that the basic idea for the Goals Project has been presented only a number of times to various players among the three audiences, it has already generated much response. Lay leaders in LC's have expressed an identification with the project's emphasis on accountability. Consequently, there is a sense among some of high expectations from the Goals Project in LC's. One group of lay leaders has even expressed a desire to become familiar with alternative conceptions of aims for Jewish education. On the other hand, there seems to be a certain degree of

vagueness concerning the Goals Project as well as a lack of understanding about the unique character of developing and working with goals in education. This has led us to suggest that if, indeed, the CIJE intends to convene a summer seminar in Israel on the Educated Jew Project for LC lay and professional leaders, it should deal, in addition, with the role of goals in education in general and in LC's.

The denominations, after having been warned about the request for assistance in formulating and pursuing goals on the part of their constituents in LC's, have also begun to consider how they might play a role in the Goals Project. Though the response to this warning has varied from denomination to denomination, our sense was that they might feel as if the goals statements which they have already produced in various curricular and other published documents could be the basis for their input into LC's. Hence, it was suggested that the bulk of the effort here would have to be in helping the denominations clarify what is involved in helping their local constituents work with denominational goals as well as in refining the formulations of those goals. In relationship to the latter, it was reported that all the denominations have expressed an interest in benefitting from the research of the Educated Jew Project.

d) Obstacles: What emerged at many different moments in these meetings is that efforts at developing and working with goals can be both considerably demanding in terms of time and energy as well as politically loaded. It was reported that vagueness in formulating goals, despite the constraint it puts on developing effective practice, can often be a useful and efficient way of preserving a safe status quo. Consequently, as was demonstrated by a simulation experiment, efforts at goals development in even a single school will need to be persistent and spread out over a long period of time in order to affect local decisionmaking processes and build consensus around new goals. These and other similar considerations called for careful attention to questions of priority, scope, personnel and budget for the Goals Project. In addition, it was suggested that alternative routes for implementation should be considered in terms of what they could lead to in one, three, and five years time.

An additional factor which was suggested in the deliberations in this area was the limitation of the Goals Project to settings in LC's. Since goals development is so demanding, energy will be best invested in working with institutions with a high level of motivation as well as with leadership and personnel which is committed from the outset. This consideration led us to revisit the possibilities of working with a coalition of motivated and committed educational institutions within and beyond LC's (moving back to the 23 communities which applied for LC status).

3. Mapping out possibilities for implementation of the Goals Project:

At this point, the meetings focused on mapping out possibilities for the implementation of the Goals Project in light all of the above.

In general, it was stated that the Goals Project should seek to catalyze vision-drivenness in lead communities and beyond via:

- a packet or arsenal of pertinent materials including conceptual pieces, examples, strategies & human resources;
- education/encouragement of lead communities in working with their goals;
- education/encouragement of the denominations and others to be pro-active in developing their goals and getting others to work with them;
- developing a coalition of vision-driven institutions in LC's and beyond.

An attempt was made to set out a wide array of possible routes for the implementation of the Goals Project with each of the three audiences. In each case, these ranged from undertaking an intensive and comprehensive effort in one or more exemplary institutions or subject matter areas (eg. Bible, Jewish History), to mid-range involvement with a group of decisionmakers and educators from a larger number of institutions, to an effort focused on developing catalysts for involvement with goals (eg. generating public debate on the aims of Jewish education through lectures, conferences, reports, etc.).

At one point in this deliberation, a full-fledged suggestion was presented for working with one of the denominations. This suggestion pointed to the CIJE's focusing the attention of the executive leadership and staff of this denomination on goals statements taken from internal resources (an analysis of the practice of a leading school in light of its goals; an historical study of the curricular goals of the denomination's institutional role model for education), while introducing them to methods of developing goals and to one of the scholars from the Educated Jew Project. Having done this, the CIJE would then help the denomination "translate" these "raw materials" into usable goals, as well as recruiting personnel and developing a plan for the implementation of these goals in settings in and beyond LC's.

4. Preparing Danny Pekarsky for the CIJE staff meeting in February:

The meetings concluded with a discussion of the agenda on the Goals Project for the CIJE staff meeting in February. It was proposed that the agenda should include:

- a clear statement of the theory of the Goals Project;
- a summary of factors to be considered in implementation;
- a presentation of alternative routes available for implementation;
- a discussion of the "pros and cons" of each of these routes in light of the above;
- a clear commitment to a specific set of implementation routes.

It was suggested that an effective way to arrive at the last item on this proposed agenda would be a concerted staff effort to develop a future plan for the Goals Project.

It was agreed that Danny Pekarsky would take on the assignment of developing a background document and agenda for the CIJE's discussion of the Goals Project at its February staff meeting and that you, Shmuel, and I would make suggestions and additions if we had any. Also Shmuel volunteered to prepare a background document on the denominations vis-a-vis the Goals Project and I did the same regarding the task of amassing past and present examples and descriptions of vision-driven education as well as of successful reform efforts through goals development.

Daniel Marom

From: "Dan Pekarsky"
Reply-To: PEKARSKY@soemadison.wisc.edu
To: MANDEL@VMS.HUJI.AC.IL
Date: Tue, 25 Jan 1994 14:35:00 -600
Subject: draft-part1

TOWARDS AN AGENDA FOR THE GOALS PROJECT -- PART I

INTRODUCTION

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

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

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

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

The Goals Project is predicated on the idea that much of what passes for Jewish education today is lacking in any sense of

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

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

The contention that vision is indispensable is, of course, not intended to suggest the desirability of any particular

vision. It does, however, represent an endorsement of the view that each educating institution should be hard at work identifying the vision appropriate for it, and then looking for ways to better embody this vision in the institution's culture and educational activities. It is this effort that the Goals Project will try to encourage and support.

From: "Dan Pekarsky"
Reply-To: PEKARSKY
To: MANDEL
Date: Tue, 25 Jan 1994 14:36:00 -600
Subject: Draft-part2

AGENDA FOR GOALS PROJECT - PART II

Caveats. A few caveats are in order:

1. Being able to articulate a guiding vision of a meaningful Jewish existence and really being committed to that vision are two very different things. The power of a vision to influence practice for the better probably depends substantially on genuine commitment to the vision.
2. For a guiding vision to really guide, it is important that front-line educators as well as lay and professional leaders come to identify strongly with it.
3. The road from a compelling vision of a meaningful Jewish existence to the design and implementation of appropriate educational arrangements is long, complex, and under-determined. In particular, no unique set of educational arrangements can be deduced from any given vision of a meaningful Jewish existence. The movement from vision to a characterization of educational arrangements that offer promise of realizing that vision presupposes a host of beliefs not contained in the original vision, as well as considerable imagination; and the movement from a portrait of optimal educational arrangements to actual practice in the real world in which we live is also anything but simple. [Time permitting, these points concerning the relationship between vision and practice will be elaborated in an appendix to this document.]

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

1. The Goals Project is closely linked to but is not identical with the Educated Jew Project. The Educated Jew Project is a

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

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

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

From: "Dan Pekarsky"
Reply-To: PEKARSKY
To: MANDEL
Date: Tue, 25 Jan 1994 14:38:00 -600
Subject: Draft-part3

AGENDA FOR THE GOALS PROJECT -- PART III

SOME CONCRETE PROPOSALS

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

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

SOME STRATEGIES TO BE CONSIDERED

1. Encouraging vision-drivenness via educational efforts.

Whatever CIJE accomplishes with the Goals Project will depend in large part on whether the relevant groups, institutions, communities, and individuals come to recognize the important role of vision-drivenness in education. The need to nurture such an appreciation poses a serious educational

challenge for CIJE. How this challenge is to be addressed will vary with different contexts; but there are certain general things we can be doing which may have a high pay-off across these contexts. In particular, the Goals Project should work systematically to develop a library of materials that explain the importance of and exemplify vision-drivenness. Such a resource bank would include the following:

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

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

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

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

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

From: "Dan Pekarsky"
Reply-To: PEKARSKY
To: MANDEL
Date: Tue, 25 Jan 1994 14:39:00 -600
Subject: Draft-part4

AGENDA FOR GOALS PROJECT - PART IV

2. Strategies for working with individual educational institutions

A. A Coalition of Vision-Driven Institutions

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

1. opportunities for participants to come to appreciate the important role that vision and goals can play in guiding the educational process; 2. a chance to begin or continue working through their own visions of a meaningful Jewish existence; 3. a chance to encounter other such views, including but not limited to formulations developed in the "Educated Jew" project; 4. a chance to begin thinking about what's involved in trying to use such a vision to guide educational practice; 5. a chance to develop a strategy for engaging educating institutions in their local communities in the goal-setting process.

If such a seminar is to take place, a number of decision need to be made fast. For example, when and for how long will it take place? Where will it take place -- in Israel or in the United States? Who will be the faculty? Who will be invited to participate? Should it be limited to the lay and professional leadership in the Lead communities or should it be opened to a broader clientele? If the latter, who should be included in this broader clientele?

Date: Tue, 25 Jan 1994 14:40:00 -600
Subject: Draft-part5

AGENDA FOR THE GOALS PROJECT - PART V

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

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

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

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

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

C. The kinds of efforts articulated in A. and B. might be

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

5. Pilot-Projects.

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

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

CONCLUDING COMMENTS

My hope is that the foregoing discussion will suffice to stimulate and guide our discussion at our February meetings. Such discussion might profitably focus on a) unclarities, incompletenesses or mis-statements found in this document; b) the

adequacy of the various proposals and ways of improving them; c) pertinent proposals not articulated in this document. Ideally, we will emerge with the rudiments of a strategy at each of the major levels discussed above.

From: "Dan Pekarsky"
Reply-To: PEKARSKY
To: MANDEL
Date: Tue, 25 Jan 1994 14:42:00 -600
Subject: draft-part6

AGENDA FOR THE GOALS PROJECT - PART VI

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

1. Summarizing/refining/rethinking the basics: a) Underlying assumptions and key distinctions that inform and define the goals project; b) the levels at which the goals project is to work; c) considerations pertinent to a decision concerning which strategy or strategies to adopt.
2. A summary and discussion of the major proposals represented in this report, as well as additional proposals that seem promising.
3. Action: a) Decide on one or more proposals to pursue, and
b) Develop a plan of action, including a division of labor.

Suggested steps for the involvement of the Denominations and Training Institutions in the Goals project.

Introduction.

In the course of the last year and a half, the denominations and their training institutions have been informed about the Mandel's Institute " Educated Jew project ". They also know that the Lead Communities are likely to turn to them for help in defining the goals which should guide their educational endeavors. At the present time, little efforts have been generated by the Denominations to meet this challenge successfully. The purpose of this short paper, is to suggest possible steps through which the denominations could become more knowledgeable about and more involved with the elaboration and clarification of goals for the educational settings which are affiliated with them.

Given that the various denominations differ from each other mainly on their ideological Weltanschauung, the suggested steps have to take into account these different approaches. The following being but a proposal it will focus on one denomination as an example of what could be done with each of the main denominations.

*** Seminar 1.**

In order to start the thinking process about Goals on a common ground, it is suggested to have an initial seminar, that would be attended by the core group that will coordinate the efforts on defining Goals at Yeshiva University, plus CIJE and MI consultants.

Desired outcomes:

The purpose of this first seminar is to clarify the Goals Project, its scope, and the steps involved in it.

Agenda:

In order to define the Goals Project for the Orthodox educational world, three possible routes could be suggested:

- * Defining Goals on the basis of existing material (curricula, mission statements, etc) produced by Yeshiva University, or by educational settings that belong formally or informally to the YU world.

* Defining Goals on the basis of the content analysis of particular educational settings. For example, the choices made by Rabbi J.B. Soloveitchik with regards to the syllabus of the Maimonides School he created in Boston: the decision to teach only some tractates of the Talmud, or some books of the Bible , the decision to have the exact same curriculum for boys and girls at Maimonides etc etc.

* Defining Goals for the Orthodox world on the basis of Rabbi Norman Lamm's book on the Volojin Yeshiva. The book is a thorough analysis of the conceptual framework and the curricular content of the institution that has become the paradygm of all the Yeshivot in Europe Israel and America. An analysis of the book is therefore likely to shed light on the Goals of contemporary Orthodox education, particularly if this is done in taking into account the many differences between the original model and its contemporary North American replications.

* Defining Goals on the basis of Rabbi I. Twersky's papers for the Educated Jew project. These papers which have for basis an analysis of Maimonides educational philosophy and ruling , may serve as a basis for discussion on the educational Goals for the entire Orthodox world. Furthermore, Rabbi Twersky could guide some of these discussions.

Recruitment of the YU Goals Project team.

It is suggested that at the end of this initial seminar Yeshiva University appoints a team of scholars , educators both from YU and from educational settings that are based on a similar ideology. The YU people that will have attended the initial seminar will present the Goals project to the all the team members, will familiarize them with the theory of the first seminar, and will set the means required to elaborate a first set of Goals that could be offered to the schools that will request them, both in Lead Communities and in Communities at large.

The Second Goals Seminar.

Once the team will be familiar with the project, it is suggested that it has a second seminar that will be attended only by this team. It is reasonable to assume that this will be an seminar that will take place over a series of meetings.

Desired outcomes:

The purpose of this second seminar will be to translate the " raw " material , into workable Goals for the various educational settings .

Agenda:

- * Choose the most appropriate outcomes from the options of possibilities suggested during the first seminar, or on any other basis suggested by YU Goals Project team.
- * Translate the chosen option into usable goals adapted to the needs of the various settings that will want to implement them
- * Stress the importance of accountability in each initiative or publication. For example in the area of Hebrew, the goals should not only specify that the students at the end of grade 12 will be fluent in Hebrew, but should also clearly define what such fluency entails and how it could be measured. The team will be made aware that appropriate modes of evaluation will be put in place in order to help the educational settings meet with increased success the challenge set by the goals.
- * Identify " lead schools " in which the suggested goals will be implemented initially, and prepare the means for this implementation.

The second goals seminar will not be attended by CIJE-MI representatives. However, it is suggested that after each meeting of this seminar, a coordinator from CIJE should be in touch with the coordinator from YU to hear about the progress made by the team, and possibly suggest alternative routes that may be considered.

A PRELIMINARY PLAN FOR THE INITIATION OF THE GOALS PROJECT

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

A) general assumptions:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

GOALS PROJECT TIMELINE STAGE ONE

IMMEDIATE:

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

DECEMBER:

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

JANUARY:

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

FEBRUARY:

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

MARCH - JUNE

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

FIRST THOUGHTS IN WAKE OF A GOALS PROJECT SIMULATION

SHMUEL WYGODA/DANIEL MAROM

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

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

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

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

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

- can be evaluated.

