MS-831: Jack, Joseph, and Morton Mandel Foundation Records, 1980 – 2008. Series E: Mandel Foundation Israel, 1984 – 1999.

Box Folder D-1 1976

CIJE Lead Communities Project Simulation Seminar and reports. CJENA reports, 1990-1993.

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

AGENDA

MARSHALL S. LEVIN

April 27, 1993

- 11. Review materials
- 2. Meetings: desired outcomes

format content participants

- 3. Schedule
- 4. Admin (see note)

MAY MEETING

Iteration 1

Desired Outcomes

- . Begin shared vision for LC
- . Trust/rellationship building
- . Some concrete steps
 Actions (e.g., Calendar)
 Decisions
- . Solidify relationship CLJE-Local federation

Cherry Com

COMMUNITIES

- 1. False starts
- 2. CLJE chain of command
 - Who is in charge?
 - What/Who is the CIJE?
- 3. Community agenda Versus CIJE agenda

Not always in sync

- 4. Role of field-researchers
 - a) Feedback loop
 - b) Who are they serving
 - c) When will they do what
 - d) Lack of involvement w/CUE and w/community
- 5. Funding role of CLJE unclear Funding Versus

Fundraising

Different visions by different actors

- 7. Need to define "elements" "terms" "concepts" and discuss w/communities
 - a) Systtemic change
 - b) Partnership
 - Lay Pro relationship

 1 Professional Credibility

 Each denomination

 Within Each actors' group
 - Within Each actors' group

 Each community
 - Major institutions (Federations versus M#1X

Across <

- c) Who is the client? Each community or all 3 together?
- d) Who is "we" in the community?
- e) CIJE—lack of understanding of CIJE

Tank Piccola

- Joint planning process
- gf Scope + who decides (community/federation)

MF Professional credibility

- 8. Calendar of events + lead time
 - 2 year
 - as matter of respect
- 9. Team building & trust buildina

CWE

- 1. False starts
- 2. Limited presentation of idea
 - Pros—limited
 - Lay group—no
 - Rabbis—no
 - Educators—limited
- 3. Educators' Survey Why yes?
- 4. No mapping of communities
 - Problems
 - Opportunities
 - Lay people?
- 5. Denominations are left out
- 6. Selection
- 7. Scope
- 8. Content
- 9. Quality
- 10.CUE Professional credibility
- 11. Full-time LC director

For the Advanced Study and Development of Jewish Education

THE LEAD COMMUNITIES PROJECT

SIMULATION SEMINAR

LOCATIONS:

Mandel Institute

Rechov Hatzfira 22A, Jerusalem

Tel: (02) 618728 / 618412

Mandel Institute

Rechov Yehoshafat 10, Jerusalem

Tel: (02) 617418 / 6199511

SCHEDULE: Tuesday, April 27th, 1993 (at Rechov Hatzfira 22A)

8:30 - 9:00 "Coffee 9:00 - 10:30 "First Session *

112:15 - 1:15 Lunch

11:115 - 2:45 If Whindi Stession 4 = 11

2:45 - 3:00 Refirestiments

3:00 - 4:00 V Fourth Session* *

Wednesday, April 28, 1993 (at Rechov Hatzfira 22A)

1/8:30-9:00 Coffee 9:00 - 10:30 Fifth Session = J 10:30 - 10:45 Coffee break 0'10:45 - 12:15 Sixth Session 112:15 - 1:15 Lunch 1:15 - 2:45 Seventh Session 2:45 - 3:00 Refreshments 3:00 - 4:00 Eight Session

Thursday. April 29, 1993 (at Rechov Yehoshafat 10)

8::30 - 9:00 9:00 - 10:30 10:30 - 10:45 10:45 - 12:15 12:15 - 1:15 1:15 - 2:45 2:45 - 3:00 3::00 - 4:00	Coffee Ninth Session Coffee break Tenth Session Lunch Eleventh Session Refreshments Twelfth Session	Funding survivor.
1:15 - 2:45	Eleventh Session	intres.
3::00 - 4:00	Twelfth Session	23 Comme
		pu 7

For the Advanced Study and Development of Jewish Education

RELATED READING MATERIAL LIST

- A) Marshall Smith & Jennifer O'Day: "Systemic School Reform," pp. 233 267
- B) A Time To Act
- C) Lead Communities Program Guidelines
- Ammette Hochstein: "Lead Communities at Work"
- E) CUE Planning Guide
- F) Adam Gamoran: "The Challenge of Systemic Reform: Lessons From the New Futures Initiatives for the CIE"
- G) Commission on Jewish Education in North America: Background materials (attached).
- H) Sara Lightfoot: The Good High-School pp. 316-323
- I) David Cohen: The Shopping Mall High-School, pp. 304-309
- J) Seymour Fox & Daniel Marom: "Goals for Jewish Education in Lead Communities"
- K) Aryth Davidson: "The Preparation of Jewish Educators in North America: A Status Report" (A report submitted to the Commission on Jewish Education in North America)
- L) Barry W. Holtz: "The Best Practices Project"
- M) Barry W. Holtz: "Best Practices Project: The Supplementary School," CUE February 1993
- N) Barry W. Holtz: "Pilot Projects". Working paper from February 22nd 1993
- O) Adam Gamoran: "Monitoring, Evaluation & Feedback in Lead Communities Tentative Plan of Work for 1992-93 (August 1992)
- P) Adam Gamoran: Update from January 1993

13 Systemic school reform

Marshall S. Smith and Jemnifer 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 stocient 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 ceribility they need to develop strategies best suited to their students. The systemic school teintructures 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. 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 of in 1970 (Cohen 1989 and Cohen in this volume, Cuban 1990). While realization of these disappointing results has promoted cries for exercise effort and more money from some quarters, many analysis attribute the meagemess 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, 'Erst 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) (Steaman and Smith 1985; 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 after the reigning notions of teaching and learning (Cohen 1990, Carnesie Forum 1986, David et al. 19901.2

Largely in response to diese dencionsies in early reform legislation, a 'second vave' et change efforts began building in the middle to late 1980s. This second wawe 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. Perhads 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 slone 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 effil'ive schools maintain a schoolwide vision or mission, and common instructional goals ; bich tie the content, structure, and resources of the school together into an effective, "jiffed 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 sendent 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 cifferent 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

only a vision but also an atmosphere - or 'school climate' - that is conductive to teaching and learning. Minimally, this means freedom from drugs, crime, and chaotic disruptions within the school and a sense of mutual respect among educators and students (Purkey and Smith 1983, Coleman and Hoffer 1987). More positively, it means the construction of a school workplace for teachers and students that both contains the resources and embodies the common purpose and mutual respect necessary for them to be successful. This same literature as well as that on school restructuring further suggests that the common vision and positive school climate can best be promoted by a system of shared decision-making and shared responsibility where the instructional staff, in particular, have an active voice in determining the conditions of work. This might involve shared control not only over how the school is organized in time and space to advance learning and teaching, but also over such things as the hiring of new staff and the expenditure of school discretionary funds.

While other commonalities may exist among successful schools, let us assume that these characteristics - a schoolwide vision and school climate conductive to learning, enthusiastic and knowledgeable teachers, a high quality curriculum and instructional strategies, a high level of engagement, shared decision-making, and parental support and involvement - taken together form the core of the successful school. The obvious question then becomes, why aren't more of our schools like this? Certainly we can all think of a handful, or probably more, of schools that exemplify this quality of education - that have coherent and challenging instructional programs, that genuinely engage all or at least most of their students, and that promote high achievement in their students. Yet these remain the exception rather than the rule in US education.* Their very existence represents tremendous commitment, expertise, and effort on the part of school and perhaps district personnel. Moreover, even with all that effort, the stability and future of such schools are at base quite fragile. Changes in principal, staff, school population or district policy may serve to undermine a hard-built but nonetheless tenuous foundation. The question remains: why are these schools so exceptional and so vulnerable?

It is our contention that systemic barriers in the organization and governance of our educational institutions inhibit such schools from developing in most areas and serve to marginalize and undermine successful schools when they do emerge. We also argue that even the very best of these schools are not accomplishing what they could do if (a) the organizational environment were sufficiently supportive; and (b) the instructional content were truly directed toward complex thinking and problem-solving. In the next section we discuss the systemic barriers to effective schooling in the USA. Then, in the third section, we present one possible strategy for developing the supportive organizational environment and challenging content needed for the next generation of students.

Systemic barriers to educational change

Most traditional explanations of poor schooling in the USA focus on low standards and inadequate resources. Yet the history of school reform demonstrates that even when standards are raised and more or better resources are allocated, little lasting change occurs in the classroom. (Cuban 1984, 1990, Elmore and McLaughlin 1988). Recognizing this, some critics argue that the teaching profession itself is inherently conservative and resistant to change, or that the increasing diversity of the US student population makes broad-based acmievement gains unattainable. Of course, such reasoning ignores the exciting examples of creative and successful schooling situaced in unfriendly environments among students:

perspective on school improvement We argue that a fundamental barrier to developing and sustaining successful schools in the USA is the fragmented, complex, multi-layered educational policy system in which they are embedded (Cohen 1990, Fuhrman 1990).

This system consists of overlapping and often conflicting formal and informal policy components on the one hand and, on the other, of a myriad of contending pressures for immediate results that serve only to further disperse and drain the already fragmented energies of dedicated and well meaning school personnel. On the formal policy side, school personnel are daily confronted with mandates, guidelines, incentives, sanctions, and programs constructed by a half-dozen different federal congressional committees, at least that many federal departments and independent agencies, and the federal courts; state school administrators, legislative committees, boards, commissions and courts; regional or county offices in most states; district level administrators and school boards in 14,000 school districts (with multiple boards and administrative structures in large systems); and all school building administrators, teachers and committees of interested parents. Every

al school building administrators, teachers and committees of interested parents. Every level and many different agencies within levels attempt to influence the curriculum and curricular materials, teacher in-service and pre-service professional development, assessment, student policies such as attendance and promotion, and the special services that schools provide to handicapped, limited English-proficient and low-achieving students.

We do not mean to imply here that structure and regulations are not necessary imgredients for a well-functioning public system. Indeed, we believe that they are absolutely necessary both to create a coherent environment within which schools and school professionals can best perform their jobs and to protect and promote the interests of those most needy in the society. Properly developed and organized, a consistent set of guidelines could create a nurturing structure within which schools could legitimately be held accountable for providing effective education to all students. Indeed, all of the energy currently generated and used by the multiple levels and responsible parties of our educational governance system would be wonderful if it were coordinated (even loosely) and focused on a set of coherent, progressive, long-term strategies to achieve challenging common goals and outcomes.

Unfortunately, it isn't. While there is considerable communication, there is little purposeful coordination. The policy generation machines at each level and within each level have independent timelines, political interests, multiple and changing special interest groups, and few incentives to spend the time and energy to coordinate their efforts. And in the same sea as this governmental octopus are independent for-profit and not-for-profit corporations generating curriculum materials, tests, and teacher and administrator training programs – corporations whose bottom lines are to stay in business or to represent their respective interest groups, not to maximize quality for the majority of students.4

The structural convolutions of the formal and informal policy systems are only the beginning, however. Political pressures on new administrators and elected officials to produce measurable or at least memorable results in short periods of time lead to a "project" mentality. A new classroom management system, an in-service day on the 'left and right brain', a new 'laboratory' filled with computers but little appropriate software, a tougher attendance policy, a new evaluation and accountability office and policy are all familiar concepts to the nation's teachers. Federal and state legislatures often have a similar mentality; there seems to be great political capital in developing 'new' approaches and programs portrayed to address major social problems. Similarly, universities and corporations get into the act - 'adopt-a-school' programs, gifts of computers, time off for employees to teach in schools, all are points of light that blink on and off. Some of these efforts are wonderful, but most are short-lived 'projects', soon to be replaced by a

different 'concept', a new panacea. Though many have a significant effect on the particular school for a short period of time, few leave much of a lasting trace. To many long-term employees of the schools they are properly viewed as marginal and political.

Where does this uncoordinated energy, this short-range perspective, and this multiplicity of purpose lead? On the one hand, they help to produce the overall 'mediocrity' in US education that was criticized by so many observers in the early 1980s. Indeed, the fragmented policy system creates, exacerbates, and prevents the solution of the serious long-term problems in educational content, pedagogy, and support services that have become endemic to the system. Our teachers are badly trained, our cumicula are unchallenging, and our schools are inhospitable workplaces. Many of these problems have been the target of periodic reform measures, including those passed in the last decade. Although generally identified as problems of quality or quantity in resources, these deficiencies ultimately must be attributed to the lack of a coherent strategy for allocating the resources we do have or for overcoming problems in both quality and quantity when they arise.

A second result of the fragmentation we have described is to fortify the basic conservatism that exists in any very large governmental system. By and large, educational practice in this country is not very different from what it was half a century ago (Cultan 1990). Teachers 'close their classroom doors' and teach as they were taught. The multiple infilmences and short-term policy perspective create a protective confusion that allows conventional practice to prevail. When change occurs on a large scale basis it is incommental and reinforces the existing condition. The first wave of reform in the 1980s, for example, can be viewed as 'intensification' of current practice (Firestone et al. 1989). The emphasis was on extending the school day, on increasing course requirements, and on greater amounts of testing. The changes were quantitative, not qualitative, in mature.

Similarly, the sweeping movement toward 'basic skills' in the late 1960s through the carly 1980s emphasized the teacher-directed, skills-oriented, rote and factually-based curriculum and pedagogy that now dominate schooling in the USA (Smith and O'Day in press). One might argue that the basic skills movement is an example of a successful reform – one for which there was a generally common vision and relatively common practice, a reform which was therefore able to permeate the entire system. This movement, however, was 'successful' precisely because it reinforced the already existing norms of the system, because the teachers were comfortable with the content, because the pedagogical implications were known, because the teacher development institutions did not have to change, because the curriculum materials were easy to develop and market, and because the prevailing assessment instruments were generally appropriate. This comfortable situation allowed many of the different policy components of the system to line up in support of the movement – commitment to the movement and in affirmation of the most conservative elements of the system.

In sum, we have argued that fragmented authority structures and multiple short-term and often conflicting goals and policies have created dual conditions within the present educational system: mediocrity in resources and conservatism in instructional practice. Before suggesting how the system might overcome these problems, we think it important to elaborate how the conditions are reflected – and in fact reinforce one another – in each of the major components of the educational system.

Curriculum

though varied somewhat in topic and form, the curricula typically found in American tools share certain characteristics. With notable exceptions, today's typical school triculum contains little depth or coherence, emphasizing isolated facts and 'basic skills' er opportunities to analyze and solve problems (Goodlad 1984, Cohen 1989). Teachers d students allike find the curricular materials uninteresting and unimaginative; and both adents and their future employers complain that school learning bears no connection to all-life experience or problems. It is not surprising that such curricula lead to a pedagogy at rarely demands active involvement from the learner: there are relatively few hands-on tivities or group activities, few opportunities for cooperative learning, little and trevally unimaginative use of computer technology, and little tolerance for activities that a mentally unimaginative use of computer technology, and little tolerance for activities that a mentally unimaginative use of computer technology.

... pant, the poor quality of US curriculum and instructional practice can be attributed the fragmented policy system described earlier. Consider the development and selection 'iinstructional materials as just one example. Diffuse authority structures and multiple tids within the system foster mediocrity and conservatism both in the publishers' supply cumricular materials and in the demand generated by local educators. On the supply side, rblishers respond to the lack of consistency and the market-driven approach to materials exallogrment in two ways. First, they attempt to pack all the topics desired or required by fferent locales into the limited space of the typical textbook. As a result, in content areas ce science, literature, and social studies; textbooks end up merely 'mentioning' topic ter topic, covering each so superficially that the main points and connections among them are offen incomprehensible to the student. In addition, and again particularly in isstory and social studies texts, publishers deal with conflicting demands and controwersial sues by watering down content, evading sensitive areas, and choosing the least common enominator among the various viewpoints. This approach often leaves the student with I little information or context that he or she is unable to construct his or her own talyses or form his or her own judgments (Tyson-Bernstein 1988, Newmann 1988).

These criticisms are not new and a few publishers have made attempts to incorporate texter depth of material and internal coherence into their textbooks. The sad thing is that I the absence of a consistent demand for such change from the majority of educational ansumers – i.e., state and local educators – these attempts will remain isolated and short wed. Nor is such consistency in consumer demand likely, given the current cagmentation of the system. Educators must respond to the same conflicting demands and lack of common goals as do publishers. This fact leads many districts, schools, and eachers to unintentionally support and perpetuate mediocrity in content by choosing urricula that are comfortable (familiar), easy to work with pedagogically (fragmented, actual, simple), and that lead to the most manageable classrooms (again, fragmented, actual, easy to monitor).

Indeed, as ironic as it may seem, this situation has actually contributed to the levelopment of a common instructional practice and, as described earlier, a common basic kills curriculum. Many analysts and curriculum scholars have attributed the instructional ocus on basic skills to a "factory model" of schooling, which emphasizes control and easy nomitoring of students, and to rigid hierarchical models of learning (e.g., McNeil 1986, Soterson 1989). Such models, they argue, are clearly outmoded, inconsistent with what we know about how people learn, and unable to lead to the type of thoughtful educated inizenty we require. However, while educators and observers have recognized the nadequages of these models and the curricula they engender and have written extensively

dearthy man

about them, the fragmentation of the policy system makes substantial, widespread change in instructional practice and the curriculum virtually impossible.

What is particularly disturbing is that, with regard to the higher-level cognitive goals now proposed, these basic skills models may further disadvantage those students already at risk in our schools. While an emphasis on isolated facts and skills in unlikely to foster-complex thinking skills among students generally, less-advantaged students often lack a surrounding environment that helps them fill in the gaps and draw the connections, mecessary to construct complex meaning in such situations (Peterson 1986). The problem is exacerbated in lower income areas where poor quality curricula combine with low expectations, with the result that many of these students are locked into failure.5

Of course, among the over one million classrooms in the USA, there are many exceptions to this general pattern. Innovative teachers or schools may experiment with particularly creative and promising curricula and instructional practices, often with considerable success. But as we observed earlier, most innovations find little support within the system and become marginalized or die out altogether. The same is true for large-scale curriculum reform movements such as the 'new math' or the science and social studies curricula spawned by Sputnik. In part, this is because programs developed in one sector (e.g., curriculum) are rarely linked to the extensive necessary changes in other sectors (e.g., the content of wide-scale assessment instruments, in-service and pre-service teacher development). And we know that if teachers do not understand or do not support particular curricular changes, those changes are unlikely to take hold in the schools.

Professional development

Despite program acter program to improve the quality of teacher education, the preparation of educational personnel in the USA remains wholly inadequate. Typically, neither pre-service nor in-service professional development programs are of high quality or are well coordinated with the demands and needs of the K-12 system.

—w elementary school teachers have even a rudimentary education in science and mathematics, and must-junitor and senior high school teachers of science and mathematics do not meet reasonable standards of preparation in those Edids. Unfortunately, such deficiencies have long been tolerated by the institutions that prepare teachers, the public bodies that license them, the schools that hire them and give them their assignments, and even the teaching profession itself (AAAS 1990: 13-14).

The average elementary school student in the USA receives only 20 minutes per day in science instruction (Raizen and Jones 1985). And, in mathematics, where school regulations require specific minimum amounts of instructional time, the content and form of instruction used by most elementary school teachers minimizes the demands on their understanding of mathematics. For example, whereas many students in other industrialized nations receive introductory instruction in algebra—geometic grades K-8, few of our students meso entireductory instruction in algebra—geometic grades K-8, few of our students meso entireductory instruction in algebra—geometic grades K-8, few of our students meso entireductory instruction in algebra—geometic grades described and not be surprising—teachers, like everyone else, tem—inun tasks that they feel unable to perform well. Essentially, many elementary and secondary school teachers do not have the confidence in their understanding of science and mathematics to enable them to do a creative job. This pattern is repeated for literature, history, and writing throughout the K-12 grades.

These are not new cricicisms. Yet, they persevere. Why? For pre-service professional development there are a variety of proposed reasons. One is that the quality of prospective teachers is weak and declining. Teaching is a low prestige and low faying profession, and

FORMER, Who once saw teaching as among their few professional alternatives, now have coupational opportunities that did not exist in the past. According to this theory, the abilities are to increase the standards for certification while simultaneously paying new archers higher salaries, thereby encouraging more talented people to enter the profession, is second reason given is that the content and pedagogy of the curriculum in many schools freducation are particularly weak. Critics are especially disdainful of courses that focus on education and turning away from pre-service pedagogical training altogether, preferring issead alternative routes to certification. A second proposed remedy focuses on reforming eacher education by limiting teacher training in schools of education to only graduate regrams (Holmes Group 1986, Darling-Hammond with Green 1990).

Both these criticisms have some truth and the proposed solutions may have some m. I menit. Typically, however, the solutions address the quality of teachers and nacing without consideration of the overall context. For example, raising beginning naddress' salaries to be more competitive with other professions does appear to attract igher scoring candidates and to increase their length of stay in teaching (Murmane and litem 1989, 1990). However, while such increases may enlarge the pool of prospective naddress somewhat, they do not guarantee that incoming faculty will have the kinds of nowledge and skills required in today's schools. Moreover, if the demand is for teachers ith panticular knowledge or expertise – such as science and mathematics – across-theorard salary increases turn out to be a very costly solution that may not sufficiently alter the supply in the desired direction (Levin 1985).

With regard to the second set of proposals, eliminating schools of education and premitive pedagogical training in favor of alternative certification strategies has unknown that — we do know that pre-service pedagogical training is even more extensive in other ations than ours, nations such as Japan where students achieve at higher levels than in the ISA ((McKniight et al. 1987)). Concentrating teacher training at the graduate level might asstrategy to raise the prestige of teachers, but judging from existing data, it offers little is see of a major change in their effectiveness (Smith and O'Day 1988). Finally, more of its strategies addresses the lack of content knowledge of many prospective teachers.

An alternative approach to the problems in professional development emphasizes the ak affifit between what prospective teachers are taught and are expected to know, on the me hand, and the knowledge and skills they need to perform their jobs, on the other. his disjuncture between teacher knowledge and teaching practice begins with the attreached condition of teaching in the nation's post-secondary system. Most of the ation's teachers learn the content of the disciplines in the arts and sciences schools apart om the schools of education within colleges and universities. The courses offered in these ettings are not designed for people who will need to teach the disciplines to elementary id secondary students in the future, and they are typically taught in a lecture style, facttionted fashion that works only because the students know they need to pass the course 1) move their life ahead. In many of the larger post-secondary institutions, courses in lathomatics, science, and history typically have examinations with short answer questions lat can be graded by machine, while literature courses require papers of only a page or wo. Thus, neither the content nor the pedagogy of the higher education institutions rives to prepare future teachers well. This is a particularly difficult problem to address. exause there are no incentives for professors in many colleges and universities either to tter their teaching approach or to teach courses designed to meet the needs of future K-12 -achers.

The colleges and universities are not solply to blame for the sinismon. Ac m-merinate

have pointed out, the licensing and certification systems used by the states typically represent a weak attempt to ensure that prospective teachers have the knowledge of content and skill in pedagogy to do an effective job in the classroom. Indeed, there is often little planned relationship between the content and skills required of prospective teachers and the curriculum of the schools. Part of this, of course, is due to the fact that there is no common curriculum beyond the emphasis on basic skills. The most withely used examination, the National Teachers Examination, has no predictive validity. Its face validity is predictive on the argument that its content is derived from current practice and is broad enough in scope to be representative of practice in all of the states in the Union. However, basing the content on current practice is inherently conservative, for it reinforces and legitimizes contemporary mediocrity. Moreover, creating a test with a content so broad (and consequently, shallow) that it is not inappropriate for any state or district surely makes it practically valueless for all of the states and districts (Smith and O'Day 1988, Haertel 1987).

The in-service professional development situation is little better than the pre-service training. One reason for continuing education is the requirement that individual teachers have to obtain a certain number of graduate credits over a period of time to maintain their job and to receive salary increments. After tenure is reached, obtaining a few credits every few years is often the only educational hurdle teachers must clear to keep their positions. Because of scheduling problems and a lack of coordination between higher education institutions and K-12 school systems, the courses teachers take for individual development and advancement are typically badly coordinated with the demands of the teachers' jobs. Their content often depends more on the intersection of the teachers' schedule and the interests of professors in the local higher education institutions than on the needs of their K-12 students.

Other professional development experiences are organized by the school or district and are generally more closely attuned to the specific needs of the schools. These sessions, however, are severely limited in scope and duration, frequently lasting a day or less only once or twice a year. Only rarely are they of sufficient depth and scope to give teachers the experience necessary to make major changes in their approach to instruction. Too often, these experiences are focused on a new innovation or technique which bears very little relationship to the curricula of the schools. Even when the development activity is directly related to the introduction of a new curriculum, the training generally suffers from a lack of depth and time. Perhaps as a consequence of these badly organized experiences, conventional professional development programs show few positive and lasting effects. And, even more damaging to prospects for productive change, the federal, state, and local budgets for in-service professional development are tiny and extremely vulnerable to budgetary constraints (Guskey 1986, Little et al. 1987, McLaughlin 1990).

We do not want to leave the impression that there are no productive in-service experiences. The reports from tens of thousands of teachers who have been to NSF summer institutes in mathematics and science, from the many teachers who have participated in groups such as the Bay Area Writing Project, and from many of the teachers who have used teacher centers all over the nation attest to the power that inservice experiences can have on individual teachers. One key to making these experiences successful has been that they are focused on content that is relevant to the teachers' classrooms and on ways of presenting that content; another is that they are often of sufficient length to be a powerful intervention. Unfortunately, in many instances of powerful individually-oriented in-service experiences, the teachers return to an environment that is not particularly supportive of new cutricula or methods of teaching.

This has led some schools to develop an alternative strategy in which the entire faculty of the school or of a particular department in the school will participate collectively in an inservice training experience of their own choosing, based on their particular curricular needs. There is some evidence that such a strategy, which combines the attributes of collective decision-making by the teachers with a focus on relevant content, has a positive effect on student achievement (Purkey and Smith 1983).

Accountability assessment systems

Accountability assessment systems in the USA suffer from a variety of problems. One is that many of our policymakers and educators are hoplessly confused about the purposes of testing in the schools. Different parts and levels of the system use the same assessment; rument for different and often conflicting purposes. In this chapter we are most interested in the use of assessment as an instrument of accountability to gauge the quality of schools and school systems, not in the more directly pedagogical uses of tests to diagnose, assess, and guide the progress of individual students, or in the use of tests to evaluate particular programs or projects. Each of these uses is important, but it is critical to keep the distinctions among them clearly in mind for, more often than not, the same instrument or instruments should not be used for multiple purposes.

Another problem is that the lack of a common curriculum within most states and many districts makes it impossible to construct a broadly-used, valid accountability assessment instrument. If the content of the curriculum purposefully varies across jurisdictions, so logically should the assessment instrument that is intended to assess how well the school or district meets their curricular purposes. Though there is no commonly adopted curriculum, most states and school systems are heavy users of one or more of a small set of norm-referenced, multiple choice, standardized tests – tests that each purport to be appropriate for most variations of curriculum.

A final issue is that many school people take seriously their school's and district's difformance on the standardized tests and use it as a gauge of the quality of their distriction. Schools often use individual test performance for student placement, while districts and states use aggregate student performance for school and system accountability. Thus, the tests have high stakes, not only for students but also for teachers, schools, and system administrators. As a consequence, teachers – generally with encounagement and even pressure to do so – will frequently adjust their teaching to improve test scores, not by teaching the subject matter in more creative and productive ways but by tailoring their instruction to the form and nature of the standardized tests (Fredericksen 1984).

Such an influence might be productive if tests were constructed to measure complex thinking and problem-solving and thus served to move curriculum and instruction in the direction of developing these skills. Of course, this would require that teachers know and be able to teach the content and skills assessed by the tests. Indeed, challenging tests or examinations used for accountability purposes might be a particularly powerful intervention if teachers had the content and pedagogical knowledge, the curriculum materials, and the support services that would enable them to 'teach to the challenging tests'. In the absence of such knowledge and materials, however, the gap between the content of the tests and the capacity of the teachers to teach the content could be extraordinarily frustrating and possibly counterproductive.

At present there seems to be little overall conflict between the capacity and pedagogy

of the teachers and the content of the tests. In general the most commonly used assessment instruments, like textbooks and other curricular materials, are designed to reflect the least common denominator in a fragmented and ill-structured system. Standardized, norm-referenced tests are developed to be so broad and general that they can assess learning across a wide range of curricular purposes. Their form emphasizes broad coverage of unconnected facts, and the ability to work very quickly on multiple choice, limited time-spam, unrelated problems that have only one right answer. It is therefore not surprising that apparently substantial and progressive changes in curriculum produce little effect on such tests or that scores may be more accurate indicators of social class background than of what is actually learned in the classroom (Hawley 1984, Fredericksen 1984, Resnick and Resnick 1985, Archbald and Newmann 1988).

Over the past 20 years many states have tried to address these inadequaries by adopting a second form of assessment instrument: criterion-referenced, minimum competency examinations. While these tests are developed with a clear curricular conception, they typically contain many of the same problems in form as the standardized norm-referenced tests, and they have the additional problem of focusing only on very low level skills and standards. Thus, they cannot appropriately be used to assess the overall curricular aim of a school, if the school has one. Instead, for very low-achieving students, schools often focus their instruction on the content of the minimum competency tests, thereby reinforcing their already low aspirations for these students.

The main point here is that both types of tests exist, in part, because of a lack of coherence in the curricular policy of state and district school systems. Standardized norm-reference tests, with their general all-encompassing nature, are used for accountability purposes because there is no common set of curricular goals among schools and systems; criterion-referenced, minimum competency tests are based on such restricted and elemental sets of curricular goals that it is easy to imagine that all districts and schools could meet their demands, as has been the ease in Florida and Virginia. Moreover, both tests, when used for accountability, serve to reinforce an instructional emphasis on facts and skills rather than problem-solving and performance in meaningful situations. The multiple choice and timed format reinforces quickness and recognition rather than thought and:... recall. These tests thus fortify the tendency of the system to be conservative and mediocre. Indeed, with a few exceptions, such as the Advanced Placement exams, the International Baccalaureates, and the New York Regents, there are no widely-used examinations in this country which either clearly assess curricula in a rich form or stand as a serious intellectual challenge for the student.

Support services

A critical element of the second wave of reform is the issue of how to enhance the professionalism of teachers. Sykes (1990) argues that professionalism will be enhanced as teachers are given more and greater control over resources within their schools.9 Certainly, it will be impossible for major changes in the quality of schooling to take place if the quality of teacher workplaces continues to be as shabby as now.

This issue has a variety of dimensions. First, there are few resources and services in the system to develop, support, or maintain processional creativity and commitment. Few schools have libraries for teachers, few offer time off for reflection and development of new ideas for teaching, few provide serious support for new teachers, few provide the means by which teachers can experiment with new ideas. On a more mundanc level, many schools —

carticularly those in areas with high concentrations of poor people – are terrible workplaces. Teachers have no space to meet and talk with other professionals, no or very ittle access to telephones, few if any photocopiers to reproduce class materials. When sapens, books, and pencils are missing, teachers must go without or supply these materials wom their own resources, often receiving little respect or reinforcement from their supervisors for their efforts. Generally teachers do not have a private place outside of the classroom to meet with parents, and there is no place for parents to meet and talk or to wait during the school day.

The extraordinary thing about these conditions is that it would take very little momey to overcome them in most of the schools in the nation. The only really costly item would be time off for reflection and development of new ideas. The remainder primarily require the entire and energetic leadership on the part of principals and central office staff. Uniformunately, instead of basing their actions on what will maximize the quality of icit ils and on principles of good administrative behavior, principals and district administrators often fall back on rules and regulations to rationalize the status quo.

Frustrated high expectations for creative work in such a difficult environment lead many educators to focus on survival. Ironically, the fragmentation of the system actually assists in this effort by operating as a kind of filter, protecting teachers from some of the otherwise deafening policy noise. Of course, policy demands do get through, often in a form that is both incoherent and divorced from the needs and context of the teacher. It is not surprising, under these conditions, that many teachers simply close their classroom doors and do their own thing. Nor is it surprising that even widely acclaimed reform efforts have little long-term effect on classroom practice. Educational institutions have truly become "loosely coupled" systems in which instructional practice is only weakly tied to organizational policies, and the system as a whole remains conservatively bound to the processes and content of the past.

If the new reform movement is to have a lasting effect on what happens in the classroom, it will thus have to overcome the current fragmentation of the system and provide a coherent direction for change and the resources to accomplish those changes.

next section discusses one possible strategy for such systemic reform.

A strategy for systemic reform

We suspect that there are many possible paths to a coherent, productive, and progressive educational system. The one we present here seeks to combine the vitality and creativity of bottom-up change at the school site with an enabling and supportive structure at more contralized levels of the system. While recognizing that change must occur at all levels of the system and that the ultimate goal is to transform what happens at the school and in the classroom, we have chosen for the purposes of this paper to focus most of our attention on the role of the state apparatus in this process. We do so for several reasons.

First, most of the current restructuring literature focuses exclusively on the school and district levels of the system. When states are mentioned at all, it is usually in the context of providing waivers from various regulations currently in force. Yet, if we wish to influence more than a few schools or districts at a time, the state is a critical actor. Second, during the past 20 years, most states have gradually amassed greater authority and responsibility over their educational systems as their share of the educational budget has risen, as the economy and productivity of the state have been seen to be more and more dependent on its educational system, and as issues of equity and fairness in the distribution

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 intercommentedness 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. Once 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, toleramore, 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 rhetonic 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.

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 f Tiarily 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-promged 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. To 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 = I 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.

Carriculum 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,

processes, and skills students from K-12 need to know. The frameworks would be developed for at least the core curriculum areas: reading and language arts, English, mathematics, science, social studies and history, foreign languages and the arts. The trameworks must provide a viable and compelling alternative to the 'basic skills' fact-based orientation that is the norm in US schooling today. They should emphasize depth of understanding, knowledge construction through analysis and synthesis of real life problems, hands-on experiences, and the integration of content and pedagogy. Highly-qualified teams of teachers and disciplinary experts should develop the frameworks which should then be continually updated and reviewed by similarly qualified expert panels. Possible prototypes for such frameworks are already being developed in mathematics by the National Council of Teachers of Mathematics (NCTM), the Mathematics Board of the National Research Council (NRC) and the National Assessment of Education Progress (NAEP), in the sciences by the American Association for the Advancement of Science (AAAS), in reading by NAEP, and in these and other areas by the departments of education in several states.

It is important to distinguish the notion of core curriculum frameworks from the more specific curricula actually taught in the schools and classrooms. The pumpose of the frameworks is neither to legislate a particular pedagogy nor to specify short-term curricular scope or sequence. Rather, the frameworks should set out desired intellectual curricular themes, topics, and objectives in sufficiently long-range churks (e.g., four-year blocks) to allow for a maximum of flexibility and creativity at the local level while still establishing the clear instructional direction and goals for the system as a whole. One aspect of this flexibility may be to open the door for more depth in areas of local choosing. For example, if the elementary science framework is organized around 30 great ideas in science, each student by the end of the eighth grade may be expected to have a general acquaintance with 15-20 of these with some greater depth in the remaining 10-15. Schools may choose the areas for deeper coverage based on local conditions, resources, and interests.

California is illustrative of a state that has already developed quite progressive curricular frameworks in a number of areas. These frameworks set out the expectations that teachers, business people and professionals in the field (historians, scientists, mathematicians) have for the content that K-12 students should all learn. Unlike the minimum competency requirements of the 1970s, these expectations reflect the problem-solving and higher-order thinking requirements proposed by the many recent refor neports. The frameworks do not detail a day-to-day, a week-to-week, or even a month-to-month curriculum for teachers to follow. Instead, for the most part, they describe the knowledge, skills, and attitudes expected of students at the end of certain periods of time, such as fourth, eighth, and eleventh grades.

The frameworks should provide a structure within which to organize the other important educational components. Teacher professional development programs, inservice and pre-service, and teacher licensing standards should be designed to insure that the teachers are well prepared to teach the content set out in frameworks. Textbook and curricular material used in the schools should be congruent with the curriculum frameworks. Test instruments used to assess pupil progress and to hold schools and teachers accountable should reflect the content of the frameworks. In short, the frameworks should provide a way of organizing a coherent instructional guidance system.

Two cricical conditions are necessary to ensure that the system works to help provide high quality instruction. The first condition is that the frameworks are of the highest quality possible and that they are continually and carefully improved. The frameworks

would embody an integrated, challenging, and engaging conception of the subject matter the schools. If they are of sufficiently high quality, we believe that they would immand the respect and enthusiasm of capable teachers. The second condition is that call school personnel are given the freedom within the framework to interpret and applement instructional strategies that most effectively meet the needs of their students, s with the International Baccalaureate, the state frameworks would set out the general intent and skills that students need to know, but it would remain the job of local school ensonnel to decide how best to organize and teach the material.

shool curricula: The states must provide sufficient support to ensure that schools and istricts have both the flexibility and support they need to construct strong and locally exponsive curricula within the structure provided by the state content frameworks, thools must have the ultimate authority to select and/or revise and develop curricular interials best suited to their students and teachers. However, the state has both the exp isibility and the potential leverage to ensure that there is an adequate supply of high jality textbooks and other materials that are in line with both the letter and the spirit of the state curriculum firameworks, so that teachers in every school or district do not have to sinwent the wheel for every subject and every grade.