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

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

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

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

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

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

suggesting emendations. This could also work the other way around - first goals formulations could be done with each of the constituents and their representatives separately and then emendations could be done by a committee of all the representatives. In both cases, it is reasonable to assume that there would be a series of rounds or movements made between the two groups in order to reach a final formulation of the school's goals.

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

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

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

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

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

HEBREW/JUDAICA MISSION STATEMENT

Draft #4: 3/9/93

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

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

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

PROGRAM GOALS

draft #3: 3/9/93

Graduates of MJDS will have attained the following goals:

In the area of J. knowl.

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

In the area of Jewish skills:

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

In the area of Jewish attitudes:

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

Marshall S. Smith and Jennifer O'Day

This analytic essay draws on research about the effectiveness of current education policies as well as observations about developing policy systems in a number of states. The chapter begins with several observations about policy and school-level success, examines current barriers to school improvement and proposes a design for a systemic state structure that supports school-site efforts to improve classroom instruction and learning. The structure would be based on clear and challenging standards for student learning; policy components would be tied to the standards and reinforce one another in providing guidance to schools and teachers about instruction. Within the structure of coherent state leadership, schools would have the flexibility they need to develop strategies best suited to their students. The systemic school reform strategy combines the 'waves' of reform into a long-term improvement effort that puts coherence and direction into state reforms and content into the restructuring movement.

Introduction

The past decade has seen a blizzard of reports, federal and state legislation, and local efforts designed to stem the 'rising tide of mediocrity' in US education. Two US presidents have announced goals, tens of governors have anchored their campaigns on educational improvement, and hundreds of thousands of educators and citizens have spent countless hours in reform efforts across the nation.¹ Moreover, investment in education in real dollars has increased, not only from government sources, but from dozens of foundations, some of which have refocused their priorities to allocate funds to education, as well as from major corporations, which have donated millions of dollars to local schools and districts (Hawkins 1990).

Yet, for all of this effort, evaluations of the reforms indicate only minor changes in the typical school, either in the nature of classroom practices or in achievement outcomes (Fuhrman *et al.* 1988, Clune *et al.* 1989, Mullis and Jenkins 1990). For the most part, the processes and content of instruction in the public school classrooms of today are little different from what they were in 1980 or in 1970 (Cohen 1989 and Cohen in this volume, Cuban 1990). While realization of these disappointing results has prompted cries for greater effort and more money from some quarters, many analysts attribute the meagerness of the results to the very nature of early reform efforts, which they characterize as 'top-down' and 'more of the same'. Initiated by forces outside the schools and mandated by state governments, 'first wave' reforms sought mainly to expand or improve educational inputs (longer school day, increased requirements for graduation, better teachers) and ensure competency in basic skills (graduation tests, lock-step curricula, promotional criteria) (Stedman and Smith 1983; Firestone *et al.* 1989). That they did little to produce meaningful gains in learning may not be surprising since they did little to change the content of instruction, to directly involve teachers in the reform process, or to alter the reigning notions of teaching and learning (Cohen 1990, Carnegie Forum 1986, David *et al.* 1990).²

Largely in response to these deficiencies in early reform legislation, a 'second wave' of change efforts began building in the middle to late 1980s. This second wave of reform calls for a fundamental rethinking and restructuring of the process of schooling, not a mere bolstering of the existing one. Decentralization, professionalization, and bottom-up change are key concepts, as reformers focus on the change process and on active involvement of those closest to instruction (Carnegie Forum 1986, Elmore 1988, Elmore and associates 1990). In this 'new' conception, the school building becomes the basic unit of change, and school educators (teachers and principals) are not only the agents, but also the initiators, designers, and directors of change efforts. In addition to an emphasis on process, student outcomes are also key in this new approach. The principle underlying many of the second wave themes - from school-site management to teacher professionalism to parental choice - is the notion that if school personnel are held accountable for producing change and meeting outcome objectives, they will expend both their professional knowledge and their creative energies to finding the most effective ways possible to do so, relevant to the specific conditions in which they work.

Although the second wave is young and as yet involves only a handful of districts and schools, it has already produced an avalanche of ideas, strategies, and structures. Those involved report optimistically that state as well as local leaders of these initiatives 'have succeeded in stimulating new ways of thinking about change inside schools and about leading, managing, and supporting restructuring efforts' (David et al. 1990: 39). Unfortunately, the very strength of this new approach may also be its shortcoming. While reliance on school-based initiative (even that stimulated by states) may be more likely to produce significant changes in classroom practice than have edicts from above, a strictly school-by-school approach makes it difficult to generalize such changes from the small number of initially active schools to the well over 100,000 educational institutions in cities, suburbs, and rural areas across the country. Indeed, analysts have found that in general the schools and teachers who are active in the restructuring movement are those who already have a history of reform experience and interest (David et al. 1990).

A second problem is related to the first. Although restructuring literature stresses the critical importance of developing complex problem-solving and higher order thinking skills in our youth, achieving this goal requires a major reorientation in content and pedagogy as well as in the structure of the educational enterprise. Perhaps more importantly, it requires a reconceptualization of the knowledge and skills we expect our children to learn, and of the teaching and learning process. This in turn will require that existing elementary and secondary teachers learn, and learn to teach, considerable amounts of new material in the physical and social sciences, humanities, and mathematics. Such a reorientation is not likely to happen on a widespread school-by-school basis among educators who have themselves been schooled in a philosophy and settings that embody fact-based conceptions of knowledge, hierarchical approaches to skill development, and a near total reliance on teacher-initiated and teacher-directed instruction. Site-based management, professional collaboration, incentives, and choice may be important elements of the change process, but they alone will not produce the kinds of changes in content and pedagogy that appear critical to our national well-being (Fuhrman et al. 1989, Elmore and associates 1990, Clune 1990, this volume).

The purpose of this chapter is to address these issues of the generalizability and the content of productive and enlightened school reform. We will argue that what is needed is neither a solely top-down nor a bottom-up approach to reform, but a coherent systemic strategy that can combine the energy and professional involvement of the second-wave reforms with a new and challenging state structure to generalize the reforms to all schools

within the state. We assume, along with current restructuralists, that if we are to significantly alter student outcomes, we must change what happens at the most basic level of education - in the classrooms and schools. However, we see in this process a more proactive role for the centralized elements of the system - particularly the states - one which can set the conditions for change to take place not just in a small handful of schools or for a few children, but in the great majority.

Our discussion is divided into four parts. First, we present a picture of the organizational goal of the reforms: a successful school. This is followed by an analysis of the administrative, governance, resource, and policy barriers to effective schooling in the USA. In the third section, we pose a strategy for transforming the system at all levels - but primarily at the state level - so that it will facilitate rather than inhibit the improvement of schools on a broad and continuing basis. Finally, we relate this strategy to other issues and proposals currently under discussion in the educational reform movement.

A successful school

If our goal is to improve student outcomes and we believe that to accomplish this goal we must change what happens in the school itself, one obvious place to begin a discussion of strategy is with a picture of the kind of schools we would like to see in the future. While personal images of the 'successful school' will differ considerably in detail, both research and common sense suggest that they will have certain characteristics in common. These include, among other things, a fairly stable staff, made up of enthusiastic and caring teachers who have a mastery both of the subject-matter of the curriculum and of a variety of pedagogies for teaching it; a well thought through, challenging curriculum that is integrated across grade levels and is appropriate for the range of experiences, cultures, and learning styles of the students; a high level of teacher and student engagement in the educational mission of the school - not just for the high achievers but the vast majority of students; and opportunities for parents to support and participate in the education of their children (Purkey and Smith 1983).

Beyond - or perhaps underlying - these resources available to the student, the most effective schools maintain a schoolwide vision or mission, and common instructional goals which tie the content, structure, and resources of the school together into an effective, unified whole (Coleman and Hoffer 1987, Purkey and Smith 1983). The school mission provides the criteria and rationale for the selection of curriculum materials, the purposes and the nature of school-based professional development, and the interpretation and use of student assessment. The particulars of the vision will differ from school to school, depending on the local context; indeed, one of the goals of 'choice' advocates is to enable individual schools to establish unique identities and purposes (Chubb and Moe 1990, Elmore 1986). However, if the school is to be successful in promoting active student involvement in learning, depth of understanding, and complex thinking - major goals of the reform movement - its vision must focus on teaching and learning rather than, for example, on control and discipline as in many schools today (McNeil 1986). In fact, the very need for special attention to control and discipline may be mitigated considerably by the promotion of successful and engaging learning experiences. For these experiences and this focus to be fully successful, however, new research suggests that they must embody a different conception of content and different pedagogical strategies than those in conventional use (Resnick 1986, Lampert 1988, Peterson 1987).

Finally, the literature on effective schools has found that successful schools have not

Broad conceptions and values, however, will not be enough. We need goals that can be communicated and measured if we are to mobilize the political support necessary to sustain the reforms over time. A carefully selected set of goals and a related system of indicators would give those within the system and the general public a sense of purpose and direction and a basis on which to evaluate progress. Some of the goals could address desired changes in the nature or quality of educational inputs, such as the quality of the teaching force or of the curriculum used in the schools.

Other (and we argue more powerful) goals would be those related to students. Statewide student outcome goals may be an extension and particularization of the national goals developed recently by the governors. They could cover more than academic achievement, including such things as ensuring school readiness, developing students' self-worth and promoting collective responsibility. We believe that the goals should focus primarily on the core functions of the system; that is, on teaching and learning. To meet the demands of the future, however, they must go well beyond the 'basic skills' goals of the 1960s, '70s and early '80s. They must provide a standard that challenges the public and the educational system to prepare our youth to grapple thoughtfully with those problems that defy algorithmic solutions and to be skilled and confident learners in school and later on. Moreover, the goals and indicators must address not only the average level of opportunity and student achievement in the state but also the variation. Justice requires that the goals of the state promote equality as well as quality.

Given an agreed upon direction for reform, we suggest a two-pronged approach for attaining the established goals. The first prong of the strategy is to create a coherent system of instructional guidance, the purpose of which is to ensure that all students have the opportunity to acquire a core body of challenging and engaging knowledge, skills, and problem-solving capacities.¹⁰ Implementing this will require overcoming the fragmentation of the system through coordinating three key functions affecting instruction: curriculum, pre- and in-service teacher training, and assessment. The actual coordination of these functions, we argue, can best be handled on the state level, but it must be linked to the second prong of the strategy: an examination of the responsibilities and policies of each level of the governance structure so that all levels operate in support of each other and of the implementation of the reforms.

A coherent system of instructional guidance

The first step in developing a coherent system of instructional guidance is to work toward agreement on what students need to know and be able to do when they leave the system. The second is then to maximize the probability that all or most students will acquire the desired capacities by ensuring at the very least that they have the opportunity to do so — that is, by ensuring that students are exposed to the requisite knowledge and skills through the highest quality, most appropriate human and material resources possible. For the statewide instructional guidance system to work would thus require coordination among state curriculum frameworks, the more specific curricula of the schools, pre-service and in-service professional development and teacher certification, and system level assessment and monitoring mechanisms. Each of these aspects of the system is discussed briefly below.

Curriculum frameworks: The basic drivers of the instructional guidance system would be curriculum frameworks which set out the best thinking in the field about the knowledge,

of resources and services among districts became an important part of the nation's agenda.

Finally, the states are in a unique position to provide a coherent leadership, resources, and support to the reform efforts in the schools. States not only have the constitutional responsibility for education of our youth, but they are the only level of the system that can influence all parts of the K-12 system: the curriculum and curriculum materials, teacher training and licensure, assessment and accountability. In addition, the states, at least in theory, could productively affect the way in which the state system of higher education might operate to help the K-12 educational system. Finally, because of the size of the markets they represent, the states are also in the best position to effectively leverage other aspects of education that are outside the system itself, such as textbook and materials development.

We do not mean to suggest that such leadership will come easily to all or even to most states. The nation's tradition of local control had often led to passive, conservative behavior by state departments of education. Party politics and conflicting agendas in state legislatures and governors' offices often impede collective action. And states differ considerably in their technical capacity to implement many of the suggestions we make below. Yet there is a basis for optimism. More and more, policymakers are beginning to understand the interconnectedness of the system and cooperative endeavors such as the Council of Chief State School Officers and the Educational Commission of the States provide mechanisms for sharing technical resources among states of varying capacity.

A unifying vision and goals

In order for a state to fulfill this unique role - that is, for it to provide a coherent direction and strategy for educational reform throughout the system - it must have a common vision of what schools should be like. Any vision will have a variety of facets. One straightforward conception is that all of our children should be able to attend a 'successful school', in the terms we described earlier. Another view of the vision suggested here is that schools within a state should operate within a coherent set of policies and practices that encourage and support a challenging and engaging curriculum and instructional program. State vision statements would clearly go far deeper than these general statements.

It is important to emphasize that underlying any coherent conception will be important sets of values. We see two such sets of values as particularly significant. One set is the collective democratic values critical to our society: respect for all people, tolerance, equality of opportunity, respect for the individual, participation in the democratic functions of the society, and service to the society. A second set has to do with the tasks and attitudes of the teacher and learner - to prize exploration and production of knowledge, rigor in thinking, and sustained intellectual effort. We believe that these values already exist in a latent form in the minds of most Americans, and especially teachers, when they think about the educational system. But they need to be awakened and to permeate and guide the system and the schools. Held in common, these values can help nourish and sustain over time environments in the schools that can intellectually stimulate and engage ALL children in the way that we should expect. The crisis rhetoric that has prompted many of the recent reforms often has not been productive in this regard. It has instead fostered project-oriented, 'magic bullet' solutions that satisfy immediate political ends, without substantively changing the core of the educational process. The new reforms must cut deeper; to do so they need to be derived from a deeper system of shared beliefs.

The Shopping Mall High School: A Critique of the Educational Marketplace

Origins

cooped with others. Teachers and students will bargain to ease the effects of the requirements. A second consequence, typically ignored by school reformers, is that educational requirements piled onto high schools cannot substitute for real economic and social incentives for study. If many demanding and rewarding jobs awaited well-educated high school graduates, lots of students who now take it easy would work harder. If college and university entrance requirements were substantial, many students who now idle through the college track would step on the gas. But when real incentives that make hard work in high school rational for most students are absent, requirements alone have an Alice-in-Wonderland effect, crazily compounding the problems that schools already have. For the requirements fly in the face of what everyone knows, inviting disbelief and evasion, creating a widespread sense that the enterprise is dishonest — and this sense is fatal to good teaching and learning.