There are a number of mechanisms available to the state to stimulate the supply of igh quality instructional materials. One is to establish a statewide adoption system that nphasizes both quality and coordination with the frameworks. States would then - ther singly or in conjunction with other states with similar frameworks - stimulate id/or require textbook publishers to meet those guidelines. A number of states already se this approach, but in our view they need to be much tougher and more rigorous than ley are now; textbook manufacturers can and should be held to higher standards of wallity and coherence. The state could also try to stimulate a cottage industry to provide naginative innovations for teaching the core concepts, popularize particularly successful scal emdeavors, and encourage the development and use of technological software - imputer, video, and multi-media - in support of the frameworks. The local districts study choose from among these resources although schools and districts could also be free act or develop alternative curricular materials as long as the outcome objectives are eiting met.

instructional development: States must ensure that both new and practicing teachers have the content knowledge and instructional skills required to teach the content of the carnesworks. This means, for example, that elementary school teachers will need to know fell and know how to teach the mathematics, literature, science, reading, and history that we set out in the curriculum frameworks for K-6 or K-8 students. At the high school well teachers must know well and know how to teach the content set out in the carnesworks in the subject matter areas they are expected to teach. The key here is that the urriculum frameworks operate to structure what we minimally expect teachers to know and be able to teach as well as what we expect students to learn. In most states this would squire drastically reforming the pre-service and in-service professional development ystems. These systems must provide an adequate foundation both in the content set out a the subject-matter frameworks and in a variety of pedagogical strategies for facilitating radent acquisition of that content.

Pre-service professional development: The low quality of pre-service teacher education has roven to be one of the most intractable problems in the entire educational system. Critics

End lacking both the subject matter training, generally the responsibility of schools of arts and sciences, and the pedagogical and professional training, the responsibility of schools of education. Prospective elementary teachers are seen as underprepared in the disciplines and badly served by non-rigorous pedagogical and professional training. Prospective secondary teachers are viewed as too narrowly trained in their content fields and as having only limited opportunities to obtain training in instructional strategies. For both elementary and secondary prospective teachers, the supervision of practice teaching is seen as weak. Finally, in general, the teaching of undergraduates is seen as unimaginative and pedantic, thereby providing a poor model for the future teachers.

Over the past decade a substantial number of schools of education have initiated changes in their curriculum and requirements, but few have succeeded in establishing their programs as exemplary courses of instruction. Beyond the individual campuses the formal attempts to improve the quality of teacher training typically depend on the regulation of inputs. Neither state regulation of required courses nor the efforts of independent program certification agencies like NCATE has had much effect on the content or form of preservice education.

The most optimistic signs of improvement of teacher preparation come from efforts of the teacher preparation profession, such as the Holmes group. These ventures have had success in raising the quality of discussion and in encouraging member institutions to conduct self-examinations and often to alter their programs to provide more rigorous training in the content and pedagogical areas and in practice teaching.

To date, however, teacher preparation reforms proposed by the professional groups and most others have conformed to the traditions of many higher education institutions. They have thus been fiercely independent of educational reforms at the K-12 levels. We know of no major national reform effort that has deliberately addressed the substantive needs of teachers beyond listing general course and degree requirements. Even in a state such as California, where there are well specified curriculum frameworks for grades K-12, there is little formal linkage between the content of the frameworks and the state's requirements for teachers.

Given this independence of higher education from K-12 education, we suspect that the main leverage for improving pre-service education is likely to come not from attempts to regulate pre-service higher education requirements but from the state's authority to screen and credential new teachers. In the context of the systemic reforms proposed here, the goal is to ensure that teachers come out of teacher preparation institutions with at least the knowledge and capacity to teach well the content set out by the state frameworks.

The cleanest way to do this from a policy perspective is to establish what teachers need to know and be able to do and then to assess for licensing purposes their ability to use this knowledge and competence. We are not suggesting a higher passing level on the current or future NTE. We are suggesting a strong, progressive, carefully developed performance assessment, one based primarily on the state's K-12 curriculum frameworks and designed to evaluate the prospective teacher's knowledge both of content and of multiple pedagogical strategies for teaching the content to students of varying abilities and backgrounds. We are also suggesting the establishment of standards that are sufficiently challenging to ensure that those who pass have at least the content and pedagogical knowledge required to be a successful teacher. We come to these suggestions reluctantly, for we would rather rely on the good will and commitment of the higher education institutions and the professional community to reform teacher education than on the blunt instrument of outcome accountability.

Nonetheless, such a strategy continues to place a great deal of authority and

professional discretion in the hands of higher education institutions, both the faculties of any and sciences and of education. Our strong sense is that, if enacted, the strategy would result in increased standards and requirements for prospective teachers. We would expect prospective teachers to have the experience of delving deeply into content through a disciplinary major, while also having a broad enough academic experience to be able to trench competently in the other areas of their future responsibility. We would also expect many institutions to alter their courses and perhaps even their own pedagogical approaches to help impure that their graduates succeed on the new state licensing examinations.

In-service professional development: In-service professional development must be a key component of the overall instructional guidance system for two reasons. First, there is no question that the majority of the current teaching force has been inadequately trained in at least some of the areas of the firameworks for which they would be responsible. Since most "these teachers will remain on the job during and after the implementation of the new frameworks, they will need to acquire the knowledge and expertise necessary to teach adequately the new comtent. Second, a well-designed professional development system, based on building networks of teacher cadre and trainer-practitioners, can serve another less obvious function in the system. It can foster both the knowledge base and the leadenship experience necessary to help empower the teaching force, thus further liberating the imitiative and creativity of "bottom-up" reform.

While the state cannot simply establish such a system, it can encourage its dissibility ment by infilteracing both the supply of and demand for in-service programs and materials that are of high quality and meet specifications derived from the curriculum frameworks. Furthermore, the state could work from a systematic, long-range plan to reach and retrain all of the teachers within the state, and to develop and maintain a viable in-service professional development system. We would imagine that a strong system would have a coherent set of opportunities, both for the development and refinement of individual teachers and for working on improvement strategies with groups of teachers such as high school departments or the entire staff of elementary schools.

To influence the supply of quality professional development programs and materials, states can allocate resources either directly into program development or into incentives for independent organizations and sub-units to generate such programs. For example, incentives may be given to universities, museums, libraries, and other non-profit educational groups to develop programs tied to the frameworks or to districts and schools to establish professional development schools, teams of trainers, and so forth. The state could provide incentives and resources to develop a eadre of practicing teachers in the schools who could serve as le2d teachers, mentors, and in-service trainers to assist other teachers in mastering the content required by the frameworks. Special funds for professional development should be available for individual teachers and sets of teachers for particularly innovative ideas related to the core curriculum and for areas outside of the core curriculum including human development. Finally, the state could require any professional development programs supported by federal funds to be fully coordinated with the firameworks.

States can also influence teacher demand for and use of professional development opportunities in a variety of ways. For example, if teachers and schools are held accountable for improving student outcomes on assessment instruments that are based on the frameworks, it behooves the teachers to be knowledgeable in the relevant areas of the frameworks and in effective pedagogy. Another available tactic might be to use the state licensing system to encourage professional development. For example, after a set period of

time following the institution of the frameworks (e.g., five years), the state might require that all teachers (both practicing and new) pass a state licensing exam based on those frameworks.

This short discussion does not do justice either to the importance of this area or to the substantial institutional changes in schools and universities required to create effective continuing professional development systems within states. A great deal of inertia and skepticism will have to be overcome. Our belief is that productive and substantial improvement is extremely unlikely in the present fragmented and ill-structured policy environment. By contrast, the kind of coherent and systemic reform strategy we have suggested here could provide the structure and purpose necessary for states, universities, and local education agencies to work together to develop a progressive and high quality continuing professional development system.

Accountability assessment: States must construct and administer high quality assessment instruments on a regular basis to monitor progress toward achievement goals for accountability purposes and to stimulate and support superior instruction. The new state assessments, like the teacher training systems and the curriculum, would be based on the state curriculum frameworks. The purpose of the assessments would be to provide information about the progress of the state, districts and schools in achieving the goals established by the state. These data would also be used to hold the various parts of the system accountable and to help stimulate curricula and instruction in the schools to achieve the state's instructional goals.

In most states the approach to assessing student outcomes will have to be completely overhauled if the instructional guidance system is to operate effectively. The rhetoric in the US is that we demand educational accountability of our schools and that student achievement tests are the central measures by which we should hold teachers, principals, and superintendents accountable. In fact, we do a terrible job of holding anyone accountable. In the typical situation, facing falling test scores, our local and state policy makers threaten, cajole, re-emphasize 'basic skills', and adopt a new program as a panacea. Occasionally, a principal or superintendent is removed as a scapegoat, but rarely is the system altered in any significant fashion. In the worst cases, the pressure to demonstrate improvement leads some educational personnel intentionally or unintentionally to manipulate the accountability system. For example, school, district, and state administrators may delude themselves and the public with bogus test scores increases generated by using precisely the same tests year after year.

Much of the reason, we suspect, for this unproductive behavior is that most school people and much of the public realize that it is impossible for assessment instruments to truly serve a monitoring and accountability function unless they measure what the schools are actually supposed to teach. Yet, as we argued earlier, this is not the ease in the US. The main accountability instruments used in most places are standardized norm referenced tests, which are purposefully divorced from the curricula of the schools. To a substantial degree this problem would be eliminated in states that adopted the kind of content-driven systemic reform strategy proposed here. The assessment instruments would be constructed to measure student achievement in the content set out in the state curriculum frameworks. In this regard the form of the new assessments, which would replace the old accountability instruments, would be much like that of the International Baccalaureate or Advanced Placement examinations.

Another criticism often raised of current accountability assessments is that schools,

from happening while also providing for adequate monitoring of the system would be togive the examinations at three levels - say at the fourth, eighth and eleventh grades. The information from these assessments would feed back to the system, and local districts and even achools could be held accountable for the results. Systems and schools could, for example, be responsible for demonstrating either an across-the-board high level of achievement for their students or a steady growth over time in that achievement. Assessment for accountability could also be combined with incentive measures for meeting on surpassing objectives. It

It is important to note that the purpose of the examinations will affect the way in which they are administered. If the principal purpose is to hold institutions (schools and sysstems) accountable, the burden of testing could be reduced by assessing samples of students, nather than the entire population of the three grade levels. If there are student reduced purposes im addition, however, such as to motivate students to study by making intilization results important to their futures, then the entire population of a grade would have to be assessed. The issue of whether to make such examinations have 'high stukess' for students, as they do in many other economically developed nations, is too complicated to address in this paper. High stakes imply that student opportunities would be imfluenced by their performance on the examinations. This poses major tradeoffs, it seems to us. On the one hand are the gains that might be accrued by having examinations that motivate students to study. On the other hand, the flexibility and second chances that characterize the US educational system might be jeopardized by a system of high stakes

sstudent examinations. Whichever decision is reached by states about the role of the examinations in individual student lives, a major reform in the assessment systems along the lines we have described is critical to education. 12 Assessment instruments are not just passive components of the educational system; substantial experience indicates that, under the night conditions, they can influence as well as assess teaching (Fredericksen 1984). While current standardized and minimum competency tests reinforce teaching toward an emphasis on isolated facts and basic skills, state-of-the-art examinations based on well-'esigned curriculum frameworks, could help encourage instruction toward higher level goals: depth of knowledge, complex thinking, an ability to respond to problems and to produce results. Examinations, designed to assess the content of the curriculum frameworks, could foster this goal by giving teachers and schools a clear idea of what they should be striving for and a way to monitor their success in getting there. Thus, if satudents taking a science examination are expected to produce science - that is, to write, to analyze text, to manipulate the necessary tools, to solve problems - teachers are more likely to emphasize these easacities in their classes. This, of course, assumes that the teachers have the necessary content and pedagogical knowledge to do so, but as stated carlier, student assessment can also motivate teachers to seek out relevant knowledge through appropriate professional development opportunities. In addition, allowing for choice among examination questions, as in the current AP examinations, would allow for variation in school program, teacher expertise, and student interest.

A restructured governance system

Much of the current literature on school restructuring and teacher professionalism is based on the notion that centralized policies regarding curriculum and instruction generally serve to undermine the school personnel's sense of authority over their own program. In nosing the need for a coherent state system of instructional guidance, we recognize the

tension that exists between centralized-policy decisions on the one hand and professional discretion on the other. We argue, however, that if states can overcome the fragmentation in the system by providing coordination of long-range instructional goals, materials development, professional training, and assessment, they can set the conditions under which teacher empowerment and professionalization, school site management, and even parental choice can be both effective and broad-based. Indeed, what we propose is an interactive and dynamic relationship between increasing coherence in the system through centralized coordination and increasing professional discretion at the school site.

Thus, while schools have the ultimate responsibility to educate thoughtful, competent, and responsible citizens, the state - representing the public - has the responsibility to define what 'thoughtful, competent, and responsible citizens' will mean in the coming decade and century. One way to picture this relationship is through the analogy of a voyage. The state, through the curriculum frameworks and in consultation with teachers and district personnel, provides a description of the ultimate destination of the journey. Teachers and other school people then have the primary responsibility to chart the course, assemble the necessary provisions and crew, and pilot the ship. Should the state attempt to take over from a distance the steerage of the vessel, it is likely to rum aground, never reaching its goal. The state may assist, however, by helping to ensure the availability of high quality provisions, accurate navigational equipment, and a well-trained and capable crew. Such is the intent of the instructional guidance system proposed in the previous section.

The governance structure, then, should define the responsibilities of the various levels in the system in order to ensure that the changes sought in the content and outcomes of instruction are actually manifested in classroom practice. Since the success of this enterprise depends ultimately on what happens in the school, we take the school as the starting point in the governance structure and work backward from there, elaborating the responsibilities at the other levels to support instruction in the school.

Governance at the school building level: Schools obviously have many responsibilities and must meet those responsibilities under, a wide range of conditions. Our primary focus here is on instructional guidance to enhance achievement in the areas laid out by the state's goals. In this regard the primary responsibility at the building level would be to develop a stimulating, supportive, and creative environment to maximize student achievement in the areas of the goals. A positive climate and atmosphere, a high level of respect between students and staff, and a set of strategies that help ensure that all students identify with the school in a positive fashion are all important factors in helping to motivate the students and staff. These conditions come from hard work and a shared commitment by the staff to make the school a productive and rewarding workplace where teachers are given the responsibility and support that they need to be effective. The restructuring literature and the older literature on effective schools indicate three practical ingredients that are important in this regard (Purkey and Smith 1983 and 1985, Cohen 1983, Elmore and Associates 1990).

The first ingredient is a staff of well-trained professionals. Under the system proposed here, the school would have the primary responsibility to bring together a staff of professionals who could use their knowledge and experience to follow the best practices appropriate to their students to meet the state goals. This implies that the selection of starf, inservice strategies, carriculum (within guidelines), and pedagogies should be done at the school site in response to local conditions and student needs. School staff should also be responsible for developing a system of goals that are based on the local school

and the second property of the second second

conditions within the general framework of the state and local district goals.

A second ingredient for a productive workplace is an internal governance structure that enhances the capacity of teachers to carry out their professional tasks and achieve the goals of the school. These structures will vary from school to school, depending on the content, but research suggests that several aspects of the governance structure may be particularly important. One of these is that teachers should have an important decisionmaking role. Since they are the closest to the students and have primary responsibility for their learning, the teachers should be in the best position to decide how to design the educational experiences of those students. In addition, it is important to structure teachers' time and responsibilities to allow for collaboration, planning, reflection, and professional development. It is also desirable to allow for flexibility in organizing student learning time, as most effective pedagogical practices (as demonstrated by research) require this sort of flexibility (e.g., smaller units, flexible time allocation for different learning tasks, cross-age tutoring and cooperative learning, interdisciplinary and thematic iproaches, and ungraded or multi-grade classrooms). Finally, schools should develop mechanisms for parental involvement in school and in the education of their children (David 1990, Sykes 1990). B

Third, schools require hardware and resources for the building to be a productive, professional workplace for teachers and other educational personnel. A place to work and confer with each other and with other professionals, a place to do work quietly, access to phones, computers and library facilities are essential if we wish to attract and retain competent teachers.

While these three conditions are integral to much of the literature on restructuring and "bottom-up" change and thus are thought to be inimical to centralized authority structures, it is our contention that they in fact underscore the need for systemic reform of the sort discussed here. The three conditions can not be met by schools without support from district and state agencies. Most teachers, at present, do not have the knowledge, skills, and time necessary to do a competent job carrying out their roles in a shared governance system or in jointly developing curricula that are integrated across grades within a school. In-service professional development, higher quality curriculum materials, and enhanced support from the district and state will be necessary. Schools, particularly schools within large districts, operate within a formal and informal network of rules and regulations that can either enhance or diminish the opportunities of the schools to serve their students well. Governance systems at the district and state levels as well as at the school level need to be structured to enhance, rather than detract from, the instructional efforts of the schools. The increased clarity in goals and direction, commonly understood curriculum frameworks, coordinated, high quality curriculum materials, and professional development programs that are part of the state systemic reforms can provide the necessary structure.

Governance at the school district level: In the type of system we advocate here, local school districts would need to establish a clear set of ideas about where they fit into the overall educational structure. This means establishing a balance between school purposes and state purposes without usurping either. The district might establish a set of long-range achievement and other goals that embellish the state goals – progressive districts might add such things as student participation and local service goals. It would be critical for districts to be parsimonious on this score, however, for too many goals can be distracting to schools.

The main responsibility of the local district should be to provide resources and a

supportive environment for the schools to carry-out their task of educating all of the district's children to meet the state and district goals. Ome thing that this means is that districts should work to reduce central bureaucracy in areas where centralization is primarily in service of administrative standardization of educational matters. Districts should review and alter as necessary those policies that have educational consequences and that might inhibit innovative and effective school-based instructional approaches. As the schools move to take greater responsibility for establishing their own curricular and instructional strategies, district policies such as uniform class sizes, rigid time requirements for teaching certain subjects and courses, and conformity in the use of textbooks should be eliminated.