Still, there is a certain logic to the requirements. It is easier to criticize high schools than it is to criticize great corporations. It is easier to impose educational requirements on high schools than it is to press higher education to devise and enforce stronger entrance requirements — especially when many colleges and universities are hungry for bodies. And it is easier to press requirements on public institutions than it is to repair labor market problems that arise in that diffuse entity called the private sector.

One encouraging feature of the eighties debate about high schools is that it presented an opportunity to raise these questions. But one discouraging fact is that they were raised so infrequently. It seems plain enough that apathy, a sense of irrelevance, and compulsion are not the ingredients of good education. It seems plain that compounding this stew of sentiments with more requirements cannot improve education much; it may only further corrupt it. But if all of this is well known to educators, few voices were raised to question their corrupting effects. Nor did many commentators point out that even if problems in labor markets and higher education will not be addressed, there are other ways to cope with youth who see nothing for themselves in secondary studies. One is a national youth service, open to students of high school age. Another is lifetime educational entitlements for those who cannot make good use of secondary school on the established schedule. Still another

is a lowered school-leaving age. These ideas have all been advanced before, and in one way or another America has had experience with each. Yet they found little place in the eighties debate. Whether or not schools are the appropriate target for reform, they are available, visible, and easy to hit. They are an easy mark for officials who feel they must respond to popular dismay about education, but who have not the time or inclination to probe a little into the sources of dismay.

It seems odd that educators have failed to make these arguments and have instead insisted again that high schools can meet all students' needs. They repeated the old litany about programs that are practical, interesting, and relevant. They urged (that dropout) to be pressed back into school. And they pleaded only that more money was required. In part this is a reflex of tradition: educators have long been committed to the evangelical notion that schools have something for everyone. In part it is self-serving: most school systems get state aid based on the number of students attending. And in part it is political strategy: educators have rarely pointed out the misdirection of reform efforts because they want to capitalize on public interest — even critical interest. Promising to do more has long been a way to avoid disappointing constituents while squeezing out more money, hiring more teachers, gaining more esteem, or improving working conditions. The strategy makes sense from one angle — appropriations to education have increased over the decades. But it has also been foolish, because the added resources have remained modest in comparison to the promises that educators have made and the demands that they have embraced. What the high schools delivered for most students therefore has always been much thinner and less effective than what was advertised. By promising to do everything well for everyone, educators have contributed to the growing sense that they can do nothing well for anyone.

There is one last, unhappy reason that educators have not pointed to certain misdirections in the current crop of reforms: one cannot point to an incorrect direction without some sense of the correct one. But American schoolpeople have been singularly unable to think of an educational purpose that they should not embrace. As a result, they never have made much effort to figure out what high schools could do well, what high schools should do, and how they

tual capacities. They can be taught by studying academic disciplines, but only if the teachers possess the capacities in good measure, if they are trying to teach those capacities rather than to cover the material, and if the materials for study are arranged so as to cultivate those capacities — as opposed, say, to the capacity to remember a few facts, or write down disjointed bits of information.

We do not imply that these capacities are content-free, as so many approaches to "basic skills" seem to suggest today. But neither are these capacities the same thing as subjects or disciplines. In fact, the capacities we mention probably could better be cultivated if teachers were able to range across disciplines. Critical reading ability is as crucial to learning English as to learning history, and clear reasoning is no more the special province of mathematics than it is of physics or philosophy. Cutting the curriculum up into subjects makes it easy for students and teachers to forget the capacities that ought to be cultivated, and easier to pursue the illusion that education is a matter of covering the material. All of the standard academic subjects are good material for cultivating these capacities, but that is rather a different way of looking at them than as content to be learned.

This brief formulation leaves out a good deal, but it does reveal how much work remains to be done if high schools are to improve substantially. If educators could agree on such purposes, they would be better armed for debating about education and for deciding that some things cannot be done because others are more important. In addition, they would be in a position to think seriously about pedagogy — that is, about how to achieve educational purposes. Amazingly, high school educators have yet to take up this work as a profession. They have inherited a few catch phrases from the progressives: making studies practical; meeting students' needs; building the curriculum around activities — but even these have not been much developed. Perhaps there is little to develop. At the moment we don't know, because a pedagogy for high schools remains to be created.

There have been some beginnings, but most have remained very limited, or have fallen into disuse, or both. From time to time, various reformers have tried to reformulate educational purposes and to sketch out suitable pedagogy, usually from the perspective

The Shopping Mall High School

could best do it. Secondary educators have tried to solve the problem of competing purposes by accepting all of them, and by building an institution that would accommodate the result.

Unfortunately, the flip side of the belief that all directions are correct is the belief that no direction is incorrect — which is a sort of intellectual bankruptcy. Those who work in secondary education have little sense of an agenda for studies. There is only a long list of subjects that may be studied, a longer list of courses that may be taken, and a list of requirements for graduation. But there is no answer to the query, Why these and not others? Approaching things this way has made it easy to avoid arguments and decisions about purpose, both of which can be troublesome — especially in our divided and contentious society. But this approach has made it easy for schools to accept many assignments that they could not do well, and it has made nearly any sort of work from students and teachers acceptable, as long as it caused no trouble.

Another way to put the point is to say that most of the foundation work of decent secondary education still remains to be done, seven or eight decades after the system began to take shape. High schools seem unlikely to make marked improvement, especially for the many students and teachers now drifting around the malls, until there is a much clearer sense of what is most important to teach and learn, and why, and how it can best be done. This is an enormous job, one that is never finished but should long ago have been started. We watched hundreds of teachers at work, but in most cases no sense of intellectual purpose shone through. The most common purposes were getting through the period or covering the material, or some combination of the two. But why does one cover the material? If the only answer is that it has been mandated, or that it is in the book, then how can the material be taught well, or learned more than fleetingly?

Americans will never completely agree on educational purposes. But educators could, through study and debate, have made some decisions to guide them in public argument and professional work. They might have decided, for instance, that their chief purpose was to produce students who could read well and critically, who could write plainly and persuasively, and who could reason clearly. Reading, writing, and reasoning are not subjects — they are intellec-

Conclusion: Renegotiating the Treaties

DEEPLY IMBEDDED in American history and deeply reflective of American preferences, the shopping mall high school is likely to withstand efforts to dismantle it: too many teenagers are served in the way they want to be served, and too many school professionals willingly provide the services. Many students are served very well indeed, and most graduate. Those are historic achievements. Whatever school participants and the public in general may think about high schools in the abstract, they seem generally satisfied with or tolerant of the educational accommodations made in their own local schools. Much of what is proposed as educational reform is thus designed to make the mall more appealing to sellers and shoppers alike, rather than to alter the educational assumptions on which it is based.

In most communities and for most students, the mall works well because it is so exclusively governed by consumer choice. Learning is voluntary; it is one among many things for sale. The mall's central qualities — variety of offerings, choice among them, and neutrality about their value — have succeeded in holding most teenagers on terms they and their teachers can live with. The will to learn is perceived, in a deceptively sensible formulation, simply as the responsibility of students and their families. Students who want to learn generally can do so, especially if they seek out or are sought

The Shopping Mall High School

of one discipline or another. Many of these efforts — most recently, the 1950s curriculum reforms — have been promising. But these never spread very far, or cut very deep. Only a small number of teachers ever used the new materials as the basis for working out a pedagogy for secondary studies, and all reports suggest that most of these efforts have since been abandoned. Of course, every teacher has an approach to her or his craft, but each approach is practiced in isolation and does not contribute to a body of shared professional knowledge about how to teach. These separately practiced versions of the teacher's trade do not contribute to developing the skills of those entering the profession, or to deciding about when teaching is good enough, or to improving teaching when it is not good enough. This is an unfortunate list, one that many teachers regret. For every teacher must solve the problem of how to teach. But because the schools have embraced so many purposes, they have impeded the development of a body of professional knowledge about how to teach well. The high schools' many successes have helped to produce this failure.

What we outline is a tall order. We do so partly in the hope that it may help a little in current efforts to improve the schools. But our brief discussion of purposes and pedagogy also reveals just how far high schools are from such improvement. The high schools' greatest strength has been their embracing capacity to avoid these issues, to cope with many contrary visions of education by promising to pursue all of them. That has produced institutions that are remarkably flexible, ambitious, and tolerant, capable of making room for many different sorts of students and teachers and many different wishes for education. They are institutions nicely suited to cope with Americans' fickle political and educational sensibilities. All are important strengths, but they have had crippling effects. They have stunted the high schools' capacity to take all students seriously. They have blocked teachers' capacity to cultivate those qualities long valued in educated men and women — the ability to read well and critically, to write plainly and persuasively, and to reason clearly. And they have nurtured a constrained and demeaning vision of education among Americans, a vision that persistently returns to haunt the profession that helped to create it.


Beyond Common Sense in Educational Restructuring

The Issues of Content and Linkage

FRED M. NEWMANN

Common sense proposals for restructuring schools suggest promising directions, but in order for this potential to be fulfilled, two major issues must be addressed: What content is needed to give educational direction to the structures, and how can the many factors that influence this content be linked? This article proposes an agenda of content for teacher commitment and competence, and it identifies four problems of systemic linkage that restructuring "theory" has yet to address. Solutions to each of these issues will require resolution of persisting conflict over education goals.

Educational Researcher, Vol. 22, No. 2, pp. 4-13, 22

 **R**estructuring in education refers to multiple ideas and strategies. The term lacks a single, commonly accepted definition, but among the many proposals for action, important common themes have emerged. These suggest major changes in students' learning experiences, in the professional life of teachers, in the governance and management of schools, and in the ways in which schools are held accountable.¹ Many of the proposals seem reasonable and are supported in some cases with empirical evidence. But considering the magnitude of changes proposed, the failures of previous reforms, and the undeveloped state of theory on educational restructuring, it is important to question the proposals.

Why should restructuring be expected to improve education for students? The implied "theory" behind many proposals seems grounded largely on the assumption that new organizational structures will increase either the commitment or the competence of teachers and students. As we shall see, however, this assumption leads to a second question: What particular kinds of commitments and competence should the new structures produce, or what is the content of restructuring? Structure without substantive purpose leads nowhere in particular, and this discussion proposes an agenda for commitment and competence to guide structural innovation.

Assuming that structures and organizational processes can be designed to aim toward particular commitments and competencies, how will the multiple organizations and factors that affect schooling be linked or coordinated to produce the desired commitments and competencies? This discussion identifies some promising ideas in planning for systemic change, but also finds critical issues of linkage unaddressed by common sense theory. The analysis helps both to identify gaps in the common sense theory of educational restructuring and to initiate reflection on how to fill them.

How Will Structural Changes Help? Hopes for Commitment and Competence

Alarm over the condition of public education, expressed most visibly by political and corporate leaders, has focused attention on a variety of proposed changes in organizational structure:²

1. Parents should choose their children's schools, and schools should compete for funding based on student enrollment.

2. Individual schools should have autonomy from district and state regulations in basic decisions on curriculum, hiring, and budget.

3. Teachers and parents should share decision-making authority with administrators in local school governance.

4. Schools should be held accountable for student performance by districts, states, and parents.

5. Tracking and ability grouping should be abolished and replaced by heterogeneous grouping.

6. Schools should operate year-round.

7. Community social services should be coordinated with school programs.

8. There should be national certification of teachers and ladders of professional advancement within the teaching profession.

9. There should be more opportunity for teachers to plan and work together in school.

10. Students should spend more time in small group and individual study, less in large group instruction.

11. Students should advance in school not according to grades attended and credits earned, but according to demonstrated proficiency.

Enormous energy and resources have been invested in debates over and attempts to implement changes of this sort.

Why should changes like these be expected to improve students' education? Literature on educational restructuring offers no thorough theoretical explanation. To understand the connections between organizational structure and student outcomes, we must instead try to infer the assumed relationships. These inferences constitute common sense theory, and they can usually be reduced to two types of

FRED M. NEWMANN is professor of curriculum instruction at the University of Wisconsin-Madison and director of the Center on Organization and Restructuring of Schools, 1025 West Johnson Street, Room 659, Madison, WI 53706. He specializes in curriculum and educational reform.

access to resources that stimulate a substantive focus on issues of curriculum, pedagogy, and assessment.⁶ The school's mission could also limit the power of the team to enhance teaching competence. If teachers are required to pursue a set of multiple, diffuse, perhaps even contradictory educational goals, which is common in schools that try to accommodate a large variety of interests, then most of the team's time together will be occupied with reaching compromises about what topics to include and to exclude from the curriculum. In a school plagued with multiple, competing goals, conflict about what ought to be taught can drive out careful consideration about how to teach any given subject well.

The Issues of Content and Linkage

The illustrations show that new organizational structures may be necessary, but not sufficient to improve education.⁷ Something else is needed to guide human energy in productive educational directions. The "something else" is a set of particular commitments and competencies to guide practice. Is the point of restructuring to provide a better way of teaching the current curriculum to students who haven't learned it? Or is the goal to fundamentally change, for all students, what is taught and how it is taught? How much of a core curriculum should be required of all students, and what should it be? How much attention should be given to high- versus low-performing students? To what extent should teachers take on new functions beyond the teaching of specialized subjects? Answers to such questions delineate the content that guides activity within organizational structures and that ultimately reflects the quality of education. "Content" in this sense involves far more than curriculum topics; it includes a broad range of values, beliefs, and competencies expressed by teachers, administrators, and other staff. In short, content is the substance that both guides the use of and is influenced by organizational form.

From this perspective, the central issue is not simply how to change from centralized to decentralized systems, from large classes to small, from tracking to heterogeneous grouping, from teacher as individual to teacher as team member, from principal as autocrat to principal as democrat. Instead, the issue is how structures can support the building of solid programmatic focus for teachers, administrators, parents, and students. Drawing from restructuring literature, I will suggest an agenda for teacher commitment and competence that helps to define content for restructuring.