A second, important role for districts is to ensure that the most needy under their jurisdiction are fairly treated. The distribution and utilization of common and base budget resources must be equitable across the district and the use of special resources from federal, state and local funds must be integrated and administered in a way that maximizes opportunities for the needy. 14

For districts to effectively fulfill their roles in this restructured system will require changes in the way the various groups within them relate to one another. Three primary local groups interact to establish much of district policy: the central district administration, the school board, and the union. These groups must work in concert in order to provide adequate support to the schools to work within the structure established by the state goals and instructional guidance system and, simultaneously, to give the professionals within the schools the authority and resources to do their job effectively. This does not mean that the traditional roles of the groups should be forsaken, but it does mean that each of these groups must understand the overall system and strategy and that they must discipline themselves to give their top priority to ensuring the long-ramse quality of the teaching and learning processes within schools.

One point of necessary discipline concerns the establishment of long term goals and strategies that, together with the state goals, would shape the important decisions of the district. For these goals to operate effectively, the superintendent and the school board must have the will to reject the get-rich-quick 'project mentality' described earlier. That is, they must be able to eschew most of those apparently attractive policies and projects that crop up each year promising short-term results. Similarly, school boards and the superintendent need to work toward strategies that ensure policy continuity rather than disruption and that give schools the steady nourishment that they need to improve; once example of this might be a two- or three-year hudget. In general, the efforts of the superintendent and the school board should be directed toward making the educational core of the system work better not just in the immediate period, but over the long haul.

A second point is that the various actors in the district must work to support the efforts of the schools and their staffs in teaching the content of the frameworks and in applying their professional expertise to the specific goals, conditions, and children in their schools. In the case of the unions, this means focusing their attention on a broad definition of workplace conditions. If the union emphasis in contract negotiations is only on increases in salaries and benefits and on requiring standardized practice in schools across a district, it will be very difficult for the district to give the necessary responsibility and autonomy to the school site to allow the school staff the freedom to develop a creative and productive instructional environment. In the case of district level personnel, supporting teacher professionalism and discretion may mean a change in how they carry out their supervisory roles. For example, as the schools and their staffs gdin responsibility and authority, district curriculum and instructional supervisors will have to give up much of

their apparent authority over curriculum and instructional matters (Purkey and Smith 1985).

This discussion, together with our consideration of school governance, reflects much of the current writing and thinking about 'restructuring schools' (Elmore and Associates 1990). The difference between the typical discussions of 'restructuring' and our formulation is in the role of the state. Where the state is ignored in much of the restructuring literature, we have argued that it is a critical partner in any long-term reform.

Finally, it would be Pollyannaish of us not to acknowledge that many districts will have difficulty in altering their procedures and modes of behavior in the manner we suggest. In some cases the talent is not presently available. In other instances the central administration is simply resistant to significant change. This latter condition is particularly prevalent in many of our large districts. These are important considerations which

saten any major educational reform. Our belief, however, is that part of the reason for the intractability of central bureaucracies in large districts is that the districts lack the coherent vision and direction that might result from the systemic reforms we suggest in this paper. To an extent, then, the state reforms would increase the chances for important changes to occur at the district level.

Governance at the state level: Just as the schools operate within the immediate context of their districts and draw much of their support from them, so too the districts operate within the structure provided by states. The present strength and scope of this structure varies greatly across the nation – from states that have almost total control over funding and that exercise considerable control over the curriculum to states where local control remains prominent. We have presented an argument intended to rationalize and legitimate state authority to create a coherent statewide instructional guidance system. We have argued that the states are in a key position for policy intervention because of their unique position to influence all aspects of the educational system. Since most of this paper has focused on developing a coherent strategy at the state level, little needs to be added here -bout the content of that strategy.

It is important, however, to make some observations about policymaking at the state level, for the greatest deterrent to an improved school system in the USA may well be the conflicting and politically motivated squabbles at the state level among the variety of agencies which have authority over aspects of the state educational system. In many states there are three independent and aggressive institutions: the state department of education, the governor's office, and the legislature. Each has its separate policy offices and separate, generally loosely structured, agendas. Within the state legislature, alone, there are often rwo, three, or even more such agendas. The multiple agendas, most of which are political and some of which are substantive, are each typically supported by vigorous lobby groups. The agendas come into conflict over resources and rise and fall in prominence, with the result being that no agenda is well served either in the short-run or in the long-run. Perhaps the most important single change in the educational governance system in many states would be to move the policy debate to a point where it is considering the substantive - and to a lesser extent the political - aspects of alternative, well-formed, and long-term policies and strategies. We obviously believe that the coherent strategy we have argued for deserves consideration.

Systemic change and the reform environment

We have tried to indicate how systemic state-initiated reform and school-based reform (restructuring) could be combined to create something with considerably more chance of succeeding than either type of reform carried out independently. In concluding, we believe it important also to show how this proposed dual reform strategy relates to three other aspects of the present political reform environment.

Educational equity

The educational reforms of the 1980s have been primarily concerned with increasing the quality of education. This concern has detracted attention from the efforts in the 1960s and 1970s to provide greater equality within the educational system, particularly for minorities and the poor. Only recently has there been a partial return to concerns for the less advantaged in our society as the nation has become aware of the growing number of children in poverty and the tragic condition of schools in the nation's inner cities. Our question here is "what would be the effect of a systemic reform of the sort proposed here on the most needy in our states?"

In another article (Smith and O'Day 1990), we argue that the gains that have been made by African-American and low-income children in reducing the achievement gap have been due in part to a variety of changes in social and economic conditions, including decreasing levels of poverty in the 1960s and '70s, increases in parental education, and desegregation in the nation's schools, particularly in the South. We also argue that the national emphasis on basic skills in the 1960s and '70s contributed to reducing the gap by helping to equalize the quality of education offered to students of different backgrounds. This emphasis was spurred by the Great Society, fueled by the test score decline, and reinforced by minimum competency tests adopted by many states. The basic skills movement focused attention on a factual, skills-oriented conception of knowledge and a view of the learner as a passive receptacle. It fit within the fragmented educational governance structure effortlessly because it was easily understood by politicians and placed little demand on teachers or the system for new learning or special resources. It represented a mediocre and conservative (and therefore politically safe) conception of curriculum and instruction.

The basic skills emphasis is now being challenged in many local districts and states which have instituted reforms emphasizing higher order thinking and a more challenging curriculum. While these proposed reforms are exciting and promise higher levels of learning and more complex skill development for those students involved in them, it is important to recognize that they could also place minorities and the poor at a new disadvantage because the less powerful in the society are typically the last to benefit from state and district generated reforms = if they benefit at all. Districts and schools with large numbers of poor and minority students often have less discretionary money to stimulate reform, less well-trained teachers, and more day-to-day problems that drain administrative energy:

We concluded in the earlier paper that, in this context, a state- or nationally based instructional guidance system would provide greater opportunity for ensuring that a change toward this new conception of the curriculum and instruction is available to all groups, more or less equally. Unless the capitaliar reforms are buttressed by a coherent state system that links less her training. ***urk training*** train

regardners into a structure within which we can legitimately hold schools and districts verywhere accountable, we will surely enlarge the differences that continue to exist convent the quality of instruction available to rich and poor, minority and majority. And others we have common curricula and a common set of expectations for all children, with onth the resources and the local flexibility to meet those expectations, the achievement gap dill again swell.

Chaice

)) were the past few years there have been a substantial number of school choice plans regested and implemented in the nation (Elmore 1986). Most recently, the idea of a full-lown woucher system has be revived (Chubb and Moe 1990). We do not hold our great on 'han there will be dramatic improvement in the quality of the system from choice lians. The reason for our pessimism is that the 'reform' will change only the governance aid financing of the schools – the quality of the potential teachers, the curriculum, and the issessment instruments will not be addressed.

Others have angued and will continue to argue that a market system in education emenated by choice among schools will operate to change these factors. At best, this is a roll-terratic and long-term hope. At worst, it belies the ever-ready survey data that show that most parents are pleased with their schools, and that many parents value the disvenience of a meanby school more than they are disturbed by a report of poor teaching thit. Moreover, in seems clear that even in a "fair" system of choice, the more advantaged in the society will have the extra opportunity - to travel further to a chosen school, to after more imformation about the possible choices, and to have more time to evaluate the reality off each option. Finally, a full-choice system runs the risk of schools being adalitished by entrepreneurs, interested in making money rather than in improving the jallity off chillthen's education.

Though we do not believe all of the problems of a full-choice system would be meliorated by a systemic reform of the sort proposed here, we do suggest that this to gy could provide a structured environment to help control many of the negative pecus, and even enhance the positive aspects of a full choice model. The state initialitim frameworks would establish a protective structure that would help ensure that il schools were attempting to provide a challenging and progressive curriculum. The eather training reforms and the stimulation of curriculum materials by the state would hip make high quality resources available to the schools. Perhaps of most importance, the are examinations based on the curriculum frameworks would provide valid data about macent outcomes to help parents and students make their choice among schools.

This would leave school personnel free within the structure provided by the iniculum frameworks to create the most effective school possible. Their responsibilities could include designing and implementing the curriculum and instructional strategies of the school, establishing the role of extra-curricular activities, and creating the climate of establishing that manner in which the students are treated and motivated. Our use is that it would be these characteristics as well as average examination scores that could be most important to parents in selecting schools for their children. The systemic form would provide an environment within which there could be substantial variation mong schools on these conditions, but which at the same time would engender across mools a attracture of common and challenging curricular goals and expectations.

Teacher professionalism

A common criticism of state reforms, particularly curricular reforms, is that they diminish the sense of professionalism, and, therefore, the effectiveness of teachers by restricting their autonomy and authority to control the content of instruction in their classroom (McNeil 1986, Sykes 1990). In certain circumstances – when centralized, required conticulum is detailed, oppressive, and mediocre, as it is in those states that have mandated a mundane conception of basic skills – we suspect the effect on teachers is very stifling.

But what we are arguing for here is something very different from this common conception of a centralized curriculum. As we imagine them, the curriculum frameworks would not spell out the day-to-day, week-to-week, month-to-month, or even necessarily the year-to-year curricula for the schools. They would set out bodies of knowledge and skills with which students should become familiar and competent over fairly large blocks of time, such as four years. This would require teachers and groups of teachers within the schools to design and organize their own curricula and instruction in such a way as to maximize the achievement of their youngsters. The system that we are suggesting would give far greater responsibility and autonomy to the teachers, individually and collectively, than do, for example, the Advanced Placement curriculum frameworks.

Moreover, part of the power of a coherent system, such as the one we have proposed, is that the knowledge and skills contained in the framework become the basis for that "expert knowledge" component of professionalism that has proved so elusive for teachers (Sykes 1990). The "restructuring" literature has addressed the need, as have we, of giving teachers authority and responsibility and the resources in their workplace to exercise that responsibility. The specification of content and skills in the frameworks provides a structure within which teachers can acquire the knowledge and skills to become experts in their profession. Too often, we suspect, in areas such as science, history, and mathematics, the field of knowledge is so daunting that teachers - especially elementary school teachers - will learn and teach only the very minimum requirements. As their lack of expertise is exposed, this reduces both the teachers' respect for themselves and the respect they receive from others. In the context of the frameworks, however, the field of knowledge is defined and, we believe, thereby more manageable. Moreover, the requirement that the teachers know and be able to teach the content of the frameworks before they can be licensed would give them the incentive to master the material.

Understanding the content of the frameworks and knowing how to teach it would lead to two important conditions conducive to enhancing the professionalism of teachers. The first is simple - such knowledge would set tomorrow's teachers apart from almost every one else in society. Few in our society know anything about plate techtonics, or the importance of 'error' in science, or Bayes Theorem, or could write a coherent three page essay about the economic determinants of the American revolution - indeed, this lack or generalized knowledge in such areas is the very problem the recent reforms are trying to address. Even fewer know how to effectively teach these concepts and skills, either to children or to adults.

Knowing how to teach the content and skills of the framework would lead to the second condition. Professional dialogue about common problems in the profession is part of the mysticism and the excitement of being a professional. If all teachers in a state are expected to teach the challenging material set out by the frameworks to all, they suddenly have a common field within which to share professional information and strategies. Just as the surgeon shares a secret knot she has developed, so will the elementary school teacher

share his strategy for teaching children about the pull of gravity on the tides.

Our complusion, thus, is that the professionalism of teachers will be enhanced by the systemic state reform strategy that we have proposed. Of Sykes's (1990) four components – authority, regard, resources, and knowledge – we have addressed three, authority, resources and knowledge. Our belief is that regard from others will follow the attainment of the other components but that it requires, first, regard from within. We believe further than such self-regard will best be nurtured in a system that both defines and fosters treathers' knowledge and thus their ability to perform competently the task of their profession.

Conclusions

We have argued that a chaotic, multi-layered, and fragmented educational government system im the USA has spawned mediocre and conservative curricula and instruction in our schools. The state reforms of the early and middle 1980s have not had a significant effect om the quality of education, and the present restructuring movement, though promising, does not seem destined to have an impact on very many of the over 100,000 schools in the nation. We have proposed a dual strategy to promote an increase in the quality of education from all schools. The strategy draws on the authority and responsibility of the state to provide a systemwide structure of educational goals and content within which all schools and districts might "restructure" to maximize the quality of their curriculum and instruction.

The state would design and orchestrate the implementation of a coherent instructional guidance system. The cornerstone of the system would be a set of challenging and progressive curriculum frameworks. The frameworks would be developed through a collaborative process involving master teachers, subject matter specialists, and other key members of the state community and would be updated on a regular basis to reflect our changing understanding of the teaching and learning process. The frameworks would provide a substantive structure for a dynamic curriculum that requires active and sustained learning by students. The state would be responsible for establishing a set of challenging student achievement goals, based on the frameworks. Teachers and other local school professionals would be responsible for designing and implementing the curriculum and pedagogical strategies for their schools within the overall context of the state frameworks, to best meet the needs of their particular students. The frameworks would also provide a substantive structure for teacher professional development and for student assessment. In order for teachers to be able to teach the content embedied in the framework, they would need to be systematically exposed to it during pre-service and continuing professional development experiences and should show command of the material and the ability to teach it before they receive a state license to teach.

These actions would require the state to exercise some long-needed leadership to alter and improve the state higher education professional development systems. In addition, the state would hold the local schools and school districts accountable for making progress toward attaining state student achievement goals by employing very high quality examinations developed, using the state curriculum frameworks as templates. Finally, the states would provide technical assistance to communities needing assistance in implementing and meeting the state goals. We have provided some detail on approaches and tacties that states might use to accomplish these aims, but we are mindful that a great

SYS

1

3

deal more than we have suggested would be required to implement the kind of coherent and high-quality strategy that we have proposed.

A state-initiated instructional guidance system would establish a framework within which schools might implement high quality educational programs. Such a system alone, however, is not enough. To alter the curriculum and instruction in schools will also require that the educational governance system be coordinated in its efforts to give local schools the resources, freedom, and authority to provide high quality instruction for their students. The state has constitutional responsibility for ensuring educational quality and opportunity throughout all of the districts within its boundaries, and it has authority to influence parts of the system (such as pre-service teacher training) that are totally out of the purview of local education agencies and schools. Local school people have the responsibility and opportunity to make professional judgments and to implement effective ways to educate their students. The trick is to establish a governance structure where the strengths of the two are maximized to provide the best possible education for all children. We have proposed a number of changes in the orientation of the present governance system to meet this end. In essence, we have suggested putting coherence and direction into the state reforms and content into the restructuring movement.

Acknowledgements

The authors thank Elissa Hirsh for her assistance in preparing this paper. Work on the paper was supported in part by the Center for Policy Research in Education, a consortium of the Eagleton Institute of Politics at Rutgers University, the University of Wisconsin at Madison, Michigan State University, and Stanford University, under grant number G-0086-90011 from the Office of Educational Research and Improvement, at the US Department of Education. The views expressed do not necessarily reflect those of the sponsoring agencies.

The ideas in this paper have been influenced by the authors' interactions with a wide variety of people, but especially by discussions with our colleagues in the Center for Policy Research in Education (CPRE), Martin Camoy, William Clune, Daivd K. Cohen, Richard Elmore, Susan Fuhrman, Michael Kirst, Henry Levin, Milbrey McLaughlin, Janice Patterson, Andrew Porter, and Gary Sykes. We have also profited from discussions with Jane David, Mike Cohen, Bill Honig, Alan Ginsburg, Albert Shanker, Gordon Ambach, and Mare Tucker. Finally, David K. Cohen, Charles Kolb, Ramsay Selden and David Tyack all gave us insightful comments on an earlier version of this paper. Naturally, none of these thoughful people necessarily share all of the ideas in this paper or are responsible for our errors of fact or logic. A brief form of some of the ideas in this paper were shared with the Advisory Council for the Science and Engineering Education Directorate of the National Science Foundation over two years ago (Smith 1988). NSF recently released a Request for Proposals to states to design and implement systemic state reforms in support of science and mathematics education (Rothman 4, April 1990). A brief description by Bill Honig of the California reforms, which are similar in some respects to the reforms proposed here, appeared in the Education Week (Honis, 28 February 1990). Finally, many of the ideas suggested here have been contained in talks made by Smith (e.g., AERA ABHI 1990).

Notes

- 1. Darling-Hammond and Berry (1988) estimate that states considered over 1000 pieces of legislation on teacher policy during the first five years of the reforms; see also Firestone et al., (1989).
- 2. A few states are exceptions to these generalizations. South Carolina (South Carolina Board of Education 1989) and California (Honig 1990), for example, both report important recent gains in student achievement, attributed to the reforms. In both of these cases, the state has made a concerted effort to influence the instructional process within the schools.
- 3. Researchers and journalists who have observed many US schools are struck by the deadening mediocrity of most. See, for example, Powell et al. (1985) and Sizer (1984). The first report of the Project 2061 effort Science for All Americans describes instruction in science in US classrooms in the following way: 'The present science textbooks and methods of instruction, far from helping, often actually impede progress toward scientific literacy. They emphasize the learning of answers more than the exploration of questions, memory at the expense of critical thought, bits and pieces of information instead of understandings in context, recitation over argument, reading in lieu of doing. They fail to encourage students to work together, to share ideas and information freely with each other, or to use modern instruments to extend their intellectual capabilities' (AAAS 1989: 14).
- 4. Take mathematics and science education as just one example. At the federal level, one independent government policymaking body establishes the specifications for a national test of mathematics achievement which is then developed by an independent private non-profit organization for administration within most of the USA; another independent agency administers over \$250 million in project funds to improve mathematics and science education at the state and local levels; still another agency administers a \$200 million federal program to states to improve mathematics and science education. The laws governing these various efforts (which are only a sample of federal government activity) are written by different subcommittees and committees in Congress, governed by regulations that contain little reference to the other federal or even to state programs, and administered by civil servants who rarely talk to each other. (There is now a federal coordinating body chaired by the Secretary of still another government agency, the Energy Department, which has almost no expertise or direct involvement in the educational system.) At the state level, in each of the 50 states, there is at least one, and often multiple, agencies producing independent efforts to improve mathematics and science education, efforts driven by literally tens of different and independently developed state laws. And almost every state has a state assessment or set of assessments designed to measure progress in mathematics and science achievement - assessments that are not only independent of the national assessment effort but of national, state and local curriculum efforts as well. Finally, the mechanisms and requirements for teacher certification in many states operate with almost total independence from other state educational laws, and the authority for overseeing the quality of teacher training typically rests with the state higher education system, which often has little interest in changing itself to meet the needs of the K-1/2 system. Add to this the supplementary and often conflicting guidance that local school teachers receive from their own district and school coordinators, and from local universities and businesses, and the fact that the basic textbooks and materials in most classrooms are developed entirely independently from ail of the federal, state, and local guidance, and we begin to see why many teachers are skeptical of attempts to reform the schools.
- 5. There is an Important irony here. In another paper we argue that the nation's 'common basic skills curriculum' has led to a dramatic reduction in the achievement gap between African-American and white students over the past 20 years. While the achievement distribution for white students has remained unchanged, African-American student achievement in reading, and to a lesser extent in mathematics and science, has shown steady gTowth. We posit that the basic skills curriculum has contributed both to the lack of change in white achievement and to the important gams of black students (Smith and O'Day 1990). Our hypothesis, however, is that the next major reductions in the size of the 'gap' will require a change for black students away from an overall emphasis on basic skills toward a more complex and challenging curriculum. The equality problem here, of course, is that this change may occur more easily in more 'advantaged' communities which may lead to future increases in the 'gap'.
- 6. A wonderful, large-scale example of this phenomenon is the history of the 'new' science curricula generated in the adtermath of Sputnik. These curricula were generally well-financed, carefully-ceveloped and contained exciting state-of-the-art (at that time) content, instructional strategies, and materials. Because of their innovative, challenging and hands-on character, they demanded more of teachers than did the conventional curricula. The curricula were initially supported by extensive, but voluntary, in-service teacher training programs. As a consequence they were initially adopted and

adapted by large numbers of innovative teachers around the nation. Moreover, the evaluations carried out on them showed clearly that they produced superior results to the conventional conticula (Shymansky et al. 1983). Yet by the middle 1970s these curricula had all but died out in the US schools. There were few pre-service teacher-training institutions preparing their students adequately to use the materials, and the in-service teacher training efforts had subsided to a trickle, so there were few new teachers beginning to use the materials. Meanwhile, increasing numbers of the teachers experienced in the new curricula left teaching, moved to different schools, or succumbed to the quiet pressures of the system to teach the more conventional material.

- 7. This discussion should not be viewed as 'teacher bashing', but as a critique of the level of knowledge and skills of almost everyone in our society. Few of us have sufficient understanding to teach the content of the seventh grade mathematics (algebra) in Japan or the geometry and probability for US grades K-8 suggested by the National Council on Teachers of Mathematics, or the science content and skills recommended for elementary school students by the American Association for the Advancement of Science.
- 8. One reason that this fundamental issue is rarely raised among school people is that there may be a lack of clarity about the curricular goals and purposes within schools and districts. If there are no well-auticulated curricular frameworks for a school or district, then it is difficult to perceive the inadequacy of a test which is similarly constructed.
- 9. Sykes (1990) also argues that teachers need more regard from others in society, greater authority witthin schools, and a specialized knowledge base.
- 10. See Cohen 1990 for a discussion of 'instructional guidance systems'.
- 11. Albert Shanker has recently been advocating a 'schools incentive program' along these lines for successful teachers and schools; see Shanker (1990) for a discussion of this proposal.
- 12. A number of states (Connecticut, California, Michigan, New York) are already on their way in the development of a new generation of challenging and innovative assessment instruments.
- 13. One mechanism for parental involvement in the education of their children has gathered a variety of advocates at all levels of the governance system. The idea is that parents and schools would enter into a "contract" with each other. The contract would be moral, not legal, and would specify the schools' instructional (content; pedagogy, and assessment) intentions on the one side, and, on the other side, the parents pledge that they would commit themselves to insuring that their children attend school on time and regularly, that their children do their homework, and that the parents meet with the teachers a number of times during the year. The focus of this effort would be on the intellectual growth of the children. Such an effort could be particularly important in those schools where there are a large number of lower income parents who feel alternated from the schools.
- 1414. There are important roles for districts which are beyond the scope of this paper to discuss in detail. Among these responsibilities are: administration of federal and state programs in progressive ways; administrative tasks such as student transportation, legal matters, facilities management and building etc. that are most efficiently carried out at the central level; maintaining a system of fiscal, administrative and educational accountability; the latter presumably relying primarily on the state examinations; and the coordination of social services for school age children with other service agencies within the district:
 - 15. However, we would not support any full choice (voucher) system unless it contained four key components: First, the "state" voucher must constitute full payment for the school schools would not be allowed to charge extra tuition beyond the value of the voucher. Second, over-subscription to a school would be resolved by lottery: Third, transportation would be provided for the needy. Fourth, there would have to be an aggressive and publicly-sponsored system of providing information about the available choices among the schools: In the context of the reforms that we suggest one more component would be necessary: The schools in the voucher system would all be assessed with the state examinations based on the state curriculum frameworks and the data would be made publicly available to assist parents and students in their selection of schools:

References

- AMERICAN ASSOCIATION FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF SCIENCE (AAAS) (1989) Science for All Americans: A Project 2061 Report on Literacy Goals in Science, Mathematics, and Technology (Washington, DC: AAAS).
- ARCHBALD, D.A. and NEWMANN, F. M. (1988) Beyond Standardized Testing: Assessing Authoritic Academic Achievement in the Secondary School (Rescon, VA: National Association of Secondary School Principals).
- CARNEGIE FORUM ON EDUCATION AND THE ECONOMY (1986) A Nation Prepared: Teachers for the Twenty-first Century (New York: Carnegie Corporation).
- CHUBB, J.E. and MOE, T. (1990) Politics, Markets, and Aumorican Schools (Washington, DC: Brookings Institute).
- JUNE, W.H., with P. White and J. Patterson (1989) The Implementation and Effect of High School Graduation Requirements: First Steps Toward Curricular Reform (New Brunswick, NJ: Ranguess University, Center for Policy Research in Education).
- CLUNE, W. H. (1990, this volume) "Educational policy in a situation of uncertainy; or, how to put eggs in different baskets', in S. H. Fuhrman and B. Malen (eds) The Polities of Curriculum and Testing (Philadelphia: Falmer Press), pp. 125-138.
- COHEN, D.K. (1989) 'Teaching practice: plus ca change e...', in P.W. Jackson (ed.) Contributing to Educational Change: Perspectives on Research and Practice (Berkeley, CA: McCutchan), pp. 27-84.
- COHEN, D. K. (1990) 'The classroom of state and federal education policy', School of Education, Michigan State University.
- COHEN, D.K. (1990, this volume), 'Revolution in one classroom', in S.H. Fuhrman and B. Malen (eds)

 The Politics of Curriculum and Testing (Philadelphia: Falmer Press), pp. 103-123.
- COHEN, M. (1983) 'Instructional, management, and social conditions in effective schools', in A. Odden and L.D. Webb (eds) School Finance and School Improvement: Linkages for the 1980s (Cambridge, MA: Ballinger).
- COLEMAN, J. and Hoffen, T. (1987) Public and Private High Schools: The Impact of Communisies (New York: Basic Books).
- CROSSWHITE, F.J., DOSSEY, J. A., SWAFFORD, J. O., MCKNIGHT C. C. and COONEY, T.J. (1985) Second International Mathematics Study Summary Report for the United States (Champaign, IL: Stipes).
- CUBAN, L. (1990) 'Reforming again, again, and again', Educational Researcher, 19, pp. 3-43.
- CUBAN, L. (1984) How Teachers Taught: Constancy and Change in the American Classroom, 1890-1980 (New York: Longman).
- DARLING-HAMMOND, L. and BERRY, B. (1988) Evolution of Teacher Policy. Report of the Center for Policy Research in Education, Eagleton Institute of Politics at Rutgers University and The Rand Corporation, Washington DC.
- DARLING-HAMMOND, L., with J. Green (1990) 'Teacher quality and equality', in J. I. Goodlad and P. Keading (eds) Access to Knowledge: An Agenda for our Nation's Schools (New York: The College Entrance Examination Board), pp. 237-258.
- DAVID, J. (1990) 'Restructuring in progress: lessons from pioneering districts', in R. Elmore and associates (eds) Restructuring Schools: The Next Generation of Educational Ressort (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass), pp. 209-250.
- DAVID, J., COMEN, M., HONETSCHLAGER, D. and TRAIMAN, S. (1990) State Actions to Resonacture Schools: First Steps (Washington, DC: National Governors' Association).
- ELMORE, R. F. (1986) Choice in Public Education (New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers Uniwersity, Center for Policy Research in Education).
- ELMORE, R. F. and associates (1990) Restructuring Schools: The Generation of Education Ressort (San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass).
- ELMORE, R. F. and McLaughtin, M. W. (1988) Steady Work: Policy, Practice and the Reform of American Education (Santa Monica, CA: Rind Corporation)
- FIRESTONE, W. A., FUHRMAN, S. H. and KIRST, M. W. (1989) The Progress of Resjorm: Am Approisal of State Education Initiatives (New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University, Center for Policy Research in Education).
- FREDERICKSEN, N. (1984) 'The real test blast influences of testing on teaching and learning', American Psychologist, 39, pp. 193-202.

- FUHRMAN, S.H. and ELMORE, R. F. (1990) 'Understanding local control in the wake of state education reform', Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 12 (1), pp. 82-96.
- FUHRMAN, S.H. (1990) 'Legislatures and education policy', paper presented at the Eagleton Institute of Politics Symposium on the Legislature in the Twenty-First Century, 27-29 April, Williamsburg, VA.
- GLASER, R. (1984) 'Education and thinking: the role of knowledge', American Psychologist, 39, pp. 93-104. GOODLAD, J. I. (1984) A Place Called School (New York: McGraw-Hill).
- GUSKEY, T. (1986) 'Staff development and the process of teacher change', Educational Resonancher, 15 (5), pp 5-12.
- HAERTEL, E. H. (1987) 'Validity of teacher licensure and teacher education admissions tests', paper prepared for the National Education Association and the Council of Chief State School Officers, Stanford University, Stanford, CA.
- HAWKINS, E. K. F. (1990) 'The effects of the 1980s reform movement on levels of public education expenditure', Ph.D. dissertation, Stanford University, Stanford, CA.
- HAWLEY, W.D. and ROSENHOLZ, S.J., with H. Goldstein and T. Hasselbring (1984) 'Good schools: what research says about improving student achievement', Peabody Journal of Education, 61 (4), pp. 1-178.
- HOLMES GROUP (1990) Tomorrow's Schools: A Report from the Holmes Group (East Lansing, MI: The Hollmes Group).
- HONIG, B. (1990) 'Comprehensive strangy' can improve schools', Education Week, 9 (23), p. 56.
- LAMPERT, M. (1988) 'What can research on teacher education tell us about improving quality in mathematics education?', Teaching and Teacher Education, 4 (2), pp. 157-170.
- LEVIN, H.M. (1985) 'Solving the shortage of mathematics and science teachers', Education, Evaluation, and Policy Analysis, 7 (4), pp. 371-382.
- Little, J. W., Gerritz, W. H., Sterm, D. S., Gutthrie, J. W., Kirst, M. W. and Marsh, D. D. (1987)

 'Staff development in California', joint publication of the Far West Laboratory for Educational

 Research and Development (San Francisco) and Policy Analysis for California Education (UC Berkeley).
- McKnight, C.C., Crosswhite, F.J., Dossey, J.A., Kiffer, E., Swafford, J.O., Travers, K.J. and Cooney, T.J. (1987) The Underachieving Cumiculum: Assessing US School Nuthematics from an Intentional Perspective (Champaign, IL: Stipes).
- MCLAUGHLIN, M. W. (1990) 'Enabling professional development: what have we learned?', in A. Lieberman and L. Miller (eds) Staff Development and School Change: New Domands, New Readities, New Perspectives (New York: Teachers College Press).
- McNell, L. (1986) Contradictions of Control (New York: Routledge & Kegan Paul).
- MULLIS, I. V.S. and JENKINS, L.B. (1990) The Recading Report Cand, 1971-1988: National Assessment of Educational Progress (Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Service).
- MURINANE, R.J. and OLSEN, R.T. (1989) 'The effects of salaries and opportunity costs on duration in teaching: evidence from Michigan', Revively of Economics and Sucristics, pp. 347-352.
- MURNANE, R.J. and OLSEN, R. T. (1990) 'The effects of salaries and opportunity costs on duration in teaching: evidence from North Carolina', Journal of Human Resources, 25, pp. 106-124.
- NEWMANN, F. (1988) 'Can depth replace coverage in the high school curriculum?', Phi Delta Kuppan, 69 (5), pp. 345-348.
- OAKES, J. (1985) Keeping Track: How Schools Structure Inequality (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press). PETERSON, P.L. (1986) 'Selecting students and services for compensatory education: lessons from aptitude-treatment interaction research', paper prepared for the Conference on Effects of Alternative Designs in Compensatory Education (Washington, DC: Office of Educational Research and Improvement, Department of Education).
- PETERSON, P.L. (1987) 'Teaching for higher-order thinking in mathematics: the challenge for the next decade', in D.A. Grouws and T.J. Cooney (eds) Effective Mathematics Teaching (Reston, VA: National Council of Teachers of Mathematics).
- PETERSON, P. L. (1989) 'Alternatives to student retention: new images of the learner, the teacher and classroom teaching', in L. A. Shepherd and M. L. Smith (eds) Flunking Grades: Research and Policies on Retention (New York: Falmer Press).
- POWELL, A., FERICAR, E. and COMEN, D.K. (1985) The Shopping Mall High School (Boston: Houghton Missia).
- PURKEY, S. and SMITH, M.S. (1983) 'Effective schools: a review', The Elementary School Journal, 83 (4), pp. 427—52.

- PURKEY, S. and SMITH, M.S. (1985) 'School reform: the district policy implications of the effective schools literatumes', The Elementary School Journal, 85 (3), pp. 427-452.
- RAIZEN, S. and JONES, L. (1985) Indicators of Precollege Education in Science and Mathematics: A Preliminary Review (Washington, DC: National Academy Press).
- RESNICK, D.F. and RESNICK, L.B. (1985) 'Standards, curriculum, and performance: a historical and comparative perspective', Educational Researcher, 14 (4), pp. 5-20.
- RESNICK, L.B. (1988) Education and Learning to Think (Washington, DC: National Academy Press).
- ROTHMAN, R. (1990) 'S80 million NSF program to spur reforms unveiled', Education Week (4 Avril), p. 5.. SHANKER, A. (1990) 'The end of the traditional model of schooling and a proposal for using incentives to resonance our public schools', Phi Delta Kappan 69 (5), pp. 344-357.
- SHYMANSKY, J. A., KYLE, W.C. Jr. and ALPORT, J. M. (1983) 'The effects of new science curricula on student performance', Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 20 (5), pp. 387-404.
- SIZER, T. (1984) Horace's Compromise: The Dilemma of the American High School (Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin).
- SMITH, M. S. (1988) Letter to Bassam Shakhashiri, Director of Science and Engineering Education Programs, NSF; available from Dean's Office, Stanford School of Education, Stanford University, Stanford, CA 94305-3096.
- SMITH, M.S. (1990) 'Toward a national curricultum', speech given at American Educational Ressentch Association Annual Meeting (Boston); available on audiotape from Teach 'Em, 160 East Illinois Street, Chicago, IL 60611, USA.
- SMITH, M.S. and O'DAY, J. (1988) Research into Teaching Quality: Main Findings and Lessons for Appreciaal (ED/WP1(88)8). Report Prepared for the meeting of the Working Party on the Condition of Teaching, OECD, Paris, France, 40pp; available from OECD; also available as 'Teaching Policy and Research on Teaching', from CERAS, Stanford School of Education, Stanford University, Stanford, CA 94305-3096, USA.
- SMITH, M. S. and O'DAY, J. (in press) 'Educational equality: 1966 and now', in D. Verstegen (ed.) Spheres of Justice in American Schools (Cambridge, MA: Ballinger).
- South Carolina State Board of Education (1989) What is the Penny Buying for South Canolina?', (Columbia, SC: SCBE).
- STEDMAN, L.C. and SMITH, M.S. (1983) 'Recent reform proposals for American education', Contemporary Education Review, 2 (2), pp. 85-104.
- SYKES, G. (1990) 'Fostering teacher professionalism in schools', in R. F. Elmore and associates (eds):

 Restructuring School: The Next Generation of Educational Reform (San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Buss).
- TYSON-BERNSTEIN, H. (1988) 'The Academy's contribution to the impoverishment of America's textbooks', Phi Delta Kappan, 70 (3), pp. 193-198.

עת לעשות

The Report of the Commission on Jewish Education in North America



EAD OMMUNITIES

A PROJECT OF THE COUNCIL FOR INITIATINES IN JEWISH EDUCATION

PROGRAM GUIDELINES

January 1992

A Message from the Chairman

The Council for Initiatives in Jewish Education was established as an outgrowth of the Commission on Jewish Education in North America in November 1990.

CIJE brings together distinguished educators, professionals, lay leaders and philam-thropists of the continental Jewish community to energize Jewish education in North America. Visions of what should and can be achieved in the 21st century need to be repeatedly placed before our communities' leadership, and the wherewithal to do so obtained. The CIJE can provide a unique blend of individual and institutional advocacy in North America.

The Lead Communities Project is intended to demonstrate that local communities can significantly improve the effectiveness of Jewish education through careful organizing for the task, with a coalition of community institutions, supplemented with continental institutions and resources.

We invite you to apply to become a participant in a systematic, creative and visible experiment to create communities of educated Jews to help insure the continuity of the Jewish people.

Morton L. Mandel

Teratur & Mardel

Chair

Purpose of Guidelines

These guidelines are designed to help communities answer the questions:

- Should we seek to become a lead community?
- How do we apply?

What and Why a Lead Communities Project?

The Lead Communities Project is a joint continental-local collaboration for excellence in Jewish education. The purpose is to demonstrate that it is possible to significantly improve Jewish education, both formal and informal, in communities in North America with the right combination of leadership, programs, resources, and planning.

Three communities in North America, each with a population of between 15,000 and 300,000, will be invited to join with the Council for Initiatives in Jewish Education in carrying out the Lead Communities Project.