Conceiving an agenda of powerful content for a single teacher for a single class is much easier than actually cultivating those commitments and competencies. Teachers' commitments and skills are influenced by previous educational training, by available curriculum materials and tests, by opportunities for staff development, and by working conditions in the school. Can the diverse agencies and people that affect teachers ever be sufficiently linked or aligned to cultivate the "right" set of commitments and competencies? Even if we could find ways of linking teacher preparation, staff development, curriculum, and assessment to help some teachers, could these be replicated and managed to be simultaneously infused, in sufficiently flexible and adaptive ways, into several classes, schools, districts, or states? Research has shown the difficulties of developing agreement and coordination between classes and teachers within schools.⁸ The problem becomes more complex if one seeks common

standards for powerful content across several schools. How to link important influences in the system to help individual teachers and how then to link classes within schools and schools within larger units is another serious frontier that common sense thinking about restructuring has yet to cross.⁹

Powerful Content: An Agenda for Commitment and Competence

What kinds of commitments and competence should new organizational structures nurture? A comprehensive look at the kinds of commitments and competence needed would consider administrators, parents, publishers, test makers, and others. I focus here on teachers, because they have the most direct opportunities to influence students. The four themes discussed next represent, in my view, the most important new forms of commitment and competence for teachers. The themes appear in general analyses of restructuring and in a number of restructuring projects.¹⁰

Theme 1: Depth of Understanding and Authentic Learning

To infuse restructuring with powerful content calls first for teacher commitment to an educational vision that emphasizes depth of understanding and authentic learning, rather than only transmission and reproduction of declarative knowledge. This emphasis does not deny, as many erroneously believe, the importance of teaching basic information, concepts, and skills. The point is to move beyond the "basics," recognizing that unless such knowledge is applied to questions more complex than those of quiz shows or crossword puzzles, it will rarely be useful to individuals or society.

To execute the commitment, teachers will need lots of help. Teaching subject matter in depth and in authentic ways is not easy. We have learned from research on student cognition and student engagement that students' perspectives must be taken more seriously in the design of curriculum and the practice of teaching. This tends to suggest a student-centered approach. We have also learned that students are more capable of complex thought than is commonly assumed but that they are rarely challenged to understand academic content in depth. Many voices urge curriculum reform in the direction of more challenging content.¹¹ These raised expectations for student understanding of disciplined knowledge suggest the need for more rigorous, subject-centered standards.

How can challenging content be taught within a student-centered approach? The answer cannot be found simply by shifting to new methods of instruction such as computers and electronic media, cooperative group work, and individually paced study or by replacing worksheets with projects, debates, hands-on experiments, or creative writing. It will require deeper understanding by teachers of the subjects they teach, greater awareness of students' preconceptions of the subjects, and efforts to generate thoughtful interaction between formal disciplines and student experience. Some of the "new pedagogies" can help, but these processes alone do not define what should be taught or the degree of depth desired.

We are in the difficult situation of recognizing that the substantive foundation for restructuring must be curriculum and instruction aimed more toward depth of understanding

PERMEABLE BOUNDARIES AND INSTITUTIONAL CONTROL

In addition, St. Paul's faces changes with a clear consciousness and great control over the choices it creates. The changes are deliberate, calculated, and balanced against the enduring habits. Ten years ago, for example, St. Paul's became coeducational, a major change in the population and self-perception of the institution. Certainly, there are ample examples of lingering sexism. Women faculty are few and experience the subtle discrimination of tokenism. But one is more impressed with the thorough integration of boys and girls, the multiple leadership roles girls play in the life of the school, and the easy, comfortable relationships that

sexism to develop between the sexes. Although the decision to become coeducational represented a critical and potentially disruptive change in school culture, the planning was carefully executed, the choice was self-imposed, and the negotiations were internally controlled.

imposed and the negotiations were internally controlled. Highland Park offers an example of a largely reactive institution with standards imposed from the outside. One is immediately aware of the school's permeable boundaries and sees the ways in which internal structures and goals reflect shifts in societal trends. The control of standards largely originates within the immediate community, which receives and interprets messages from the wider society. The waves of change reverberate within the school and administrators and faculty are often put in the position of trying to resist the shifts, negotiate a middle ground, or offer alternative views. The principal describes his role as largely reactive between the often opposed constituencies of parents and teachers. He acts as an interpreter and negotiator, and not as a visionary or initiating leader. He remarks sadly that the school is no longer at the moral center of the community; that it has become a "satellite" in the lives of students. The "real world" defines what is important and the school lags closely behind or it risks obsolescence.

school lags closely behind or it risks obsolescence.

The curriculum and academic structure of Highland Park, for example, have closely followed the trends of progressivism and liberalism that dominated social attitudes during the late 1960s and 1970s, and reverted back to the conservatism that resurfaced in the early 1980s. When inflexible rhetoric was at its height, it was not uncommon to see boys in the home economics and interior design courses and many girls clamoring for courses in auto repair and industrial arts. Now many girls clamoring for courses in auto repair and industrial arts. Now the traditional gender-related patterns have been largely re-established and the increased competition, rigid status hierarchies, and return to subjects that will "pay off" reflect the resurgence of conservative attitudes abroad in society. Antoinette from the Highland Park faculty, who has watched the shifting trends for almost three decades, refuses to become invested in the newest wonder-idea. She wishes the school leadership would take a firmer, more conscious position on the school's intellectual goals and the moral values that guide them, and looks with sympathy at her younger colleagues who ride the waves of change not knowing where the tide will land.

Brookline faced with many of the same shifts in standards and morality as Highland Park, has responded differently. Certainly its experiences in a society of ever-performing within its walls, but it has also taken a more deliberate, inflexible stance in relation to them. In the mid-to-late 1970s, the increased diversity of the student body caused factional feuds, divisiveness, and eruptions of violence in the school. A counselor speaks

GROUP PORTRAIT

of these harsh encounters as distinct echoes of the racial strife in the wider Boston community. Under the new leadership of Bob McCarthy, school violence was no longer tolerated. First, McCarthy helped teachers express their long-suppressed rage at the inappropriate student behavior; second, there were immediate and harsh punishments handed down to all of the aggressors; and third, the school began to look upon "the problem" of diversity as a rich resource. The battle against factionalism is not won. The shifts in consciousness are elusive and difficult to implant in community life. Everyone continues to speak of the stark divisions among racial and ethnic groups; but now those students who manage to move across the boundaries tend to be perceived as strong and unthreatened. There is a clear admiration for their risk taking and their versatility. The social worker who once saw the school as an echo of the inequalities and injustices of the community, now says it serves as an asylum for many; a place of safety from violence; a place to learn different patterns of behavior; a place to take risks.

Headmaster McCarthy's attempts at restructuring patterns of authority in Brookline High are also aimed at undoing behaviors and attitudes learned in the wider world and marking the distinctions between school and society. Adolescents are offered a piece of the power in exchange for Responsible action. It is an uphill battle. Many students prefer a more passive, reactive role and resist the demands of responsibility and authority; others are suspicious of bargaining with any adult and do not trust McCarthy's rhetoric. But the school's efforts are conscious and deliberate, designed to counteract the cultural, ideological sweeps of contemporary society and make clear decisions about philosophical goals and moral codes.

In these three examples we see great variations in the ways in which boundaries are drawn between the school and the community. St. Paul's high standards, goals, and values are most protected from societal imperatives, most preciously guarded, and most thoroughly ingrained. They are chosen and defended. Highland Park mirrors the societal shifts, sometimes offering resistance but rarely initiating conscious counterplans. Brookline lies somewhere between these approaches to the outside world. Its walls are not impenetrable, but neither are they invisible. Brookline has permeable boundaries that provide intercourse with and separation from society. Attempts are made to defend the school from the severity of societal intrusions, define educational goals and standards through internal consensus, and build resilient intellectual and moral structures.

Kennedy High School resembles Brookline in its conscious and de-

On Goodness in High Schools

liberate attempts to define boundaries between inside and out. Bob Mastuzzi recognizes the need to be knowledgeable about the social, economic, and cultural patterns of the surrounding community; the need to have heightened visibility in the neighborhood; and the need to be a keen observer of and participant in the political networks of the borough, city, and state. His role as "community leader" is designed to assure Kennedy's survival in a skeptical, sometimes hostile, community. Without this devoted community work, Mastuzzi fears the school would face politically debilitating negativism from neighborhood forces. But Mastuzzi does not merely reach out and embrace the community; he also articulates the strong contrasts between neighborhood values and priorities and those that guide the school. It is not that he capitulates to community pressure. Rather, he sees his role as interpreter and negotiator of the dissonant strains that emerge in the school-community interface. Sometimes he must engage in calculated, but intense, battles where the differences flare into heated conflicts. He was ready and willing to fight when he believed the Marblehead residents in the nearby working-class neighborhood did not adhere to the negotiated settlement both parties had reached.

However, Mastuzzi's concern with defining workable boundaries is not limited to establishing relationships with the wider community. He is at least as preoccupied with negotiating the bureaucratic terrain of the New York City school system. There are layers of administrators and decision makers in the central office whose priorities and regulations affect the internal life of Kennedy. These external requirements are felt most vividly by the principal and assistant principals, who must find effective and legal adaptations of the prescribed law. Once again, Mastuzzi does not passively conform to the regulations of the "central authorities." He tries to balance the school's need for autonomy and the system's need for uniform standards. He distinguishes between the spirit and the letter of the law, sometimes ignoring the latter when the literal interpretation is a poor match for his school's needs. He also serves as a "buffer" against the persistent intrusions of the wider system in order to offer his faculty and staff the greatest possible freedom and initiative.

Institutional control is a great deal easier for schools with abundant resources, non-public funding, and historical stability. It is not only that private schools tend to be more protected from societal trends, divergent community demands, and broader bureaucratic imperatives; they are also more likely to have the advantage of the material and psychological resources of certainty. In many ways, these six schools seem to exist in different worlds. These inequalities are dramatic; the societal injustices fla-

On Goodness in High Schools

punctuality, and poise; and the immediate rewards that keep them involved in school.

The connections to church and religion, though less clearly etched, underscore the fervor attached to education by generations of powerless, illiterate people. The superintendent of Atlanta uses spiritual metaphors when he urges parents and students to join the "community of believers." Carver faculty and administrators reinforce the religious messages and link them to themes of self-discipline, community building, and hard work at school. Hogans's rhetoric is culturally connected, clearly articulated, and visibly executed in student programs, assemblies, and reward ceremonies. The ideology is legible and energizing to school cohesion.

One sees a similar enthusiasm and ideological clarity at Milton Academy. Humanism and holistic medicine are broad labels that refer to a responsiveness to individual differences, to a diversity of talent, and to the integration of mind, body, and spirit in educational pursuits. Headmaster Pieh offers a subtle and complex message about providing a productive and nurturant ethos that will value individual needs; the registrar develops a hand-built schedule so that students can receive their first choices of courses, and teachers know the life stories and personal dilemmas of each of their students. Underneath the New England restraint of Milton, there is a muted passion for humanism. Students talk about the special quality of relationships it provides ("They want us to be more humane than human beings in the real world"), teachers worry over the boundaries between loving attention and indulgence, and the director of admissions offers it as the primary appeal of Milton, a distinct difference from the harsh, masculine qualities of Exeter. Although Carver and Milton preach different ideologies, what is important here is the rigorous commitment to a visible ideological perspective. It provides cohesion within the community and a measure of control against the oscillating intrusions from the larger society.

Highland Park lacks this clear and resounding ideological stance. The educational vision shifts with the times as Principal Denson and his teachers listen for the beat of change and seek to be adaptive. Although the superb record of college admissions provides institutional pride, it does not replace the need for a strong ideological vision. Rather than creating institutional cohesion, the quest for success engenders harsh competition among students. The persistent complaints from many students that they feel lost and alone is in part a statement about the missing ideological roots. Without a common bond, without a clear purpose, the school fails to encompass them and does not take psychological hold on their energies. The director of counselling at Highland Park observes

GROUP PORTRAIT

grant. One has feelings of moral outrage as one makes the transition from the lush, green 1,700 acres of St. Paul's to the dusty streets of the Carver Homes where the median income is less than \$4,000 a year. How could we possibly expect a parity of educational standards between these pointedly different environments? Of course, St. Paul's enjoys more control, more precision, more subtlety. Of course, life at St. Paul's is smoother and more aesthetic.

Yet despite the extreme material contrasts, there are ways in which each institution searches for control and coherence. Gaining control seems to be linked to the development of a visible and explicit ideology. Without the buffers of land and wealth, Carver must fashion a strong ideological message. It is not a surprising message, lived with the newly contrived rhetoric of "interfacing" and "networking" used by Dr. Hoggans, the ideological appeal is hauntingly similar to the messages given to many Carver student ancestors. Several generations ago, for example, Booker T. Washington, one of Hoggans's heroes, spoke forcefully to young Black men and women about opportunities for advancement in a White man's world. He urged them to be mannerly, civilized, patient, and enduring; not rebellious, headstrong, or critical. They were told of the dangers of disruption and warned about acting "uppity" or arrogant. Although they were encouraged in their patience, these Black ancestors recognized the profound injustices, the doors that would be closed to them even if they behaved admirably. Industriousness was the only way to move ahead and ascend the ladders of status, but Black folks recognized that the system was ultimately rigged.

Carver's ideological stance, enthusiastically articulated by Hoggans, echoes these early admonitions—be good, be clean, be mannerly, and have a great deal of faith. Recognize the rigged race but run as hard as you can to win. School is the training ground for learning skills and civility, for learning to lose gracefully, and for trying again in the face of defeat. Education is the key to a strong sense of self-esteem, to personal and collective power. Hoggans's rhetoric, old as the hills and steeped in cultural metaphors and allusions, strikes a responsive chord in the community and serves as a rallying cry for institution building. His ideological message is reinforced by the opportunities Hoggans creates for the immediate gratification of success and profit and to the connections he reinforces between education and religion. When Carver students, in their gleaming white Explorer jackets, cross the railroad tracks and enter the places of money and power in downtown Atlanta, their eyes are open to new life possibilities. Hoggans tells them their dreams can come true. The work programs at Carver provide the daily experiences of industry,

On Goodness in High Schools

For Carver students, it is a clear exchange. "I'll commit myself to school for the promise of a job . . . otherwise forget it," says a junior who describes himself as "super-realistic." Milton Academy symbolizes the attempts at balance between separation and connection in its public relations material. The catalogue cover pictures the quiet, suburban campus with the city looming in the background. The director of admissions speaks enthusiastically about the meshing of utopian idealism and big-city realities. The day students arrive each morning and "bring the world with them." The seniors speak about the clash between the school's humanitarian spirit and the grueling requirements of college admissions. The protection and solace good schools offer may come from the precious abundance of land, wealth, and history, but they may also be partly approached through ideological clarity and a clear vision of institutional values.

AMERICAN JEWISH FEMININE AND MASCULINE QUALITIES OF LEADERSHIP

The people most responsible for defining the school's vision and articulating the ideological stance are the principals and headmasters of these schools. They are the voice, the mouthpiece of the institution, and it is their job to communicate with the various constituencies. Their personal image is inextricably linked to the public persona of the institution.

The literature on effective schools tends to agree on at least one point—that an essential ingredient of good schools is strong, consistent, and inspired leadership.¹¹ The tone and culture of schools is said to be defined by the vision and purposeful action of the principal. He is said to be the person who must inspire the commitment and energies of his faculty; the respect, if not the admiration of his students; and the trust of the parents. He sits on the boundaries between school and community; must negotiate with the superintendent and school board; must protect teachers from external intrusions and harassment; and must be the public imagemaker and spokesman for the school.¹² In high schools the principals are disproportionately male, and the images and metaphors that spring to mind are stereotypically masculine. One thinks of the military, protecting the flanks, guarding the fortress, defining the territory. The posture is often seen as defensive, the style clear, rational, and focused.

" " * GROUP PORTRAIT

students reaching out to one another through a haze of drugs in order to reduce feelings of isolation and dislocation. Drugs are the great "leveler," providing a false sense of connection and lessening the nagging pain. A minority of students are spared the loneliness and only a few can articulate "the problem," but it is visible to the stranger who misses "the school spirit."

Ideological fervor is an important ingredient of utopian communities. Distant from the realities of the world and separated from societal institutions, these communities can sustain distinct value structures and reward systems. In his book *Asylums*, Erving Goffman makes a distinction between "total institutions" that do not allow for any intercourse with the outer world and organizations that require only a part of a person's time, energy, and commitment. In order to sustain themselves, however, all institutions must have what Goffman calls "encompassing tendencies" that wrap their members up in a web of identification and affiliation, that inspire loyalty.⁹

Schools must find way of inspiring devotion and loyalty in teachers and students, of marking the boundaries between inside and outside, of taking a psychological hold on their members. Some schools explicitly mark their territories and offer clear rules of delineation. Parochial schools, for instance, are more encompassing than public schools because they vigorously resist the intrusions of the outer world and frame their rituals and habits to purposefully contrast with the ordinary life of their students. Parents who choose to send their children to parochial schools support the values and ideological stance of the teachers and the clear separation between school life and community norms.¹⁰ Quaker schools often mark the transition from outside to inside school by several minutes of silence and reflection at the beginning of the school day. After the noise, energy, and stress of getting to school, students must collect themselves and be still and silent. Those moments separate them from non-school life and prepare them to be encompassed by the school's culture.

Although I am not urging schools to become utopian communities or total institutions, I do believe that good schools balance the pulls of connection to community against the contrary forces of separation from it. Administrators at Kennedy vividly portray their roles as a "balancing act." They walk the treacherous "tightrope" between closed and open doors, between autonomy and symbiosis. Schools need to provide asylum for adolescents from the rugged demands of outside life at the same time that they must always be interactive with it. The interaction is essential. Without the connection to life beyond school, most students would find the school's rituals empty. It is this connection that motivates them.

From: "Dan Pekarsky"
Reply-To: PEKARSKY@soemadison.wisc.edu
To: MANDEL@VMS.HUJI.AC.IL
Date: Tue, 25 Jan 1994 14:35:00 -600
Subject: draft-part1

TOWARDS AN AGENDA FOR THE GOALS PROJECT -- PART I

INTRODUCTION

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

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

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

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

The Goals Project is predicated on the idea that much of what passes for Jewish education today is lacking in any sense of

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

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

The contention that vision is indispensable is, of course, not intended to suggest the desirability of any particular

vision. It does, however, represent an endorsement of the view that each educating institution should be hard at work identifying the vision appropriate for it, and then looking for ways to better embody this vision in the institution's culture and educational activities. It is this effort that the Goals Project will try to encourage and support.

From: "Dan Pekarsky"
Reply-To: PEKARSKY
To: MANDEL
Date: Tue, 25 Jan 1994 14:36:00 -600
Subject: Draft-part2

AGENDA FOR GOALS PROJECT - PART II

Caveats. A few caveats are in order:

1. Being able to articulate a guiding vision of a meaningful Jewish existence and really being committed to that vision are two very different things. The power of a vision to influence practice for the better probably depends substantially on genuine commitment to the vision.
2. For a guiding vision to really guide, it is important that front-line educators as well as lay and professional leaders come to identify strongly with it.
3. The road from a compelling vision of a meaningful Jewish existence to the design and implementation of appropriate educational arrangements is long, complex, and under-determined. In particular, no unique set of educational arrangements can be deduced from any given vision of a meaningful Jewish existence. The movement from vision to a characterization of educational arrangements that offer promise of realizing that vision presupposes a host of beliefs not contained in the original vision, as well as considerable imagination; and the movement from a portrait of optimal educational arrangements to actual practice in the real world in which we live is also anything but simple. [Time permitting, these points concerning the relationship between vision and practice will be elaborated in an appendix to this document.]

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

1. The Goals Project is closely linked to but is not identical with the Educated Jew Project. The Educated Jew Project is a

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

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

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

From: "Dan Pekarsky"
Reply-To: PEKARSKY
To: MANDEL
Date: Tue, 25 Jan 1994 14:38:00 -600
Subject: Draft-part3

AGENDA FOR THE GOALS PROJECT -- PART III

SOME CONCRETE PROPOSALS

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

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

SOME STRATEGIES TO BE CONSIDERED

- 1 Encouraging vision-drivenness via educational efforts.

Whatever CIJE accomplishes with the Goals Project will depend in large part on whether the relevant groups, institutions, communities, and individuals come to recognize the important role of vision-drivenness in education. The need to nurture such an appreciation poses a serious educational

challenge for CIJE. How this challenge is to be addressed will vary with different contexts; but there are certain general things we can be doing which may have a high pay-off across these contexts. In particular, the Goals Project should work systematically to develop a library of materials that explain the importance of and exemplify vision-drivenness. Such a resource bank would include the following:

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

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

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

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

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

From: "Dan Pekarsky"
Reply-To: PEKARSKY
To: MANDEL
Date: Tue, 25 Jan 1994 14:39:00 -600
Subject: Draft-part4

AGENDA FOR GOALS PROJECT - PART IV

2. Strategies for working with individual educational institutions

A. A Coalition of Vision-Driven Institutions

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

1. opportunities for participants to come to appreciate the important role that vision and goals can play in guiding the educational process;
2. a chance to begin or continue working through their own visions of a meaningful Jewish existence;
3. a chance to encounter other such views, including but not limited to formulations developed in the "Educated Jew" project;
4. a chance to begin thinking about what's involved in trying to use such a vision to guide educational practice;
5. a chance to develop a strategy for engaging educating institutions in their local communities in the goal-setting process.

If such a seminar is to take place, a number of decision need to be made fast. For example, when and for how long will it take place? Where will it take place -- in Israel or in the United States? Who will be the faculty? Who will be invited to participate? Should it be limited to the lay and professional leadership in the Lead communities or should it be opened to a broader clientele? If the latter, who should be included in this broader clientele?

Date: Tue, 25 Jan 1994 14:40:00 -600
Subject: Draft-part5

AGENDA FOR THE GOALS PROJECT - PART V

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

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

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

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

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

C. The kinds of efforts articulated in A. and B. might be

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

5. Pilot-Projects.

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

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

CONCLUDING COMMENTS

My hope is that the foregoing discussion will suffice to stimulate and guide our discussion at our February meetings. Such discussion might profitably focus on a) unclarities, incompletenesses or mis-statements found in this document; b) the

adequacy of the various proposals and ways of improving them; c) pertinent proposals not articulated in this document. Ideally, we will emerge with the rudiments of a strategy at each of the major levels discussed above.

From: "Dan Pekarsky"
Reply-To: PEKARSKY
To: MANDEL
Date: Tue, 25 Jan 1994 14:42:00 -600
Subject: draft-part6

AGENDA FOR THE GOALS PROJECT - PART VI

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

1. Summarizing/refining/rethinking the basics: a) Underlying assumptions and key distinctions that inform and define the goals project; b) the levels at which the goals project is to work; c) considerations pertinent to a decision concerning which strategy or strategies to adopt.
2. A summary and discussion of the major proposals represented in this report, as well as additional proposals that seem promising.
3. Action: a) Decide on one or more proposals to pursue, and
b) Develop a plan of action, including a division of labor

F
A
X

C
O
V
E
R

S
H
E
E
T

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
Shmuel Wygoda
Organization: From: Ginny Levi

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

meeting of the Steering Committee and thereupon to the October 1994 meeting of the CIJE Board. ADH will staff the Steering Committee.

Action needed:

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

2. Four CIJE Board Committees will be created and all members of the CIJE Board will be allocated to at least one committee. The proposed committees are: Building the Profession, Community Mobilization, Content and Research. These committees will be staffed by the core full-time staff and some consultants of CIJE and will meet at each Board meeting and at least once between each board meeting for a total of four committee meetings during the year. A workplan which is a sub-set of this workplan will be developed for each committee and will be approved for 1995 at the October board meeting. The 1994 interim workplan will be presented at the first meeting of each committee on April 20th.

Action needed:

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

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

Action needed:

- a. Prepare Board meeting
[3/8/94: MLM/ADH/VFL]
- b. New board members discussed
[every Steering Committee meeting]
- c. Assignment of staff to board members
[1/20/94:ADH]

4. The ~~Executive Committee~~ of the Board will meet prior to each Board meeting and will ~~be~~ composed of committee chairs, officers and ~~funders~~. The Executive will review and approve the budget of CIJE.

Action needed:

- a. Develop new 1994 budget based on 1994 workplan.
[2/6/94:ADH]

5. Board Communication will be through a CIJE 'Letter from the Chair' to appear in March, June, August and December. In addition, board members will receive more specialized written briefing materials from the chair and staff of the committee on which they serve. ~~These should appear in~~

B. DEVELOPING LAY LEADERSHIP FOR JEWISH CONTINUITY

change *coalitions for*
This is the systematic process of bringing key North American community leadership into our work. The ~~commissions on~~ Jewish continuity which are emerging nationwide are the first targets for this undertaking. The emerging work of the Goals Project with lay leadership in the lead communities could form part of the content of this project.

A plan will be developed using the best of available resources (e.g. Clal) to build a replicable process for leadership development in a community. The Board and Committee structure of CIJE should be used to bring new leadership into national involvement both as leaders and as funders.

Action needed:

- a. First draft by June Steering Committee
[6/2/94:ADH]

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 ~~lobby~~ 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.

For action:

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

J. 1995 WORKPLAN AND BUDGET

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

For action:

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

THE CIJE – PRELIMINARY WORKPLAN 1992/1993

A. Function, Structure and Staffing Assumptions

The following assumptions guide this plan:

1. The function of the CIJE is to do whatever is necessary to bring about the implementation of the Commission's decisions. This includes initiating action, being a catalyst and a facilitator for implementation. The CIJE is not a direct provider of services except consultations.
2. The CIJE is a mechanism of the North American Jewish community for the development of Jewish education. Optimally an increasing number of leaders would see it as their organization for purposes of educational endeavours.
3. It will always be a small organization with few staff and high standards of excellence. We assume that its staff will include, in addition to the Executive Director, and an administrative support staff, a planner, a chief education officer, a director of research and community projects, as well as possibly some additional staff with content expertise.
4. The plan is based on the assumption that the assignment includes fundraising for the CIJE and for the CIJE's contribution to Lead Communities.

B. Establishing Lead Communities

The bulk of the CIJE's work for this coming year will be the pro-active efforts required to establish lead communities, to guide them and guarantee the content, the scope and the quality of implementation, and to help raise the necessary funds for the CIJE's share in their work, as well as for the lead communities themselves (the CIJE's role in funding was debated at the August meetings—I am not sure that this formulation accurately reflects the debate).

C. Elements of the Workplan for Lead Communities

● *Immediate: Preparation, Negotiations and Launch*

1. Prepare written guidelines for lead communities (LC), including proposed agreement, planning guidelines, description of the project and of the CIJE's support role.
2. Prepare CIJE staff for the assignment with LCs and have periodic staff meetings for ongoing work. Items 1 and 2 involve further preliminary development of the concept of Lead Communities, its translation into specific content and practice.
3. Offer ongoing guidance and backing to the two support projects: Best Practices and Monitoring, Evaluation and Feedback.
4. Launch the dialogue with lay and professional leadership in each LC towards an understanding of the broad lines of the project, an agreed-upon process for the project and the formulation of an agreement or contract. The chronology is to be determined. IN particular, we discussed the question of whether we ought to push for rapid, written agreement, or rather engage in a joint learning process that would lead to agreement when the communities are more knowledgeable. Whatever the decision, the dialogue with the communities would revolve around the concept of Lead Community, the terms of the project, the planning and decisionmaking process, the relationship with the CIJE—including funding and the two projects.
5. Work with educators and rabbis in the community: they usually have strong views, commitments and expectations on which we will want to build.
6. Convene an ongoing (monthly?) planning seminar of the lead communities and the CIJE to further develop and design the concept of LCs. Given the innovative and experimental nature of the project, much needs to be worked out jointly with the best available talent joining forces for the design and planning work. This will also provide a basis for networking among LCs.

The character of the first meeting, to be convened as soon as possible, is yet to be determined (e.g., should it be a major meeting aimed at socializing, acquainting, familiarizing the leadership (lay and professional) with the ideas, staff, actors, projects, foundations, related to the CIJE; or should it be a smaller meeting of several representatives of each community and of the CIJE (see appendix B for possible scenario).

7. Set up the various expert contributions of the CIJE:
 - a) Provide planning guidance and guidance for the community mobilization process (community organization and ongoing trouble-shooting). Prepare guidelines and

discuss them with the communities. Assist as needed in the establishment of a strong planning group (committee, commission), with wall-to-wall representation.