The central thesis of the Lead Communities Project is that the best way to generate positive change at the continental level is to mobilize the commitment and energy of local communities. The successes achieved by local communities are the most compelling testimony to what is possible.

For the purposes of this project, a "community" is an urban or metropolitan geographic area with a communal organization structure and decision-making system in place.

See the Appendix beginning on page 7 for elaboration on the Rationale for the Lead Communities Project.

Who is Eligible?

Any central communal entity within a city or metropolitan area (as recognized by the Council of Jewish Federations) with a Jewish population between 15,000 and 300,000 is eligible.

Expectations of a Lead Community

A lead community will:

- enlist top local leadership representing all aspects of the community;
- build a community-wide coalition involving federation, congregations, educational and other institutions;
- mobilize stakeholders from all sectors of the Jewish community in improving programs;
- create programs of educational excellence;
- devise innovative programs, for example, that cross traditional boundaries of age, setting or subject area;
- commit additional financial resources to Jewish education;
- base its programs on a serious planning effort with ongoing monitoring and evaluation;
- show tangible results after several years of intense activity; and
- help other communities benefit from its successes.

In short, a lead community is committed to improving Jewish education and to translating its commitment into action.

CIJE's Role in the Lead Communities Project

CUE will initiate and coordinate continental supports for the benefit of each lead community. CUE will:

- identify funders and help obtain financial support;
- offer examples of good programs and experiences through the "Best Practices Project," and help translate them to lead communities;
- provide professional assistance for planning and education;
- develop links to continental resource agencies (e.g., national training institutions, JESNA, JCCA, denominational movements, universities);
- develop a monitoring, evaluation and feedback system;
- provide leadership recruitment assistance;
 and
- convene lead communities for ongoing seminars during the project.

How to Apply

To be considered a potential lead community, a central communal entity should submit a five to eight (5 - 8) page preliminary proposal to the CIJE. This should include:

A cover letter signed by an authorized representative of the central entity. It should identify a committee to guide the project; indicate the criteria for naming a major communal leader to chair such a committee (or provide a name if a chair has already been identified); and briefly describe the probable size and composition of the projected or actual committee. The letter should also address the issue of probable or actual professional leadership for the project (e.g. do you contemplate a Lead Community Director?).

A 1 or 2 page statistical profile including Jewish population; number of individuals receiving various types of Jewish education, both formal and informal; a listing of Jewish educational agencies and programs, both formal and informal; current spending on Jewish education; and the number and categories of personnel involved in Jewish education.

A 1 or 2 page description of current or recent studies of community needs and resources or plans for Jewish education.

A 1 or 2 page essay making the case for why you think that your community would be an outstanding lead community. The essay can also describe the overall approach to educational improvement that your community might use if selected.

A 1 or 2 page listing of recent community initiatives in Jewish education. Please cite examples of unusually successful programs and innovative efforts in Jewish education already undertaken in your community.

Preliminary proposals must be received by March 31., 1992. Proposals received after that date cannot be considered.

Proposals, preliminary and full, should be typed or printed on letter size paper, double-spaced using a full-size type face and normal margins. Please do not submit appendices or supplemental materials to the preliminary proposal. If reviewers need additional information, they will ask for it. Faxed proposals will not be accepted.

Send two (2) copies of the proposal to:

Council for Initiatives in Jewish Education e/o Ukeles Associates Inc. 611 Broadway, Suite 505 New York, NY 10012

Review Criteria: Preliminary Proposals

Preliminary proposals will be assessed to confirm eligibility and evaluated using two primary criteria:

- Community Preparedmess. Is the community positioned to move forward by virtue of its involvement of key institutions and constituencies, leadership, previous planning and improvement efforts in Jewish education?
- **Commitment.** How clearly and convincingly has the community expressed its commitment to the improvement of Jewish education?

The community's record of achievement and its approach to educational improvement also will be taken into account.

CIJE seeks the best proposals, reflecting a range of regions and types of communities.

Full Proposals

If selected as a finalist, a community will be asked to submit a full proposals. Final proposals should include the following elements:

- A 2 to 3 page summary description (or copies of previously prepared documents) that addresses the current view of the educational needs of the community.
- A 2 to 3 page analysis (or copies of previous prepared documents) of the community's capabilities for meeting the commitments outlined in the preliminary proposal.
- A 2 to 3 page summary of the community's record of achievement in Jewish education that describes successful programs, systemic reforms, and innovations that have been introduced.
- A 2 to 3 page description of the community's vision for improving Jewish education. This vision statement should address both formal and informal Jewish education, and approaches for different population groups and educational settings.
- A 2 to 3 page description of the anticipated planning resources that will be committed if the community is selected to be a lead community.
- A preliminary projection of the scale or size of the project (e.g. in dollars) and possible local sources of funding.

Review Criteria: Full Proposals

Full proposals will be evaluated using the same criteria as preliminary proposals, but with greater depth. One additional criterion will be employed: the capacity of the community to carry out its commitment and vision.

?? QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS??

Teleconference by Satellite

A teleconference by satellite, broadcast throughout the United States and Canada, to answer questions about the Lead Communities Project will be held on February 24, 1992, at 3:00 pm Eastern Standard Time. Any community that intends to submit a proposal or is considering submitting one is urged to participate. The teleconference will start with a brief presentation on the Lead Community Project expectations. Participants will them have the opportunity to address questions directly to CIJE staff and consultants.

Please send the "plan to attend" form by mail or facisimile transmission by February 18, 1992, if you plan to participate in the teleconference. Instructions for arranging to attend a teleconferencing center in your area are provided on a sheet included with these program guidelines.

Questions after February 24, 1992

After the teleconference on February 24, questions may be directed to:

Dr. James Meier
Council for Initiatives in Jewish Education
c/o Ukeles Associates Inc.
611 Broadway, Suite 505
New York, NY 10012
(212) 260-8758 (office)
(212) 260-8760 (fax)



Timetable

Selection Process Timetable

Month Benchmark

January 31, 1992 Program Guidelines released

February 24 Satellite teleconference

March 31 Preliminary proposals due

April Review panelists evaluate proposals

May 5 Select finalists

June 30 Finalists submit full proposals

July Review panelists visit sites

mid-August Lead communities selected

Lead Communities Timetable

September 1992 Hold initial seminar for lead communities

October CIJE/community agree on joint program;

project begins

October 1992- Lead communities develop plan and

July 1993 pilot action program

September 1993 Lead communities begin full-scale

implementation of first year program

Appendix

Rationale for Lead Communities Project

Rationale for Lead Communities Project

The Lead Communities Project is a joint continental-local collaboration for excellence in Jewish education. The purpose is to demonstrate that it is possible to significantly improve Jewish education, both formal and informal, in communities in North America with the night

Why a Lead Communities Project

combination of leadership, programs, resources, and planning.

Improving Effectiveness

The heart of this effort is a commitment to help improve the effectiveness of Jewish education in North America.

Jewish education involves not only acquisition of knowledge but also the development of skills, shaping of values and influence of behavior. It can take place in a day school, a supplementary school, summer camp, congregation or Jewish community center; on a trail in the Galilee, in a living room in Iowa or in a setting where young and old learn together. It happens through study of text, a lecture, film, computer or discussion groups or field trips.

However it happens, Jewish education must be compelling —emotionally, intellectually and spiritually. It must inspire greater numbers of Jews, young and old, to remain engaged, to learn, feel and act in a way that reflects an understanding of and commitment to Jewish values.

To achieve this objective, Jewish education must be nurtured, expanded and vastly improved. Both the CIJE and the lead communities will set goals for "improvement." These will take a concrete form, such as:

- More and better Jewish education programs and services;
- Greater participation in Jewish education; and
- Better outcomes (related to Jewish knowledge, skills, behaviors and values).

The central thesis of the Lead Communities Project is that the best way to generate positive change at the continental scale is to mobilize the commitment and energy of local communities to create successes that stand as testimony to what is possible.

"Models" as a Strategy for Positive Change

Local efforts that are working well need to be reinforced. Local communities have to be connected to the pockets of excellence across the nation that too often have worked in isolation. Positive change will require a vehicle to encourage inspired approaches and to support innovation and experimentation. This project makes it possible to evaluate,, improve and try out a variety of approaches for Jewish education throughout the community,, and prepare the groundwork for adoption and expansion of good ideas elsewhere.

Fundamental to the success of this project will be the commitment of the community and its key stakeholders. The community must be willing to set high educational standards, raisse additional funding for education, involve all or most of its educational institutions in the program and, thereby, become a model for the rest of the country.

Definition of Community

For the purposes of this project, a "community" is an urban or metropolitan geographic area with a communal organization structure and decision-making system in place. The initial focus is on communities with a Jewish population of 15,000 to 300,000.**

A cornerstone of the Lead Communities Project is the emphasis on the entire local community, rather than the individual school, program or Jewish camp. The evidence is growing in general education as well as Jewish education that lasting educational reform involves the interaction of school, family and community because there is a continuing interplay among them. One needs to affect the entire system, not just a single setting, program or age group.

What Makes a Lead Community

A lead community will be characterized by four areas of community commitment: leadership, programs, resources, and planning.

Leadership

A lead community is expected to chart a course that others can follow. The most respected rabbis, educators, professionals, scholars and lay leaders will serve on community-wide steering committees to guide the project in a specific community. All sectors of the community == congregations, schools, community centers and federations == will need to be involved. Recruiting top community leaders to the cause of Jewish education and involving all sectors of the community will help raise Jewish education to the top of the community agenda:

Lead community leadership, both professional and lay, also will participate in the ongoing effort to define and refine the project as it is extended to other communities.

^{*} The \$7 communities within this range account for about 3,300,000 out of about 3.3 million Jews.
These figures are based on data from the Council of Jewish Federations.

Programs

Each of the lead communities will engage in the process of redesigning and improving Jewish education through a wide array of intensive programs. The programs of the lead community need to reflect continental as well as local experience and ideas.

Lead communities will benefit from successful experiences across the continent. CIIE is undertaking a systematic effort to identify the best examples of specific programs, projects or institutions in North America, called the "Best Practices Project." In preparing action plans, lead communities will have access to the inventory of the most promissing programs.

The report of the Commission on Jewish Education in North America recommends that lead communities concentrate on personnel and broadening community support as critical "enabling options." They are necessary for the significant improvement of Jewish education. A promising programmatic option is study and travel in Israel, which has proven to be a very effective motivator for young and old alike. Thus, personnel, community support and educational travel by youth to Israel will be important ingredients in the community's plan of action.

Local initiatives may include improvement or expansion of existing programs or the creation of new ones. It is anticipated that communities will devise new programs that cross traditional boundaries of age, setting or content. Examples of other programs that could be undertaken, separately or combined in an imaginative way, as part of a lead communities program include:

- Replicating good schools and/or establishing model schools;
- Developing outstanding programs at Jewish community centers;
- Intensifying and improving early childhood programs;
- Designing programs in adult and family education;
- Creating cooperative programs between the community and local college campuses;
- Developing new models of post bar-mitzvah or bat-mitzvah education;
- Developing strategies for outreach;
- Raising the level of Jewish knowledge of communal leaders;
- Integrating formal and informal education (e.g. camping/study programs); and
- Using new technology (video and computers).

Lead community projects are expected to address both scope and quality: they should be comprehensive enough to make an impact on a large segment of the community; and focused enough to ensure standards of excellence.

Financial Resources

A program of breadth, depth and excellence will require new monies, primarily because the endeavor has long been underfunded. The economic recession and substantial resettlement needs make communal fund-raising more challenging. Nevertheless, a lead community will point a direction in this area as well—substantially upgrading the local investment in Jewish education. Increased funding will come from federations, private foundations, congregations, tuition and other sources.

An important part of CIJE's role is to mobilize private foundations, philanthropists and other continental resources to match the financial efforts of local communities.

Planning

The plan for each lead community will include: an assessment of the state of Jewish educatiom in the community at the present time; an analysis of needs and resources; the development of a strategy and priorities; the design of programs; and the preparation of a multi-year integrated implementation plan for improving educational effectiveness. CIJE can help focus the resources of national agencies -- institutions of higher Jewish learning, religious movements, JCCA, JESNA, and universities -- on the needs of local communities.

How will we know the lead communities have succeeded in creating better outcomes for Jewish education? On what basis will the CIJE encourage other cities to emulate the programs developed in lead communities? Like any innovation, the Lead Communities Project requires evaluation to document its efforts and gauge its success. In addition, each lead community needs to know how well it is doing as a basis for making change along the way. CIJE will design and implement a consistent monitoring, evaluation and feedback system for use in each lead community to help answer these questions.

Lead Communities: A Continental Enterprise

Improving Jewish education throughout the continent is the ultimate goal of the Lead Communities Project: to re-energize Jewish education, and to demonstrate and validate successful approaches to Jewish education that can be found in and replicated by communities throughout North America.

Council for Initiatives in Jewish Education

Board of Directors:

Morton Mandel, Chair Charles Goodman, Vice Chair Neil Greenbaum, Vice Chair Matthew Maryles, Vice Chair Lester Pollack, Vice Chair

Max Fisher, Honorary Chair

David Amow Mandell Berman Charles Bronfman Gerald Cohen John Colman Maurice Corson Irwin Field Alfred Gottschalk Arthur Green Thomas Hausdorff David Hirschhorn Ludwig Jesselson Henry Koschitzky Mark Lainer Norman Lamm Norman Lipoff Seymour Martin Lipset Florence Melton Melvin Merians Charles Ratner Esther Leah Ritz Ismar Schorsch Isadore Twersky Bennett Yanowitz

Staff:

Stephen Hoffman, Acting Director Shulamith Elster, Chief Education Officer



LEAD COMMUNITIES AT WORK

A. INTRODUCTION

The Commission on Jewish Education in North America completed its work with five recommendations. The establishment of Lead communities is one of those recommendations, but it is also the means or the place where the other recommendations will be played out and implemented. Indeed, a lead community will demonstrate locally, how to:

- .. Build the profession of Jewish education and thereby address the shortage of qualified personnel;
- Mobilize community support to the cause of Jewish education;
- 3. Develop a research capability which will provide the knowledge needed to inform decisions and guide development. In Lead Communities this will be undertaken through the monitoring, evaluation and feedback project;
- 4. Establish an implementation mechanism at the local level, parallel to the Council for Initiatives in Jewish Education, to be a catalyst for the implementation of these recommendations;
- 5. The fifth recommendation is, of course, the lead community itself, to function as a local laboratory for Jewish education.

((The implementation of recommendations at the continental level is discussed in separate documents.)

B. THE SCOPE OF THE PROJECT

1. A Lead Community will be an entire community engaged in a major development and improvement program of its Jewish education. Three model communities will be chosen to demonstrate what can happen where there is an infusion of outstanding personnel into the educational system, where the importance of Jewish education is recognized by the community and its leadership and where the necessary resources are secured to meet additional needs.

The vision and programs developed in Lead Communities will demonstrate to the Jewish Community of North America what Jewish education at its best can achieve.

- 2. The Lead Community project will involve all or most Jewish education actors in that community. It is expected that lay leaders, educators, rabbis and heads of educational institutions of all ideological streams and points of view will participate in the planning group of the project, to shape it, guide it and take part in decisions.
- 3. The Lead Community project will deal with the major educational areas those in which most people are involved at some point in their lifetime:
 - Supplementary Schools
 - Day Schools
 - JCCs
 - Israel programs
 - Early Childhood programs

In addition to these areas, other fields of interest to the specific communities could also be included, e.g. a community might be particularly interested in:

- Adult learning
- Family education
- Summer camping
- Campus programs
- Etc...
- 4. Most or all institutions of a given area might be involved in the program (e.g. most or all supplementary schools).
- 5. A large proportion of the community's Jewish population would be involved.

C. VISION

A Lead Community will be characterized by its ongoing interest in the goals of the project. Educational, rabbinic and lay leaders will project a vision of what the community hopes to achieve several years hence, where it wants to be in terms of the Jewish knowledge and behavior of its members, young and adult. This vision could include elements such as:

- adolescents have a command of spoken Hebrew;
- intermarriage decreases;
- many adults study classic Jewish texts;
- educators are qualified and engaged in ongoing training;
- supplementary school attendance has increased dramatically;

- a locally produced Jewish history curriculum is changing the way the subject is addressed in formal education;
- the local Jewish press is educating through the high level of its coverage of key issues.

The vision, the goals, the content of Jewish education would be addressed at two levels:

- 1. At the communal level the leadership would develop and articulate a notion of where it wants to be, what it wants to achieve.
- 2. At the level of individual institutions or groups of institutions of similar views (e.g., all Reform schools), educators, rabbis, lay leaders and parents will articulate the educational goals.

It is anticipated that these activities will create much debate and ferment in the community, hat they will focus the work of the Lead Communities on core issues facing the Jewish identity of North American Jewry, and that they will demand of communities to face complex dilemmas and choices (e.g., the nature and level of commitment that educational institutions will demand and aspire to). At the same time they will re-focus the educational debate on the content of education.

The Institutions of Higher Jewish Learning, the denominations, the national organizations will join in this effort, to develop alternative visions of Jewish education. First steps have already been taken (e.g., JTS preparing itself to take this role for Conservative schools in Lead Communities).

D. BUILDING THE PROFESSION OF JEWISH EDUCATION

Communities may want to address the shortage of qualified personnel for Jewish education in some of the following ways:

- 1. Hire 2-3 additional outstanding educators to bolster the strength of educational practice in the community and to energize thinking about the future.
- Create several new positions, as required, in order to meet the challenges. For example: a
 director of teacher education or curriculum development, or a director of Israel programming.
- Develop ongoing in-service education for most educators in the community, by programmatic area or by subject matter (e.g. the teaching of history in supplementary schools; adult education in community centers).

- 4. Invite training institutions and other national resources to join in the effort, and invite them to undertake specific assignments in lead communities. (E.g. Hebrew Union College might assume responsibility for in-service education of all Reform supplementary school staff. Yeshiva University would do so for Orthodox day-schools.)
- 5. Recruit highly motivated graduates of day schools who are students at the universities in the Lead Community to commit themselves to multi-year assignments as educators in supplementary schools and JCCs.
- 6. Develop a thoughtful plan to improve the terms of employment of educators in the community (including salary and benefits, career ladder, empowerment and involvement of front-line educators in the Lead Community development process.)

Simultaneously the CIJE has undertaken to deal with continental initiatives to improve the personnel situation. For example it works with foundations to expand and improve the training capability for Jewish educators in North America.