- b) Negotiate with foundations, organizations and purveyors of programs the nature of their involvement and their contribution to lead communities. Begin training them for the assignment (e.g., discuss the institutions of higher Jewish learning, their role in in-service and pre-service training, as well as their role for the articulation of visions or goals of Jewish education; work with the JCCA, JESNA, CAJE, CLAL; approach program-oriented foundations with specific programs). This requires preparing background documents—for example, what would the Israel experience be in a lead community—and discussing with the appropriate organization or foundation their interest in taking all or part of the program upon themselves.
 - c) Provide funding facilitation as required.
 - d) Provide planning guidance for:
 - 1) The self-study
 - 2) The one-year plan
 - 3) Pilot projects to be launched in year 1
 - 4) The five-year plan
 - e) Complete plans for the introduction of the Best Practices project into the community and make educational consultants available to the communities.
 - f) Introduce the Monitoring and Evaluation project in the community (field researchers to conduct preliminary interviews) and help process the findings of the periodic reports (first one in January 1993).
 - g) Provide guidance for the development of vision-, mission-, goal- statements at institutional and community levels.
 - h) Appoint a key staff consultant for each community to mediate the content (community mobilization; building the profession) and make educational consultants available for specific needs (e.g., develop in-service training programs for early childhood educators; re-invent a best practice supplementary school model into the community).
 - i) Develop networking between communities.
 - j) Develop means of communications and P.R.
8. Toward the end of the year: gear-up towards implementation

- ***Ongoing Work—General CIJE and Related to Lead Communities***

- 1) Board meetings (August and February), executive group, board committees (lead communities, Monitoring/Evaluation, Best Practices) and camper assignments.
- 2) Senior advisory group meetings or conference calls.
- 3) Monthly CIJE-lead communities planning seminar.
- 4) Fundraising.
- 5) Ongoing contacts with constituencies (organizations, purveyors of programs, foundations, lay leaders, educators, rabbis).
- 6) Staff meetings (for planning and discussion of educational content—twice a year).
- 7) Guidance to key projects.
- 8) Networking with educators, organizations and institutions.
- 9) Plan the second and third years of the project.

D. Beyond Lead Communities:

Major areas of endeavor of the CIJE and suggested action in each area for the next 12 months (please note: areas 1, 2, and 3 below must be dealt with both at the continental level and in lead communities).

1. Community mobilization and communications

Plan and launch the activities that will help mobilize communities, organizations and leaders to Jewish education and create more fertile grounds for access to the resources required (beyond the three communities selected). Areas of endeavour might include:

- Work with the 23 applicant communities to the Lead Communities Project (or with any differently defined large group of communities) to capitalize on goodwill, initial interests, local initiatives. This should initially include a very limited number of activities—until the CIJE's work load permits more. For example: during the coming year one might convene once or twice representatives of the communities to share with them two topics
 - findings of the Best Practices Project and methodology of the Monitoring, Evaluation and Feedback Project
 - and meetings with programs and representatives of programmatic foundations (CRB for Israel; Melton for the adult mini-school; Revson for media; etc.).

- Launch a communications program that will continue the work begun with the publication of *A Time to Act*.

In too many quarters the work of the CIJE is not known. This limits our effectiveness, particularly with reference to fundraising, and misses on important opportunities for community mobilization.

This area has not yet been planned and very limited work was done to date.

2. *Building the profession of Jewish education*

In order to deal with the shortage of qualified educators a thoughtful plan needs to be prepared concerning action required at the central or continental level. We have deferred dealing with issues such as a portable benefits plan, salary policies, what would it take to meet the shortage of qualified personnel in terms of both pre-service and in-service training (beyond the grants to the training institutions), etc. In the course of the current year we may want to begin planning of the work. (I believe this requires initially an in-house or commissioned planning piece.)

3. *Developing a research capability*

Two steps were taken so far: the development of two major research projects to support the development effort in lead communities (Holtz and Gamoran) and the preparation of a background paper by Dr. Isa Aron. We have not yet found financial support for this project.

4. *Establishing lead communities*

(See above).

January 26, 1993

F a l l S e m i n a r — S o m e S u g g e s t i o n s s

An event to start work, inform, set the terms, create the dialogue.

The components might include:

1. General meeting of CIJE and lead community representatives re: the project in general and the CIJE's contribution. Includes CIJE and lead community lay leadership (10-20 people per community plus CIJE staff and consultants, as well as lay people for part of the meetings).
 - a. Communities introduce themselves, their views, hopes, ideas, past achievements, etc.
 - b. The CIJE introduces the present state of the lead community idea—its evolution from the Commission to today. The notion of these communities as spearheads for systemic change—for addressing the problems of Jewish education/continuity.
2. Lay leaders to lay leaders—issues of funding and community mobilization.
3. Vision and goals: presentation and discussion followed by work with representatives of the training institutions and others who will be leading this effort.
4. Professionals, educators, rabbis: build upon their work, commitments, convictions.
 - a. Discussion of the project, the process, getting to work.
 - b. The Best Practices Project: presentation and discussion—includes consultants on content.
 - c. Monitoring, Evaluation and Feedback: same.
 - d. Planning:
 - *self-study*
 - *pilot projects*
 - *one year plan*
 - *five year plan*
 - *the ongoing CIJE seminar*
5. Networking among lead communities.

6. Meetings with organizations, purveyors of programs and programmatic foundations: to discuss specific interests and projects
 - *in-service training programs*
 - *CAJE*
 - *JESNA*
 - *JCCA*
 - *the Melton mini-school*
 - *the CRB foundation*
 - *etc.*
7. Closing session and discussion of next steps.

CIJE -- Workplan -- Draft

Task Name	Start	End	1992				1993											
			Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	D
Appoint staff consultant	15/Sep/92	15/Sep/92	-2															
Develop Networking between communiti	01/Dec/92	01/Dec/92																
Communications and pr	15/Sep/92	28/Aug/93																
Gear up towards implementation	10/Aug/93	10/Aug/93																
	15/Sep/92	15/Sep/92	A															
Ongoing	15/Sep/92	02/Sep/93																
Fundraising	15/Sep/92	28/Aug/93																
Board meetings	14/Feb/93	14/Feb/93																
Board Committees	15/Sep/92	15/Sep/92																
Executive Committee	29/Nov/92	29/Nov/92																
Senior Advisors	31/Oct/92	31/Oct/92																
Planning Seminar	30/Nov/92	26/May/93																
Mobilizing constituencies	15/Sep/92	31/Aug/93																
National organizations	15/Sep/92	30/Aug/93																
Purveyors of programs	15/Sep/92	28/Aug/93																
Foundations	15/Sep/92	28/Aug/93																
Individuals	15/Sep/92	31/Aug/93																
Educators and Rabbis	15/Sep/92	28/Aug/93																
Staff seminars	18/Oct/92	18/Oct/92																
Ongoing guidance to projects	15/Sep/92	09/Aug/93																
Networking	15/Sep/92	02/Sep/93																
Plan years two and three	12/Jul/93	30/Aug/93																
	15/Sep/92	15/Sep/92	A															
Community Mobilization and Communicati	15/Sep/92	01/Sep/93																
Plan	00/Jan/93	26/Aug/93																
From 3 to 23	07/Jan/93	01/Sep/93																
Communications program	07/Jan/93	31/Aug/93																
	15/Sep/92	15/Sep/92	A															
Building the Profession	15/Sep/92	08/Sep/93																
Plan	10/Mar/93	08/Sep/93																
	15/Sep/92	15/Sep/92	A															
Develop a Research capability	16/Aug/93	16/Aug/93																
Decide on next steps	16/Aug/93	16/Aug/93																

At the end of the year

CIJE -- Workplan -- Draft

Task Name	Start	End	1992				1993											
			Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	D
Lead Communities	15/Sep/92	02/Sep/93																
Launch Activities	15/Sep/92	15/Sep/92																
Prepare written guidelines	15/Sep/92	20/Oct/92																
Written agreement	15/Sep/92	30/Sep/92																
Planning guidelines	15/Sep/92	20/Oct/92																
Negotiate Agreement	15/Sep/92	30/NOV/92																
Present project to Community	15/Sep/92	01/Dec/92																
CIJE staff preparation	15/Sep/92	01/Dec/92																
Launch Monitoring	15/Sep/92	26/Aug/93																
Introduce in community	15/Sep/92	25/Sep/92																
Develop feedback loop	15/Sep/92	30/NOV/92																
Set terms for first report	15/Sep/92	27/NOV/92																
Feedback from findings	19/Jan/93	26/Aug/93																
Launch Best Practices	15/Sep/92	02/Sep/93																
Introduce	15/Sep/92	30/NOV/92																
Develop method	15/Sep/92	02/Sep/93																
Provide consultants	15/Sep/92	02/Sep/93																
Vision project	15/Sep/92	31/Aug/93																
Develop project	15/Sep/92	31/Aug/93																
Work with IHJL etc..	15/Sep/92	26/Aug/93																
Introduce in communities	16/Nov/92	26/Aug/93																
Convene first planning seminar	01/Dec/92	01/Dec/92																
Community process	15/Sep/92	26/Aug/93																
Work with educators, rabbis	15/Sep/92	27/Aug/93																
Planning guidance	15/Sep/92	26/Aug/93																
Self study	01/Nov/92	30/Apr/93																
First year plan	15/Sep/92	31/Dec/92																
Pilot projects	00/Feb/93	08/Feb/93																
Five year plan	01/Dec/92	26/Aug/93																
Work with foundations	15/Sep/92	26/Aug/93																
Work with program purveyors	15/Sep/92	26/Aug/93																
Work with national organizations	15/Sep/92	26/Aug/93																
Funding facilitation	15/Sep/92	26/Aug/93																

F
A
X

C
O
V
E
R

S
H
E
E
T

**Council for Initiatives
in
Jewish Education**

Date sent: *1/18* Time sent:

No. of Pages (incl. cover): *20*

To: *ARH & SF*

From: *Teddy Davis*

Organization:

Phone Number:

Phone Number: 216-391-1852

Fax Number:

Fax Number: 216-391-5430

Comments:

MINUTES: CIJE Steering Committee

DATE OF MEETING: January 4, 1994

DATE MINUTES ISSUED: January 14, 1994

PRESENT: Morton L. Mandel (Chair), Sandee Brawarsky, John Colman, Gail A. Dorph, Adam Gamoran, Stephen H. Hoffman, Alan D. Hoffmann, Barry Holtz, Daniel Pekarsky, Charles Ratner, Esther Leah Ritz, Richard A. Shatten, Virginia F. Levi (Sec'y)

COPY TO: Seymour Fox, Annette R. Hochstein, Henry L. Zucker

I. Introductory Remarks

Mort Mandel opened the meeting by introducing participants. He thanked those present for agreeing to participate in the work of the Steering Committee and noted that the primary purpose of the committee is to help evaluate ideas, and set priorities. Normally decisions will be made by the board of CIJE.

Members of the Steering Committee will include the chairs of CIJE committees and staff. The group will meet as frequently as is practical and useful.

II. Update

Alan Hoffmann noted that the Steering Committee will be helpful in clarifying goals and methods of reaching them.

He noted that the Commission on Jewish Education in North America completed its work a little more than three years ago. It concluded with a plan to work in the following five areas:

1. Build a profession of Jewish education.
2. Mobilize community support.
3. Develop a research capability.
4. Establish Lead Communities in which to work toward local systemic change.
5. Create the Council for Initiatives in Jewish Education.

During the first year and a half of its existence, CIJE worked to develop and move ahead with the concept of best practices for Jewish education while also building a team for monitoring, evaluation and feedback of the work in Lead Communities. At the same time, a process was developed and followed for selecting the Lead Communities.

Following an initial expression of interest by 45 communities, 23 submitted applications and 3 were selected. A joint meeting of the Lead Communities and CIJE staff in Cleveland in April 1993 clarified the importance of partnership among the communities and CIJE. The next joint meeting, held in August 1993 in Baltimore, focused on the content

of work in the Lead Communities. The most recent meeting, held in November 1993 in Montreal, provided the Lead Communities with a curriculum for taking the results of research on local Jewish education personnel and moving toward a personnel action plan.

In the area of monitoring, evaluation and feedback, we have broken important ground by putting in place a team which can monitor what is happening, evaluate outcomes, and provide feedback to local communities and CIJE. This model shows how research can be used in working for change.

Clearly, CIJE has focused most heavily on the establishment of Lead Communities while the other three recommendations of the Commission have received less attention. In fact, CIJE is about changing Jewish education for all of North America.

As the staff team which was constituted in August 1993 has begun its work in the Lead Communities, the following issues have surfaced:

1. CIJE has chosen the local federation as the home for systemic reform in Jewish education. There is an inherent tension between the federation approach of working through consensus and CIJE goals of reform and radical change. Getting wall-to-wall coalitions to take revolutionary steps presents a significant challenge.
2. CIJE is an intermediary organization. This means that we do not have the same direct control over the change process that a local commission has. For example, CIJE can prepare materials for use by local communities and can recommend their use, suggest benchmarks, and set deadlines. However, as an intermediary organization we do not have (nor want) the local clout to implement and follow through. Yet local implementation is a must.
3. The work with the Lead Communities has suggested that the following three variables must be present in order for systemic change in Jewish education to occur in any community:
 - a. A federation executive director who will make betterment of Jewish education a personal priority.
 - b. One or more lay champions on the key leadership team.
 - c. A high caliber local professional driving the educational process.
4. The Commission itself chose to sidestep the issue of goals for Jewish education in order to reach consensus on its recommendations. However, any local community inevitably gets to questions of goals, mission, and vision. Daniel Pekarsky has

agreed to consult with CIJE on goals in conjunction with the Mandel Institute staff's work on the goals project and the Educated Jew project.

CIJE currently faces the following challenges:

1. How can we reenergize the process of deliberation, strategic thinking and planning by lay leaders which worked so effectively during the work of the Commission? Leadership of CIJE needs to be more fully engaged.
2. How should we work for effective dissemination of our progress? Because we have not yet clearly articulated what CIJE is about, we risk becoming pigeon-holed as "the Lead Communities project."
3. How do we move beyond where we are now? How do we extend our involvement with more communities? Thought has been given to using Ted Sizer's concept to establish a "coalition of essential communities."

In the discussion that followed, the following points were made: By working in the Lead Communities we have begun to impact change on a local level. However, building the profession and developing community support requires work on a continental level. We may wish to think about establishing an equivalent to the Jerusalem Fellows and Senior Educators programs in North America, drawing upon the resources of the denominational training institutions and others with appropriate expertise.

Since few communities seem to possess all three of the elements which have been identified as critical, we should determine what incentives could be used to gain the commitment of the local federation executive and appropriate lay champions and to draw the caliber of professional we seek. We should be careful to remember that the three elements we have identified as central to this process appear to be necessary conditions, but are probably not sufficient to accomplish our goal.

At present, research is being directed locally. Should we consider a parallel track with respect to national factors? For example, can we identify factors that could motivate leaders to work for Jewish education?

The relationship of local communities to an intermediary organization might be clarified through written agreements. CIJE does have leverage in the form of expertise which it can provide or not. We will develop the expertise to go into a community, evaluate what is in place, and recommend changes.

1

III

▲

It was suggested that the Steering Committee consider developing a set of outcomes toward which CIJE might work over a ten year period. These outcomes, which should be revised annually, would serve as the basis for an annual work plan.

In discussion, it was noted that it will be difficult to generate agreement around some outcomes. However, we should be able to identify outcomes with clear consensus. One such outcome might be to attract top people to identified positions in Jewish education. We might identify desired outcomes that fit under these headings: building the profession, improving lay leadership, program and content, and developing a research capability.

Assignment

B.

The first annual work plan to be based on a total vision will be for the year 1995. An interim work plan has been prepared for use in 1994.

TV

The Steering Committee will function as a "think tank" for CIJE. Its role will be different from that of either the Executive Committee or the board. It will meet approximately six times each year and will work to prepare recommendations for presentation to the board.

v.

It is suggested that the operation of CIJE be shifted to four functional committees. Each will have a chair, a vice chair, and members from the CIJE board and will be staffed by CIJE staff and consultants. Each will submit to the Board its own total vision and work plan which, after approval, will become the overall vision and annual plan for CIJE. Each committee will define its role and set its mission.

Following is a list of the committees including proposed responsibilities, chairs, staff people, and related organizations with which each might work.

<u>Committee (and Responsibilities)</u>	<u>Chair</u>	<u>Staff</u>	<u>Related Organizations</u>
1. <u>Building the Profession</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recruiting • Career Development • Seniors; Senior Seniors Developed • Pre-service training • Lead Communities 	(MLM)	G. Dorph	Training institutions CAJE
2. <u>Community Development</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3-23 • Community support • Foundation networking • Managing relationship with CJF Commission • Lead Communities 	G. Ratner	A. Hoffmann S. Hoffman	CJF JAFI JCCA
3. <u>Content and Program</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Program development • Best Practices • Goals • Diffusion • Communication • Lead Communities 	J. Colman	B. Holtz (D. Pekarsky)	JESNA, JCCA
4. <u>Research, Monitoring</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lead Communities 	E. L. Ritz	A. Gamoran (E. Goldring)	

Steering Committee members were asked to recommend board members for assignment to the various committees. VFL will check the list of people who were originally assigned to a committee on Lead Communities for possible inclusion on the Community Development Committee and will collate suggestions for board membership. MLM and ADH will then recommend assignments to committees.

Each committee will meet in conjunction with the two board meetings to be held each year. Additional independent meetings will be scheduled.

It was suggested that board meetings would be two-day affairs scheduled as follows:

<u>Day One</u>	10 a.m. to 4 p.m. - Steering Committee (or 10 a.m. to 2 p.m.)
	4 p.m. to 6 p.m. - Executive Committee (or 2 p.m. to 6 p.m.)

Assignment

Day Two 8:30 a.m. to Noon - Committee Meetings

Noon to 4 p.m. - Luncheon and Board Meeting

It was suggested that the two days might include a plenary session during which all four committees, each of which has Lead Community responsibilities, would be provided with an update on the happenings in the Lead Communities.

It was also suggested that the board should grapple with issues rather than simply hear reports. We might bring the issues of one or two of the committees to each board meeting for consideration.

It was suggested that we consider holding two committee meetings at one time, similar to sessions at a conference, so that there could be broader participation of board members.

It was recommended that each two-day board meeting include a Jewish study component. It was also recommended that we continue to invite members of the Commission on Jewish Education in North America and other guests to a segment of the board meeting once every year or two years.

VI. Role of Board

A. Board of Directors

As noted above, we should work to ensure that the board is engaged in discussion of issues. Reports should be sent in writing rather than presented orally at meetings. Staff will be assigned to all Board members to keep them briefed.

One approach might be to begin the board meeting on the evening of day one, following the Executive Committee meeting, with a presentation of general interest which would generate discussion. Commission members would be invited to these presentations. The following morning the committees would meet, followed by a business meeting of the board.

B. Executive Committee

The Executive Committee will include committee chairs, officers, and other carefully selected individuals. It will be responsible for such managerial issues as budget and professional staffing.

VII. Role of Consultants

We have several consultants working with CIJE on a regular basis. These include Adam Gamoran and Ellen Goldring on monitoring, evaluation and feedback and Daniel Pekarsky on the goals project. Seymour Fox, Annette Hochstein, and their co-workers at the Mandel Institute are taking on specific content assignments. In addition, Annette Hochstein is working with Adam and Ellen on monitoring, evaluation and feedback.

There was once a recommendation for the creation of a group of CIJE fellows. It was suggested that this would be a good item for consideration by the committee on building the profession.

VIII. Review of the Goals and Educated Jew Projects

It was reported that as the work of the Commission unfolded, it became clear that there was very little literature on the desired outcomes of Jewish education. As a result, the Mandel Institute invited three Judaic scholars to write papers on their own concepts of the outcome of a Jewish education or what is an educated Jew. The participants were Isadore Twersky, Moshe Greenberg, and Menachem Brinker. Each was asked to write from his own point of view. Israel Scheffler, a leading philosopher of general education, was asked to write a similar paper reviewing different conceptions of the educated person. Michael Rosenak was asked to look at this question from the point of view of Jewish education. Seymour Fox was responsible for the entire concept and for conducting the deliberation. These papers were then shared with leading Jewish educators who reflected on what an educational system might look like in order to implement the ideas proposed by each of the original philosophers. The scholars then redrafted their papers on the basis of the work of the educators. Following this process, the papers have undergone at least three iterations. The collected papers will be published with the goal of providing a model for how to deal with the outcomes of Jewish education.

The CIJE goals project will involve itself in trying to help individual institutions and communities to develop goals. This involves differentiating between instrumental and substantive goals and defining the ideal that drives the enterprise. It is a basis for translating vision to practice. Daniel Pekařsky is working with the Mandel Institute on developing a way to present this to North American communities.

After hearing this summary of the two projects, it was suggested that a presentation on the Educated Jew project might be an interesting topic for a board meeting.

IX. CIJE Mission Statement

A mission statement developed for CIJE in 1990 served as the starting point for this discussion.

It was suggested that the following might serve as an introductory paragraph to a mission statement: "The CIJE was created by the Commission on Jewish Education in North America with a highly focussed mission that incorporates three major tasks: 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."

A second section of the mission statement might indicate that the mission is to be implemented through the following means, then list the names of the four committees and include a brief paragraph indicating what each hopes to accomplish. It would be the role of each committee

to develop the language to describe its role in accomplishing CIJE's mission. This would be refined at the committee meetings.

The mission statement should also refer to CIJE's desire to engage in a partnership with select communities to demonstrate that innovation can have a lasting impact and to help local communities shape their agendas for Jewish education.

It was suggested that we refer to CIJE as an agent to assist Jewish communities and institutions to provide effective Jewish education. It was also suggested that the mission statement refer to the role of CIJE as intermediary, perhaps using the following language: "One job of CIJE as an intermediary is to facilitate the success of the service delivering institutions. We cause outcomes to occur through advocacy, research, forcing initiatives, energizing, and synergizing. Our outcomes relate to how the service delivering institutions behave."

Assignment Alan will develop a draft mission statement for consideration by the Steering Committee.

X. Lay Leadership Development for Jewish Continuity and CIJE

CIJE needs a board of leaders who are wise, experienced, and willing to work. It is hoped that the committee structure will help to encourage this involvement. In addition to working with our current board members, we should identify new people for board participation. We might identify people to add to committees with the thought of eventually naming some of them to the board. At the same time, we should develop a means of rotating non-participants off the board. We should have a set of by-laws to help facilitate this rotation.

With respect to lay leadership beyond the CIJE board, it was noted that there are many people involved in local commissions on Jewish education. We may wish to consider holding a national conference for these people or for a select sub-group.

XI. CJF Commission

Reference was made to the CJF North American Commission on Jewish Identity and Continuity. Steve Hoffman and Alan Hoffmann will continue to monitor the relationship of the CJF Commission to CIJE.

XII. Communications with all Publics

The following publics were identified as groups with whom CIJE should be communicating:

A. Lay Leadership

- members of the CIJE board
- people on local continuity commissions
- other national lay leaders
- others

B. Jewish Educators

- leaders of institutions (local and national)
- central agency personnel

C. Opinionmakers/Centers of Influence

D. Existing Publications

- JCC Circle
- JESNA's Agenda

(We might submit an occasional article)

E. Academics/Intellectuals/Professors of Jewish Studies

F. Congregations and Rabbis

G. Training Institutions

We may wish to develop different kinds of publications for these different publics. One suggestion was to produce a newsletter which invites feedback from the readers. Initially, we have engaged Sandee Brawarsky to work with us on the development of a brochure to describe CIJE.

XIII. 1994 Interim Workplan

Alan Hoffmann circulated a first draft of a 1994 interim workplan for review. He noted that as the work of CIJE has grown from a primary focus on the Lead Communities to more extensive work with other communities and the establishment of CIJE as a national identity, the redeployment of staff to accomplish these goals has not yet been determined.

Assignment

Alan will rework the draft workplan and will send it to Steering Committee members in February.

XIV. Future Meeting Dates

The following dates were set for future meetings of the Steering Committee:

Tuesday, March 15 (in Cleveland)

Wednesday, April 20 (in New York--in conjunction with a board meeting on April 21)

Friday, September 23 (in New York)

Wednesday, October 19 (in New York--in conjunction with board meeting on October 20)



- ☐ ASSIGNMENTS
☐ ACTIVE PROJECTS
☐ RAW MATERIAL
☐ FUNCTIONAL SCHEDULE

73450 (REV. 1/79) PRINTED IN U.S.A.

FUNCTION

CIJE STEERING COMMITTEE

SUBJECT/OBJECTIVE

DORPH ASSIGNMENTS

ORIGINATOR/PROJECT LEADER · VFL

DATE 1/17/94

NO.	DESCRIPTION	PRIORITY	ASSIGNED TO (INITIALS)	DATE ASSIGNED STARTED	DUE DATE	COMPLETED OR REMOVED DATE
1.	Develop pilot project on early childhood education project on Best Practices.		GD	1/4/94	2/15/94	
2.	Work with Milwaukee to plan a summer teachers' institute at Melitz (Melton).		GD	12/1/93	6/15/94	



- ☐ ASSIGNMENTS
☐ ACTIVE PROJECTS
☐ RAW MATERIAL
☐ FUNCTIONAL SCHEDULE

73890 (REV. 1/89) PRINTED IN U.S.A.

FUNCTION

CIJE STEERING COMMITTEE

SUBJECT/OBJECTIVE

FOX ASSIGNMENTS

ORIGINATOR/PROJECT LEADER VFL

DATE 1/17/94

NO.	DESCRIPTION	PRIORITY	ASSIGNED TO (INITIALS)	DATE ASSIGNED STARTED	DUE DATE	COMPLETED OR REMOVED DATE
1.	Finalize arrangements for Blaustein grant with D. Hirschhorn.		SF	7/22/93	TBD	
	With SHH, develop a plan for involving denominations in each Lead Community process.		SF	3/31/93	TBD	
3.	Contact the following board members ...		SF	11/8/93	TBD	
	a. Alfred Gottschalk					
	b. David Hirschhorn					
	c. S. Martin Lipset					
	d. Florence Melton					
	e. Isadore Twersky					

- ☐ ASSIGNMENTS
- ☐ ACTIVE PROJECTS
- ☐ RAW MATERIAL
- ☐ FUNCTIONAL SCHEDULE

13870 (REV. 1/89) PRINTED IN U.S.A.

FUNCTION CIJE STEERING COMMITTEE

SUBJECT/OBJECTIVE GOLD RING ASSIGNMENTS

ORIGINATOR/PROJECT LEADER

VFL

DATE 1/17/94

NO.	DESCRIPTION	PRIORITY	ASSIGNED TO (INITIALS)	DATE ASSIGNED STARTED	DUE DATE	COMPLETED OR REMOVED DATE
1.	Develop program on educational leadership for lead communities.		EG	1/4/94	3/15/94	

- ☐ ASSIGNMENTS
☐ ACTIVE PROJECTS
☐ RAW MATERIAL
☐ FUNCTIONAL SCHEDULE

73890 (REV. 1/89) PRINTED IN U.S.A.

FUNCTION CIJE STEERING COMMITTEE

SUBJECT/OBJECTIVE HOLTZ ASSIGNMENTS

ORIGINATOR/PROJECT LEADER VFL

DATE 1/17/94

NO.	DESCRIPTION	PRIORITY	ASSIGNED TO (INITIALS)	DATE ASSIGNED STARTED	DUPLICATE DATE	COMPLETED OR REMOVED DATE
1.	Prepare a memo summarizing proposal on distribution of CIJE materials (Woocher - possibility).		BH	5/28/93	1/31/94	
2.	Contact the following board members...		BH	11/8/93	TBD	
	a. Gerald Cohen					
	b. Susan Crown					
	c. Billie Gold					
	d. Neil Greenbaum					
	e. Thomas Hausdorff					
	f. Mark Lainer					
	g. Matthew Maryles					
	h. David Teutsch					

- ☐ ASSIGNMENTS
☒ **ACTIVE PROJECTS**
☐ RAW MATERIAL
☐ FUNCTIONAL SCHEDULE

71890 (REV. 1/79) PRINTED IN U.S.A.

FUNCTION **CIJE STEERING COMMITTEE**

SUBJECT/OBJECTIVE **LEVI ASSIGNMENTS**

ORIGINATOR/PROJECT LEADER **VFL** DATE **1/17/94**

NO.	DESCRIPTION	PRIORITY	ASSIGNED TO (INITIALS)	DATE ASSIGNED STARTED	DUE DATE	COMPLETED OR REMOVED DATE
1.	Collate committee recommendations, add Lead Community search committee members, and submit to MLM and ADH.		VFL	1/4/94	1/14/94	
2.	Revise and reprint letterhead.		VFL	9/21/93	2/15/94	
3.	Review files on financial commitments of CIJE supporters and be sure Barry Reis' records are complete.		VFL	9/21/93	2/15/94	
4.	Design and order business cards for staff.		VFL	9/21/93	2/15/94	
5.	Plan to discuss letters of agreement for the Lead Communities. Consider including our expectations regarding the sort of lay and professional involvement we expect.		VFL	4/7/93	TBD	
6.	Work with ADH on budget. Start with work plan and structure.		VFL	9/21/93	TBD	



- ☐ ASSIGNMENTS
☐ ACTIVE PROJECTS
☐ RAW MATERIAL
☐ FUNCTIONAL SCHEDULE

73090 (REV. 1/82) PRINTED IN U.S.A.