E. DEVELOPING COMMUNITY SUPPORT

This could be undertaken as follows:

- 1. Establishing a wall-to-wall coalition in each Lead Community, including the Federation, the congregations, day schools, JCCs, Hillel etc...
- 2. Developing a special relationship to rabbis and synagogues.
- 3. Identify a lay "Champion" who will recruit a leadership group that will drive the Lead Community process.
- 4. Increase local funding for Jewish education.
- 5. Develop a vision for Jewish education in the community.
- 6. Involve the professionals in a partnership to develop this vision and a plan for its implementation.
- 7. Establish a local implementation mechanism with a professional head.
- 8. Encourage an ongoing public discussion of and advocacy for Jewish education.

F. THE ROLE OF THE CIJE IN ESTABLISHING LEAD COM-MUNITIES

The CIJE, through its staff, consultants and projects will facilitate implementation of programs and will ensure continental input into the Lead Communities. The CIJE will make the following available:

1. BEST PRACTICES

A project to create an inventory of good Jewish educational practice was launched. The project will offer Lead Communities examples of educational practice in key settings, methods, and topics, and will assist the communities in "importing," "translating," "re-imventing" best practices for their local settings.

The Best Practices initiative has several interrelated dimensions. In the first year the project deals with best practices in the following areas:

- * Supplementary schools
- * Early childhood programs
- * Jewish community centers
- * Day schools
- * Israel Experience programs

It works in the following way:

- a. First a group of experts in each specific area is recruited to work in an area (e.g., JCCs). These experts are brought together to define what characterizes best practices in their area, (e.g., a good supplementary school has effective methods for the teaching of Hebrew).
- b. The experts then seek out existing examples of good programs in the field. They undertake site visits to programs and report about these in writing.

As lead communities begin to work, experts from the above team will be available to be brought into the lead community to offer guidance about specific new ideas and programs, as well as to help import a best practice into that community.

2. MONITORING EVALUATION FEEDBACK

The CIJE has established an evaluation project. Its purpose is three-fold:

a. To carry out ongoing monitoring of progress in Lead Communities, in order to assist community leaders, planners and educators in their work. A researcher will be commissioned for each Lead Community and will collect and analyze data and offer it to

practitioners for their consideration. The purpose of this process is to improve and correct implementation in each Lead Community.

- b. To evaluate progress in Lead Communities assessing, as time goes on, the impact and effectiveness of each program, and its suitability for replication elsewhere. Evaluation will be conducted by a variety of methods. Data will be collected by the local researcher. Analysis will be the responsibility of the head of the evaluation team with two purposes in mind: 1) To evaluate the effectiveness of individual programs and of the Lead Communities themselves as models for change, and 2) To begin to create indicators (e.g., level of participation in Israel programs; achievement in Hebrew reading) and a database that could serve as the basis for an ongoing assessment of the state of Jewish education in North America. This work will contribute in the long term to the publication of a periodic "state of Jewish education" report as suggested by the Commission.
- c. The feedback-loop: findings of monitoring and evaluation activities will be continuously channeled to local and CIJE planning activities in order to affect them and act as an ongoing corrective. In this manner there will be a rapid exchange of knowledge and mutual influence between practice and planning. Findings from the field will require ongoing adaptation of plans. These changed plans will in turn, affect implementation and so on.

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 among different individuals or segments of the community? How vague or specific are these visions?
- (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 CIJE's efforts? How deep is participation within the various agencies? For example, beyond a small core of leaders, is there grass-roots involvement in the community? To what extent is the community mobilized financially as well as in human resources?
- (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 benefits? Are school faculties 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 disclosing what these goals are. The second and third questions concern

the "enabling options" decided upon 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.

3. PROFESSIONAL SERVICES

The CIJE will offer professional services to Lead Communities, including:

- a. Educational consultants to help introduce best practices.
- b. Field researchers for monitoring, evaluation and feed-back.
- c. Planning assistance as required.
- d. Assistance in mobilizing the community.

#. FUNDING FACILITATION

The CIJE will establish and nurture contacts between foundations interested in specific programmatic areas and Lead Communities that are developing and experimenting with such programs (e.g., the CRB Foundations and youth trips to Israel; MAF and personnel training; Blaustein and research).

5. LINKS WITH PURVEYORS OR SUPPORTERS OF PROGRAMS

The CIJE will develop partnerships between national organizations (e.g., JCCA, CLAIL, JESNA, CAJE), training institutions and Lead Communities. These purveyors could undertake specific assignments to meet specific needs within Lead Communities.

G. LEAD COMMUNITES AT WORK

The Lead Community itself could work in a manner very similar to that of the CIJE. In fact, it is proposed that a local commission be established to be the mechanism that will plan and see to the implementation and monitoring of programs.

What would this local mechanism (the local planning group) do?

- a. It would convene all the actors;
- b. It would launch an ongoing planning process; and
- c. It would deal with content in the following manner.

- 1. It could make sure that the content is articulated and is implemented.
- 2. Together with the team of the Best Practices project and with the Chief Education Officer, it would integrate the various content and programmatic components into a whole. For example: it could integrate formal and informal programs.

It could see to it that in any given area (e.g., Israel experience) the vision piece, the goals, are articulated by the various actors and at the various levels:

- by imdividual institutions
- by the denominations
- by the community as a whole.

In addition, dealing with the content might involve having a "dream department" or "blueskying unit," aimed at dealing with innovations and change in the programs in the community.

H. LAUNCHING THE LEAD COMMUNITY - YEAR ONE

During its first year (1992/93) the project will include the following:

- 1. Negotiate an agreement with the CIJE including:
 - a. Detail of mutual obligations;
 - b. Process issues working relations within the community and between the community, the CIJE and other organizations
 - c. Funding issues;
 - d. Other.
- 2. Establish a local planning group, with a professional staff and with wall-to-wall representation.
- 3. Gearing-up activities, e.g., prepare a 1-year plan, undertake a self-study (see 6 below), prepare a 5-year plan.
- 4. Locate and hire several outstanding educators from outside the community to begin work the following year (1993/94).
- 5. Preliminary implementation of pilot projects that result from prior studies, interests, communal priorities.
- 6. Undertake an educational self-study, as part of the planning activities:

Most communities have recently completed social and demographic studies. Some have begun to deal with the issue of Jewish continuity and have taskforce reports on these. Teachers studies exist in some communities. All of these will be inputs into the self-study. However, the study itself will be designed to deal with the important issues of Jewish education in that community. It will include some of the following elements:

- a. Assessment of needs and of target groups (clients).
- b. Rates of participatiom.
- c. Preliminary assessment of the educators in the community (e.g., their educational backgrounds).

The self-study will be linked with the work of the monitoring, evaluation and feedback project.

Some of the definition of the study and some of the data collection will be undertaken with the help of that project's field researcher.



EAD COMMUNITIES

A PROJECT OF THE COUNCIL FOR INITIATIVES IN JEWISH EDUCATION

PLANNING GUIDE



A MESSAGE FROM THE CHAIRMAN

The Council for Initiatives in Jewish Education was established as an outgrowth of the Commission on Jewish Education in North America in November 1990.

CIJE brings together distinguished educators, professionals, lay leaders and philanthropists of the continental Jewish community to energize Jewish education in North America. Visions of what should and can be achieved in the 21st century need to be repeatedly placed before our communities' leadership, and the wherewithal to do so obtained. The CIJE can provide a unique blend of individual and institutional advocacy in North America.

The Lead Communities Project is intended to demonstrate that local communities can significantly improve the effectiveness of Jewish education through careful organizing for the task, with a coalition of community institutions, supplemented with continental institutions and resources.

This planning guide has been prepared to assist the lead communities in their work.

Morton L. Mandel

Wester 1 - Hoteradel

Chair

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Fag	<u> </u>
INIIRO	DDUCTOON		2
L	FIRST STEPS		4
H.	SELF-STUDY	•	10
m.	CRITICAL ISSUES	• 4	23
IV.	MISSION OR VISION STATEMENT	- A	26
V.	SETTING STRATEGIES AND PRIORILIESS	28	28
VI	DESIGNING PROGRAMSHLOT PROJECTS	. 3	311
VH.	FINANCIAL RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT		3 55

[dhaft: guide.06C 02-10-93]

LEAD COMMUNITIES PLANNING GUIDE

"Our goal should be to make it possible for every Jewish person, child or adult; to be exposed to the mystery and romance of Jewish history, to the enthralling insights and special sensitivities of Jewish thought, to the sanctity and symbolism of Jewish existence, and to the power and profundity of Jewish faith. As a motto and declaration of hope, we might adapt the dictum that sayss, 'They searched from Dan to Beer Sheva and did not find, an am ha aretz!" 'Am ha aretz,' usually understood as an ignoramus, an illiterate, may for our pumposes be redefined as one indifferent to Jewish visions and values, untouched by the drama and majestly off Jewish history, unappreciative of the resourcefulness and resilience of the Jewish community, and unconcerned with Jewish desting. Education, in its broadest sense, will enable young people to confront the secret of Jewish temacity and existence, the quality of Torah teaching which firstimates and attracts irresistibly. They will then be able, even eagen, to find their place in a creative and constructive Jewish community."

Professor Isadore Twersky
A Time to Act, p. 19

"It is clear that there is a core of deeply committed Jews whose very way of life ensures meaningful Jewish continuity from generation to generation. However, there is a much larger segment of the Jewish population which is funding it increasingly difficult to define its future in terms of Jewish values and behavior. The responsibility for developing Jewish identity and instilling a commitment to Judaism for this population now rests primarily with education."

"Recent developments throughout the continent indicate that a climate exists today for bringing about major improvements. However, a massive program will have to be undertaken in order to revitalize Jewish education so that it is capable of performing a pivotal role in the meaningful continuity of the Jewish people."

A Time to Act, pp. 15 & 16

Atlanta, Baltimore, and Milwaukee have taken on an exciting challenge and an awesome responsibility: to dramatically improve Jewish education throughout their communities, and in the process, to serve as beacons in this endeavor for others in North America. These "lead communities" will provide a leadership function for others in communities throughout the continent Their purpose is to serve as laboratories in which to discover the educational practices and policies that work best. They will function as the testing places for "best practices"—exemplary or excellent programs—in all fields of Jewish education.

INTRODUCTION

This set of guidelines has the luxury and the challenge of preaching to the converted. Jewish communities understand and have been engaged in planning for a long time. The lead communities more than many others have made pioneering efforts in planning for Jewish education and continuity. Despite that advantage, all of us are acutely aware of the limitations in the available information and the magnitude of the task of setting out a plan that addresses the challenges of the Lead Communities Project.

The purposes of these guidelines are to:

- offer approaches, methods, data collection instruments and other tools to use in the planning process, and
- give some measure of uniformity to the planning process that each of the lead communities will engage in.

Each community will, of course, need to tailor these guidelines to its own circumstances.

As a general principle the object is to build upon the work and the research that has already been done in each community and use those as a point of departure for the Lead Communities Project. On the other hand, it is sometimes necessary to retrace steps in order to enlist new constituents in a broad coalition.

CUE will serve as a resource and clearinghouse for lead communities as they proceed through the planning process: offering expertise, recommendations on methods or information collection instruments, linkages to national organizations, and a means by which the communities can share their approaches with each other.

- Lay leaders
- Major donors
- Educators
- Rabbis
- Other professionals
- 2. Establish the Lead Community Commission, composed with representation that includes top leadership from each of these groups and that reflects the broad spectrum of the community, E.g., leadership from:
 - **■** Federation
 - Formal educational settings
 - o schools
 - **o** synagogues
 - Informal educational settings
 - o JCCs
 - o camps
 - Communal agencies and organizations dealing with education

Box 1: Concentric Circles of Leadership

One way to organize to reconcile the dual objectives of strong and thoughtful leadership coupled with wide involvement is to develop expanding circles of leadership. For example:

- Steering committee, composed of 10-15 members, delegated by the Commission to handle active operational responsibilities and decisions. The Steering Committee would meet approximately monthly, the full Commission every 3 months.
- Commission, composed of 35-50 members, serves as a forum for priority setting, policy development, long-range planning, coordination, and review of task forces recommendations.
- <u>Task Forces</u>, to address substantive issues and make recommendations to the full Commission, and/or to monitor and evaluate projects once they begin operations (see below.)
- Ad Hoe Working Groups, to be set up on an ad hoc basis by individual task forces to investigate special issues, work out program implementation details, confer with end users to ensure receptivity to program ideas or refine details, etc.
 - Compile packets of background information and distribute to each of the committee members. Box 2 contains a selection of materials that may be useful for this purpose.

Box 2: Examples of Background Materials

- A Time To Act
- Previous planning documents, particularly on Jewish education or continuity, prepared by your community.
- · Other studies and documents relating to the community's educational systems.
- Summary of most recent Jewish population study for your community.
- CUE project descriptions
 - O "Best Practices"
 - 6 Monitoring, Evaluation and Feedback
 - 6 Goals Project

3. Convene Commission

Establish a detailed timetable for the project by working backward from the year one end date, as well as forward based on the amount of time work components will require.

Working with the chairperson of the committee, establish a schedule of committee meetings all the way through the first year of planning. Scan major Jewish and national holidays for conflicts. (See Box 3 for an illustrative schedule of steps.)

■ Prepare a tentative agenda for the first committee meeting to review with the chair.

Phase	Deliverable	Commission Meeting Subject
1. Start-up	 Form Commission Discuss the idea Detailed workplan Agree on mandate Form committees 	la. Review of project key ideas, aims and structures lb. Review of workplan: Key methods and projects - Best Practices - dealing with goals - Monitoring evaluation feedback project lc. Develop charge to committees: main thrusts: - personnel
		- community mobilization
2. Start Self-study (ongoing)	 Design scheme Profile of Jewish education: strengths and weaknesses Survey of educators in the community Report on findings 	2a. Design of needs survey 2b. Presentation Of profile 2c. Discussion of findings
3. Critical Issues	• Formulate issues	3. Resolve strategic issues; make choices
4. Mission or Vision Statement	• Draft community mission statement	4. Approve mission/vision statement
5. Strategies and Priorities for Action	 List of recommendations for each major area (personnel, community mobilization, Israel experience) with priority rankings and priority sequencing 	5. Recommendations on priorities
6. Programs	 Confer with CIJE, Best Practices Draft guidelines Define program priority areas and new initiatives Issue call for program implementation proposals 	6. Define program priorities
7. Resource Development	*Fundraising plan (e.g., potential donors, strategies, targets, CIJE assistance, timetable)	7. Approve and agree on assignments for carrying out plan.
8. Subsequent year action plan	 Draft budget with resource objectives Compile summaries of program options Prepare first year implementation plan 	8a. Select programs for next year 8b. Approve overall implementation plan 8c. Set resources objectives (\$)

4. Devise task force structure

It is helpful to organize task forces to address substantive issues and make recommendations to the full commission. Once pilot operations begin, the role of these committees can be modified to monitor and evaluate projects they have initiated.

There are several ways of organizing task forces. Here are some samples:

- Main thrusts of the recommendations of the Commission on Jewish Education in North America
 - O personnel
 - O community mobilization
 - o research/self-study
 - O Israel experience
- Delivery settings, e.g.:
 - o day schools
 - O supplementary schools
 - o programs in informal settings
- Functional, the classic "Board of Directors" model, e.g.:
 - o pilot projects
 - o best practices
 - 6 goals/visions of Jewish education
 - 6 monitoring and evaluation
 - 6 fundraising
 - O coalition building and marketing/networking
 - o educator's survey
 - 6 five year planning

Issues to consider in deciding on the most effective approach for organizing include:

- Energizing: Whether topic areas are likely to generate excitement among potential committee participants and stakeholders.
- Priorities: Do the topics represent articulated, or likely, priority areas of the Leadi Communities Project.
- Content expertise: How do staff knowledge and other resource experts relate to the potential topics? Do any of the organizing approaches make better use of available human resources?
- Bridge building: Likelihood of fostering collaboration, of enlisting membership in each committee that is representative of multiple constituencies.

The time professionals to committees:	and commitme service the tas	ent of top lay	y leaders to e factors to	o serve as ch o consider i	airs, and the dept n deciding on the	h of capabl number c

H. SELF-STUDY

"[An important step in mobilizing is.".] to review the current state of Jewish education in its various aspects. This will provide the basis for analyzing the problems, considering the achievements and shortcomings, and determining where the most promising opportunities for improvement might lie."

A Time to Act, p. 31

Rationale

Obtaining reliable information about something as complex as a community's educational system is an ongoing endeavor. Its payoffs are immediate, long-term, and continuous: as the community learns more about itself, its decision making will improve. Over time, the process will yield better and better quantitative and qualitative data about what exists in the community's Jewish education system, how good it is, what people in the community want, what more is needed and what works better.

Lead communities can offer leadership in this area too, developing means, methods and experience for an ongoing process of serious self-study. Hopefully, the tools developed in lead communities will be disseminated for other communities to adopt and adapt. CUE is a resource for designing and carrying out the self-study, as well as for disseminating findings and new products.

The initial purpose of the self-study is to provide commission members with an increasingly solid foundation of information, to enlighten even the most knowledgeable insider, and to identify the critical issues and choices the commission may choose to address. It will also belp move the community towards establishing standards of achievement that the community aspires to.

The self-study process is an ongoing one; it will not be completed within the first year of the project. It is proposed that during the first year of the project the self-study include the following 3 elements:

- 1. A profile of the Jewish education enterprise in the community, including the following:
 - Participation (absolute numbers, rates and trends)
 - Inventory of personnel, programs, institutions, organizations
 - Program resources
 - an Financial resources
- 2. A needs analysis to focus during the first year on personnel-related issues, a central part of which will be an educator's survey.

3. A follow-on agenda for continuing analysis during years 2-5.

1. Profile

- a. Develop demographic profile of Jewish education needs in the community.
 - Jewish population characteristics: cohort sizes (e.g., early childhood, school age lay leaders, adult education learners, college-age youth, other special groups, like mixed married couples)
- b. Develop inventory of program capacities and participation rates (formal and informal programs) including:
 - A profile of the institutional resources, programs and services presently available in the community.
 - Present enrollments and participation rates (i.e., percent of group attending), and recent enrollment/participation trends.
 - Estimate of the capacity of each program if it is not being fully utilized.

(See Box 4 for categories of information to describe each program area.)