FUNCTION	CIJE STEERING COMMITTEE		
SUBJECT/OBJECTIVE	A. HOFFMANN ASSIGNMENTS		
ORIGINATOR	PROJECT LEADER	VFL	DATE 1/17/94

NO.	DESCRIPTION	PRIORITY	ASSIGNED TO (INITIALS)	DATE ASSIGNED STARTED	DUE DATE	COMPLETED OR REMOVED DATE
1.	Redraft 1994 work plan and send to Steering Committee members.		ADH	1/4/94	2/20/94	
2.	Work with lead communities on recruiting senior educators.		ADH	1/4/94	3/1/94	
	Develop descriptive brochure for CIJE.		ADH	9/21/93	3/15/94	
4.	Prepare draft of CIJE desired ten year outcomes for review by Steering Committee.		ADH	1/4/94	3/15/94	
5.	Draft CIJE mission statement.		ADH	1/4/94	3/15/94	
6.	Work with CRB Foundation to clarify relationship of Israel experience programs to Lead Communities.		ADH	7/22/93	TBD	
7.	Work with VFL on budget--start with work plan with structure.		ADH	9/21/93	TBD	
8.	Develop a communications program: internal; with our board and advisors; with the broader community.		ADH	9/21/93	TBD	
9.	Work with MLM about approaching Jesse's son family.		ADH	6/8/93	TBD	



PREMIER INDUSTRIAL CORPORATION

- ☐ ASSIGNMENTS
☐ ACTIVE PROJECTS
☐ RAW MATERIAL
☐ FUNCTIONAL SCHEDULE

FORM 100 (REV. 1/89) PRINTED IN U.S.A.

SEE MANAGEMENT MANUAL POLICY NO. 1.5
FOR GUIDELINES ON THE COMPLETION
OF THIS FORM FOR A FUNCTIONAL SCHEDULE

FUNCTION CIJE STEERING COMMITTEE

SUBJECT/OBJECTIVE HOCHSTEIN ASSIGNMENTS

ORIGINATOR/PROJECT LEADER

VFL

DATE

1/17/94

NO.	DESCRIPTION	PRIORITY	ASSIGNED TO (INITIALS)	DATE ASSIGNED STARTED	DUE DATE	COMPLETED OR REMOVED DATE
1.	Contact the following board members... a. David Arnow b. Norman Lamm c. Esther Leah Ritz d. Ismar Schorsch		ARH	11/8/93	TBD	

- ☐ ASSIGNMENTS
- ☐ ACTIVE PROJECTS
- ☐ RAW MATERIAL
- ☐ FUNCTIONAL SCHEDULE

73890 (REV. 1/89) PRINTED IN U.S.A.

FUNCTION	CIJE STEERING COMMITTEE
SUBJECT/OBJECTIVE	MANDEL ASSIGNMENTS
ORIGINATOR/PROJECT LEADER	VFL
DATE	1/17/94

NO.	DESCRIPTION	PRIORITY	ASSIGNED TO (INITIALS)	DATE ASSIGNED STARTED	DUE DATE	COMPLETED OR REMOVED DATE
1.	Contact the following board members... a. Charles Bronfman b. Max Fisher c. Lester Pollack d. Richard Scheuer		MLM	11/8/93	TBD	
2.	Consider establishing a finance committee.		MLM	4/7/93	TBD	
3.	Visit with Erica Jesselson to get her on board to support CIJE.		MLM	6/17/93	TBD	



- ☐ ASSIGNMENTS
☒ ACTIVE PROJECTS
☐ RAW MATERIAL
☐ FUNCTIONAL SCHEDULE

73890 (REV. 1/79) PRINTED IN U.S.A.

FUNCTION CIJE STEERING COMMITTEE

SUBJECT/OBJECTIVE PEKARSKY ASSIGNMENTS

ORIGINATOR/PROJECT LEADER VFL

DATE 1/17/94

NO.	DESCRIPTION	PRIORITY	ASSIGNED TO (INITIALS)	DATE ASSIGNED STARTED	DUE DATE	COMPLETED OR REMOVED DATE
1.	Develop goals project for lead communities.		DP	1/4/94	4/15/94	

- ☐ ASSIGNMENTS
☐ ACTIVE PROJECTS
☐ RAW MATERIAL
☐ FUNCTIONAL SCHEDULE

73290 (REV. 1/89) PRINTED IN U.S.A.

FUNCTION	CIJE STEERING COMMITTEE
SUBJECT/OBJECTIVE	ZUCKER ASSIGNMENTS
ORIGINATOR/PROJECT LEADER	VFL
DATE	1/17/94

NO.	DESCRIPTION	PRIORITY	ASSIGNED TO (INITIALS)	DATE ASSIGNED STARTED	DUE DATE	COMPLETED OR REMOVED DATE
1.	Contact the following board members... a. Mandell Berman b. John Colman c. Maurice Corson		HLZ	11/8/93	TBD	

MEMORANDUM

July 13, 1993

To: CIJE Board

From: Dr. Barry W. Holtz

Re: Update - The Best Practices Project

The Best Practices Project has many long-range implications. Documenting "the success stories of Jewish education" is something that has never been done in a systematic way and it is a project that cannot be completed within a short range of time. This memo outlines the way that the Best Practices Project should unfold over the next 1 to 2 years.

Documentation and Work in the Field

The easiest way to think about the Best Practices Project--and probably the most useful--is to see it as one large project which seeks to examine eight or nine areas (what we have called "divisions"). The project involves two phases of work. First is the documentation stage. Here examples of best practice are located and reports are written. The second phase consists of "work in the field," the attempt to use these examples of best practice as models of change in the three Lead Communities.

The two phases of the Best Practices Project are only partially sequential. Although it is necessary to have the work of documentation available in order to move toward implementation in the communities, we have also pointed out previously that our long-range goal has always been to see continuing expansion of the documentation in successive "iterations." Thus, the fact that we have published our first best practice publication (on Supplementary Schools) does not mean that we are done with work in that area. We hope in the future to expand upon and enrich that work with more analysis and greater detail.

In the short run, however, we are looking at the plan below as a means of putting out a best practices publication, similar to what we've done for the Supplementary School division, in each of the other areas. What we have learned so far in the project is the process involved in getting to that point. Thus it appears to be necessary to go through the following stages in each of the divisions.

The Steps in Documentation: First Iteration

Preliminary explorations:	To determine with whom I should be meeting
Stage one:	Meeting (or multiple meetings) with experts
Stage two:	Refining of that meeting, leading to a guide for writing up the reports
Stage three:	Visiting the possible best practices sites by report writers
Stage four:	Writing up reports by expert report writers
Stage five:	Editing those reports
Stage six:	Printing the edited version
Stage seven:	Distributing the edited version

Next Steps

For this memo, I've taken each "division" and each stage and tried to analyze where we currently are headed:

- 1) *Supplementary schools*: Mostly done in "iteration #1". There may be two more reports coming in which were originally promised.
- 2) *Early childhood programs*: Here we are at stage six. The volume is in print.
- 3) *JCCs*: Here we are at stage three. This will require visits, report writing, etc. The JCCA is our partner in implementing the documentation.
- 4) *Day schools*: Here we are at stage one, two or three, depending on the religious denomination. Because this involves all the denominations, plus the unaffiliated schools, this will be the most complicated of the projects for the year.
- 5) *College campus programming*: Here we are at stage three, with the national Hillel organization as a partner. One question to deal with is non-Hillel campus activities and how to move forward with that. As to Hillel programs, we need to choose report writers, visit sites, etc.
- 6) *Camping/youth programs*: Here we are at the preliminary stage. We should be able to have a stage one meeting this year. It's probably fairly easy to identify the right participants via the denominations and the JCCA.
- 7) *Adult education*: Here we are at the preliminary stage. We should be able to have a stage one meeting this year. Here gathering the right participants is probably more complex.

- 8) *The Israel experience:* We hope to move this project forward with consultation from the staff of the CRB Foundation. As they are moving forward with their own initiative, we hope to be able to work jointly on the “best practice issues” involved with the successful trip to Israel.
- 9) *Community-wide initiatives:* Finally, I have recommended that we add a ninth area—Community-wide initiatives using JESNA’s help. This refers to Jewish education improvement projects at the Federation or BJE level, particularly in the personnel or lay development area. Examples: The Providence BJE program for teacher accreditation; the Cleveland Fellows; projects with lay boards of synagogue schools run by a BJE; salary/benefits enhancement projects. This project would use JESNA’s assistance and could probably be launched rather quickly.

Lead Communities: Implementation—and How to Do It

In previous reports I have quoted Seymour Fox’s statement that the Best Practice Project is creating the “curriculum” for change in the Lead Communities. This applies in particular to the “enabling options” of building community support for Jewish education and improving the quantity and quality of professional educators. It is obvious from the best practice reports that these two elements will appear and reappear in each of the divisions under study.

The challenge is to develop the method by which the Lead Community planners and educators can learn from the best practices that we have documented and begin to introduce adaptations of those ideas into their own communities. This can occur through a wide range of activities, including: presentations to the local Lead Communities’ commissions about the results of the Best Practices Project, site visits by Lead Community lay leaders and planners to observe best practices in action; visits by best practices practitioners to the Lead Communities; workshops with educators in the Lead Communities, etc. The Best Practices Project will be involved in developing this process of implementation in consultation with the Lead Communities and with other members of the CIJE staff. We have already discussed possible modes of dissemination of information in our conversations with the three communities.

How Can We Spread the Word?

The first report on supplementary schools has engendered a good deal of interest in the larger Jewish educational community. One issue that the CIJE needs to address is the best way to make the results of the Best Practices Project available. How should the dissemination of materials take place? How should the findings of this project have an

impact on communities outside of the Lead Communities? Certainly we should find ways to distribute the materials as they are produced. Perhaps we should also begin to consider a series of meetings or conferences open to other communities or interested parties, as the project moves forward.

MEMORANDUM

July 13, 1993

To: CIJE Board

From: Dr. Barry W. Holtz

Re: Update - The Best Practices Project

The Best Practices Project has many long-range implications. Documenting "the success stories of Jewish education" is something that has never been done in a systematic way and it is a project that cannot be completed within a short range of time. This memo outlines the way that the Best Practices Project should unfold over the next 1 to 2 years.

Documentation and Work in the Field

The easiest way to think about the Best Practices Project--and probably the most useful--is to see it as one large project which seeks to examine eight or nine areas (what we have called "divisions"). The project involves two phases of work. First is the documentation stage. Here examples of best practice are located and reports are written. The second phase consists of "work in the field," the attempt to use these examples of best practice as models of change in the three Lead Communities.

The two phases of the Best Practices Project are only partially sequential. Although it is necessary to have the work of documentation available in order to move toward implementation in the communities, we have also pointed out previously that our long-range goal has always been to see continuing expansion of the documentation in successive "iterations." Thus, the fact that we have published our first best practice publication (on Supplementary Schools) does not mean that we are done with work in that area. We hope in the future to expand upon and enrich that work with more analysis and greater detail.

In the short run, however, we are looking at the plan below as a means of putting out a best practices publication, similar to what we've done for the Supplementary School division, in each of the other areas. What we have learned so far in the project is the process involved in getting to that point. Thus it appears to be necessary to go through the following stages in each of the divisions.

The Steps in Documentation: First Iteration

Preliminary explorations:	To determine with whom I should be meeting
Stage one:	Meeting (or multiple meetings) with experts
Stage two:	Refining of that meeting, leading to a guide for writing up the reports
Stage three:	Visiting the possible best practices sites by report writers
Stage four:	Writing up reports by expert report writers
Stage five:	Editing those reports
Stage six:	Printing the edited version
Stage seven:	Distributing the edited version

Next Steps

For this memo, I've taken each "division" and each stage and tried to analyze where we currently are headed:

- 1) *Supplementary schools*: Mostly done in "iteration #1". There may be two more reports coming in which were originally promised.
- 2) *Early childhood programs*: Here we are at stage six. The volume is in print.
- 3) *JCCs*: Here we are at stage three. This will require visits, report writing, etc. The JCCA is our partner in implementing the documentation.
- 4) *Day schools*: Here we are at stage one, two or three, depending on the religious denomination. Because this involves all the denominations, plus the unaffiliated schools, this will be the most complicated of the projects for the year.
- 5) *College campus programming*: Here we are at stage three, with the national Hillel organization as a partner. One question to deal with is non-Hillel campus activities and how to move forward with that. As to Hillel programs, we need to choose report writers, visit sites, etc.
- 6) *Camping/youth programs*: Here we are at the preliminary stage. We should be able to have a stage one meeting this year. It's probably fairly easy to identify the right participants via the denominations and the JCCA.
- 7) *Adult education*: Here we are at the preliminary stage. We should be able to have a stage one meeting this year. Here gathering the right participants is probably more complex.

- 8) *The Israel experience:* We hope to move this project forward with consultation from the staff of the CRB Foundation. As they are moving forward with their own initiative, we hope to be able to work jointly on the “best practice issues” involved with the successful trip to Israel.
- 9) *Community-wide initiatives:* Finally, I have recommended that we add a ninth area—Community-wide initiatives using JESNA’s help. This refers to Jewish education improvement projects at the Federation or BJE level, particularly in the personnel or lay development area. Examples: The Providence BJE program for teacher accreditation; the Cleveland Fellows; projects with lay boards of synagogue schools run by a BJE; salary/benefits enhancement projects. This project would use JESNA’s assistance and could probably be launched rather quickly.

Lead Communities: Implementation—and How to Do It

In previous reports I have quoted Seymour Fox’s statement that the Best Practice Project is creating the “curriculum” for change in the Lead Communities. This applies in particular to the “enabling options” of building community support for Jewish education and improving the quantity and quality of professional educators. It is obvious from the best practice reports that these two elements will appear and reappear in each of the divisions under study.

The challenge is to develop the method by which the Lead Community planners and educators can learn from the best practices that we have documented and begin to introduce adaptations of those ideas into their own communities. This can occur through a wide range of activities, including: presentations to the local Lead Communities’ commissions about the results of the Best Practices Project, site visits by Lead Community lay leaders and planners to observe best practices in action; visits by best practices practitioners to the Lead Communities; workshops with educators in the Lead Communities, etc. The Best Practices Project will be involved in developing this process of implementation in consultation with the Lead Communities and with other members of the CIJE staff. We have already discussed possible modes of dissemination of information in our conversations with the three communities.

How Can We Spread the Word?

The first report on supplementary schools has engendered a good deal of interest in the larger Jewish educational community. One issue that the CIJE needs to address is the best way to make the results of the Best Practices Project available. How should the dissemination of materials take place? How should the findings of this project have an

impact on communities outside of the Lead Communities? Certainly we should find ways to distribute the materials as they are produced. Perhaps we should also begin to consider a series of meetings or conferences open to other communities or interested parties, as the project moves forward.