- c. Develop profile of present Jewish education personnel by drawing on available data. (Note: knowledge of educator strengths and needs will be enriched as returns on the educator's survey, discussed below, are compiled.)
 - Size of key groups of personnel (e.g., day school principals, day school teachers, supplementary, early childhood, camps counselors, JCC program staff, other informal education personnel) by institution/program
 - Employment status (full-time, part-time) and years of service (e.g. in current positions, in Jewish education in community)
 - Qualifications, skills, expertise and background
 - Salary and benefit levels

Box 4: Elements of an Institution or Program Profile

- · Organizational:
 - type of institution, program (e.g., day school, camp, retreat center, etc.)
 - (P) denominational affiliation
- Students:
 - **O** emollment and graduation trends
 - O age range
- Educators:
 - 10 mumbers of full- and part-time
 - O areas of expertise
 - 60 qualifications
 - O turnover/retention rates
- Program components:
 - o subjects
 - o degree(s) offered
 - o im-service stafff development
 - 6 activity duration
 - o methods
 - © support resources (e.g. library, training) and services
- " Finances
 - o cost per unit of service
 - o revenue and expenditure trends
 - O major sources of revenue
- d. Summarize community expenditure levels for major categories of services. E.g.:
 - Certientralengency
 - 5 Day schools
 - a Supplementary schools
 - JCC education services
 - Camps

2. Needs Analysis

A needs analysis identifies unserved and underserved needs for Jewish education. It will include:

Educator's survey

- Market analysis: selected client/consumer groups
- Assessment of quality

Educators" Survey

Given the critical importance of personnel in Jewish education and its centrality in the Lead Communities Project, an educators' survey should be an early and major component of the needs analysis. While the first round presentation of the community profile of Jewish education (see above) will compile presently available information on personnel, there are likely to be large gaps. Quality information about this fundamental human resource is invaluable, first for identifying priorities for improving the profession, and later for assessing the impact of community initiatives. Box 5 contains ideas for areas to cover in a survey of Jewish education personnel. Adapting or building upon educator surveys undertaken in recent years by other communities is also recommended. Communities may contact CIJE for assistance in identifying useful prototypes.

Make sure to involve experienced social scientists, and educators from formal and informal settings in the design and implementation of the survey. Involving people from the field will improve the quality of the data elements selected, help avoid time and resource consuming efforts to obtain unavailable information, help pave the way when it comes time to collect data, and help mobilize educators to support the overall objectives of the commission.

Summarizing, the initial thinking about the educator's survey should take several factors into account:

- Purpose of the survey: Eg.
 - o to provide detailed profile of personnel characteristics
 - o to understand personnel strengths, weaknesses and needs (e.g. qualifications, turnover, shortage areas)
 - o to establish a database for future comparisons
- Potential uses, outcomes. E.g.:
 - o to identify in-services training needs
 - o to understand the structure of employment (is most of the work force very much part-time, vocational, or avocational, reasonably well paid, or not)
 - o to identify priorities for recruitment
- Categories of Information: What information is desired (see Box: 4) 4)
- Database: Allow for growth, in number of information fields aswell|assinnnmbser of records
- Involve educators from formal and informal settings
- Select survey director, or researcher with requisite expertise. In selecting staff, or

contracting with a researcher, thoroughly review assignments, expectations and workplans

In view of the importance, complexity, and ongoing nature of this aspect of the lead community effort, it may be advisable to convene a special task force (if such a task force was not built into the organizing framework) to oversee this phase of work-

Box 5: Educators' Survey: Possible Categories for Inventory (Illustrative only)

- Demographic profile (e.g., sex, age, marital status, address)
- Affiliation
- Jewish education background (e.g., degrees, licensure, courses and programs)
- Im-service staff development (subjects, scope and level)
- Work history
- Jewish education work experience (e.g., years of experience, present and recent positions, full-time and part-time weekly hours; camp, other summer and other part-time jobs)
- Secular education positions
- Salary history, in Jewish education
- Inventory of formal and informal expertise (e.g., Judaic/Hebrew; age level specializations; teacher training, resource room management, special education; organizing, supervisory or administrative skills). Classifiable as:
 - Areas of knowledge
 - o Skills
 - o Special talents
- Attitudinal questions (e.g., Jewish education career intentions; job satisfaction and priority concerns)

Market Analysis

A market analysis attempts to quantify the unmet demand among different client groups for various lewish education services/programs, and the potential pool of consumers who might participate if programs were made attractive enough to them.

Unmet demand, conceptually at least, is relatively straightforward: the difference betweer: those who seek to participate in a program or service, and the available openings. Quantifying the potential pool is somewhat more complex. At the largest extreme it quantifies everyone in the comsumer group, or cohort. The portion of the group likely to participate, however, will be affected by many factors, such as improvements in personnel and community mobilization — the enabling options which are central to the success of this endeavor. Therefore, the market analysis should also seek insights on tactics to mobilize new segments of the community, and methods to recruit new people to participate in the enterprise of Jewish education.

<u>Client Sub-groups</u>: Jewish education takes place in formal and informal settings from infancy to grandparenting. There are no easy answers to the question of which (or whether any) sub-group or stage in life is the best one to start focusing attention and resources on. Therefore, with respect to potential client groups, two important Issues should be articulated and addressed up-front:

- 1. Targeting: which client sub-group should be studied first?
- 2. Measures of Need: what is the appropriate definition of need?

Targeting: The first step is to select the key consumer groups, in addition to Jewish education professionals, to be the focus of research during the first round. One construct of categories from which to select client sub-groups is:

- B Early childhood
- E Ages 5=13
- Post Bar/Bat Mitzvah
- F College age
- Parents of young children
- E Singles
- Empty nesters
- Older adults

Given limited resources, it may make sense to fine tune the targeting still further by looking at specific age groups in particular program areas, for example, Israel programs for teens.

Box 6: Targeting

Several criteria can be applied in making decisions about what information or which groups to target in the needs analysis.

- Present knowledge: How much is already known about the topic or the needs of the group? Has the issue or group previously been studied? Are there significant open questions about what the needs are or how they should be addressed?
- Priority: How high a priority is the topic or sub-group with respect to Jewish education? Are the needs of this group for Jewish education a major issue or concern in the community?
- Scope: Is the scope of its impact (for example because of size or centrality) likely to be large?
- Feasibility: What resources of time, effort, money are needed to answer the open questions? For example, does available personnel have the expertise to design and carry out the study? Are data collection instruments available in the community or elsewhere that can be adapted?

Measures of Need: There are three conceptual ways of considering need:

- a. "Market:" Actual demand by a defined set of people.
- b. "Standard:" A measure of how much people require, or, from the community perspective, what is needed to realize a set of aspirations.
- c. "Receptivity:" What people might potentially respond to, i.e. "buy", but cannot articulate because it is not within their past experience.

In designing the needs analysis, you must decide which measure or measures will be most useful for each subgroup. The CIJE's "Goals Project" and its "Best Practices" project may help reveal valuable insights which will help communities define appropriate measures. The criteria for targeting will be helpful in narrowing the measures as well (see also Box 6).

Box 7: Selecting the Measure of Need

Here are some other considerations to bear in mind in deciding how to measure need:

- Market measures are most appropriate when the institutions of the community are relatively powerless to design incentives or exercise leverage to influence individual choices, other than by improving the programs that are offered.
- Conversely, standards will be appropriate when community institutions <u>are</u> in a position to offer incentives or exercise leverage, and have a clear and definable stake in the outcomes of the service area. The caliber and training of professionals is one case in point. Another example is the quality of the curriculum.
- In a needs analysis it is virtually impossible to "measure" receptivity, for example to a charismatic teacher or leader, to an effective new recruitment strategy, or to a climate that has been transformed by the involvement and participation of new actors and stakeholders. It is possible to examine programs that have been successful elsewhere to expand the vision of decision makers, particularly when it comes time to elicit or develop program strategies. In the context of the needs analysis, it is useful to ponder more ambitious alternatives when the expressed needs aspire to a low level.

Measures of Resources: Potential "needs" should be compared to available resources to identify areas of unmet need or "gaps". At the most basic level, a profile of educational resources should include:

- Data on the numbers of programs, by type, their capacities (in terms of openings, places) and actual enrollments
- Data on numbers of personnel (reprise from profile or survey) qualified for different program types ~ as a measure of shortages or capacity to serve more participants
- Utilization of space
- Levels of funding
- Anticipated changes (including resources in the pipeline, such as new programs being planned or anticipated cutbacks)

Measures of Quality

Ideally, a profile of resources should also incorporate assessments of their quality. For example, while a community may appear to have enough supplementary school programs, the more crucial issue is how good are they?

The quality of programs is generally measured by assessment of levels of achievement, or measures of performance. The task in Jewish education is substantially more difficult because of the paucity of satisfactory tests of knowledge or achievement, and the complexity of defining a set of generally acceptable standards. For these reasons, in the short run at least it makes sense to rely on "surrogate" measures of performance. For example, attendance and longevity/dropout statistics can be enlightening as indicators of changes in student performance. At the same time, lead communities may spearhead efforts to develop more direct measures of student performance. In undertaking developmental work of this sort, communities may want to draw upon the expertise of national organizations (e.g., CAJE, CJF, CLAL, JESNA, JCCA) and national training institutions with whom CIJE has developed partnerships.

If enrollment or attendance is low, or dropoff at age 13 is high, is it because the prospective students are not out there, no effort is made to recruit, the programs are poorly designed or because effort is needed to increase parental support? Information on the quality and effectiveness of programs is important for identifying strengths and weaknesses of the existing system, for developing strategies for improvement, and ultimately for establishing a baseline against which the impact of future efforts can be measured.

Regardless, the difficult in measuring quality dictates that in this area especially several iterations of study are necessary. Findings and gaps uncovered in one round define the task for the next round, as the community's efforts to better evaluate, collect information and conduct surveys are implemented, and bear fruit.

Generally speaking, three types of measures can be used: (1) input, (2) output or performance, and (3) outcomes. See Box 8 for examples of measures to consider. If you find an absence of information on effectiveness—that, in itself, may suggest that critical issues for the community will be: How should programs be evaluated and against what criteria? What are the characteristics of an excellent educational program? Should there be a process for setting community standards and "accrediting" programs? Should there be an effort to develop community-wide performance indicators and what should they be?

Box 8: Illustrative Measures of Quality and Effectiveness

- Measures of inputs are generally the easiest to obtain. Examples include: per capital expenditures for various age cohorts and programs, teacher/student ratios, average teacher salaries, per cent of teachers with advanced degrees, lay involvement, number of teachers participating in in-service training, curriculum units developed and introduced, increases/decreases in educator/participant contact hours, and etc. Comparisons can be made to provide perspective on where the community stands in relation to other communities and the nation on key indicators.
- Examples of output or performance measures include per cent of eligible population participating in formal and informal Jewish education by age group, levels of student and parent satisfaction, drop out rates pre and post bar(bat) mitzvah, performance on tests of Jewish knowledge, etc. Methods of collecting this information include sample surveys, questionnaires to program directors, focus groups (for satisfaction), self-studies by schools, allumni surveys, data collected by a central body such as the Board of Jewish Education or Federation, and information collected in recent Jewish population studies.
- "Outcomes are the most difficult to measure. It is useful to articulate what these might be, even if the data is not available, because it will be helpful in developing the mission statement later on as well as for suggesting lines of future research. Examples of outcome measures would be self-definition and commitment to Jewish identity, values and practices; evidence of transmission of Jewishness to the next generation; affiliation with synagogues, communal organizations, support of Israel and Jewish institutions, etc.

Community Mobilization: Through the very process of moving forward as a lead community and of engaging in the market analysis, findings will surface about the strengths and shortcomings on the awareness, involvement and commitment of various sectors of the community about Jewish education programs and commission initiatives. Examples of areas of potential attention include:

- Communication and collaboration between program professionals and rabbiss
- Involvement of teachers, educators in informal settings in articulating problems and solutions
- The size (and growth) of the eadre of committed and supportive lay leaders, parents and/or donors
- The presence (or absence) of regular publicity/information announcements about Jewish education programs, performances, or initiatives (e.g. columns in the local Jewish newspapers, community program catalogues, regular flyers, etc.)

These findings should be documented as part of the market analysis so that recommendations can be put forward to further mobilization of the community.

Summary of Benchmarks/Tasks

- 1. Design Needs Analysis
 - a. Focus: Select the primary element, issue or program to be studied
 - b. Measures: Decide on the method(s) for measuring the needs (see Box 8)
 - c. <u>Develop Concept Scheme</u>: Layout decisions on design for discussion with commission
- 2. Collect Information: on present participation levels
- 3. Estimate Community Need/Demand
- 4. Gaps [3 minus 2]: a comparison of the market demand for the present programs will give an estimate of the unmet needs: who are the "unserved" or "underserved" groups in the community from the point of view of adult Jewish education?
- 5. Qualitative Analysis: compile findings on problems, and limitations on program quality or effectiveness and recommendations for improvement
- 6. Community Mobilization Impacts: compile findings and recommendations on recruitment and deeper involvement of students, personnel, leadership, parents and other stakeholders

Box 9: Methods

<u>Defining Potential Markets</u>: Four types of information can be used to identify the needs of user groups. As a rule, malleable methods should be employed because no single method will give a full picture of participation levels, and the quantitative and qualitative limitations in the programs available for different groups.

- Available demographic studies and data: enrollment trends, statistics on personnel involved in Jewish education and communal affairs (e.g., full-time, part-time, turnover, longevity ...), enrollment trends in local day and supplemental school programs (as a predictor of future personnel demands).
- "Other national and local studies, commission and planning reports: such as the report of the Commission on Jewish Education in North America, local reports of task forces om Jewish continuity, and strategic planning reports that give insights on trends or externall forces that will impact on needs. Experience in other cities can be analyzed for possible relevance. Opportunities for program modification or expansion will be identified where substantial unmet needs are documented and where new revenue opportunities appear to exist.
- Discussion or Focus groups: with selected consumer groups (such as day and supplementary school educators, synagogue lay leaders, students) to gain insights on access barriers as well as desires.
- Questionnaires: attitude surveys of selected sectors of the Jewish community: e.g. about student career interests; motivations for participating in specific program; views of institutional or program strengths or weaknesses; perceptions of their own needs or desires for Jewish education; and past and anticipated involvement in Jewish affairs.

Identify a variety of submarkets. Attempt to estimate the size of each submarket, the extent of the need and the competition.

3. Flootbow oon Aggentla

Given the magnitude, complexity and the high stakes connected to developing the Lead Communities Project, self study should be on-going — not a one-shot effort. Findings on one issue inevitably will raise more sophisticated questions. Moreover, limits on time and resources, information availability, and research capability dictate that the process be phased over a period of several years. The lead community will need to decide which parts of the self study to begin the first year, and which to postpone to later years.

Consequently, the objective should be to develop a design for years 2 through 5 for further data collection, in-depth studies in personnel, refinement of community mobilization efforts, and development of assessment instruments to better measure quality of formal and

imformal Jewish education pr supplementary school student	ograms (for s).	example,	achievement	measures to	test	knowledge	of

Citie bis 10 to 10 to

ML CRITICAL ISSUES

"The Jews of North America live in an open society that presents an unprecedented range of opportunities and choices. This extraordinary environment confronts us with what is proving to be an historic dilemma: while we cherish our freedom as individuals to explore new horizons, we recognize that this very freedom poses a dramatic challenge to the finture of the Jewish way of life. The Jewish community must meet the challenge at a time when young people are not sure of their roots in the past or of their identity in the fluture. There is an urgent need to explore all possible ways to ensure that Jews maintain and strengthen the commitments that are central to Judiaism."

A Time to Act, p. 25-26

Rationale

In charting future directions, any community faces a number of important policy choices: i.e., critical issues. Early discussions of the planning committee are the first step in identifying the critical issues in personnel and community mobilization. Findings emerging through the ongoing self study, including information on educators, areas of needs in mobilizing the community, and program strengths and weaknesses, will help sort out and clarify the fundamental decisions.

Deliverables:

- Explicit assumptions
- Formulation of critical issues
- Document summarizing consensus of committee on each critical issue

Benchmarks and Methods

1. Assumptions: In designing the best possible system for coordinating and supporting Jewish education, there will be several fundamental "givens" (e.g., overcoming shortages in qualified Jewish education personnel will require a systemic action in many areas, not just a single program). These assumptions should be made explicit to ensure agreement by the commission. Assumptions on which there is not consensus may well become "issues" which the committee must address (see Box 10 for sample assumptions).

Box 10: Sample Assumptions

- 1. Shortages in qualified Jewish education personnel will not be satisfactorily overcome until a series of systemic problems in the profession are addressed (e.g., salaries, training, eareer opportunities, empowerment in decision making) —not just one element.
- 2. Talented young adults can be entired to enter careers in Jewish education if major communal leaders (lay, rabbis, educators, professionals) take an <u>active</u> role in the recruitment process.
- 3. Significant levels of increased funding for Jewish education will not materialize if community leaders are not included early in the planning and decision on actions.
- 4. Jewish education has a more powerful impact on students when formal and informal experiences are linked.
- 5. The delivery system needs to offer an opportunity for balance (creative tension) between community-wide perspectives and the perspectives of the religious movements (Reform, Conservative, Reconstructionist and Orthodox).
- 2. <u>Critical Issues</u>: The most important choices on enabling options faced by the community must be defined and resolved in order to set priorities in Jewish education. The planning committee will attempt to reach agreement on what the important questions regarding personnel, community mobilization, and future investment in Jewish education throughout the community.

The selection of the critical choices is as important as the commission's decisions on their resolution. Omission of, or "papering over," a burning issue is likely to exacerbate future discord and confusion in the community. On the other hand, the omission may choose to table for the present a particular issue on which it is unable to achieve resolution. By this means it acknowledges recognition of an important problem and its intention to return to it.

Because the formulation of the critical issues is pivotal to the development of the mission and the rest of the planning process, you are urged to confer with CIJE and tap its resources. As with other parts of the process, CIJE will facilitate sharing experience with the other lead communities.

In defining and organizing choices, it may be useful to classify issues in cascading categories that proceed from more philosophic (i.e., mission) toward more operational (i.e., programmatic or organizational). (See Box 11 for types of issues.)

Box 11: Classification of Issues

- 1. Mission-level issues i.e. choices relating to the vision, philosopphy and the role off the community in initiating or supporting the emerging needs.
- 2. Policy issues i.e. choices relating to the broad policies relevant to carrying out the community's mission. Some of these choices relate to professional development (e.g. the balance between in-service and pre-service training for pre-school teachers); recruitment (e.g. the balance between new entrants into the field, continuing education; re-training people from other fields); and community mobilization (e.g., the trade-offs between early action to create a sense of community support, versus the slower process of involvement of stakeholders in planning to build ownership).
- 3. Standards and Program Issues choices relating to the content and level of programming in Jewish education (e.g. what form of in-service training: mentoring program, workshops and course offerings, personalized growth plan for each educator, some of each, or what kind of staff development incentive plan: completion bonus, waived fees, contractual requirement).
- 4. Resource and organization Issues:—ite. choices relating to the present or, more importantly, future capacity of the community to support mission and policies (e.g. the financial resources, agency roles, possible coordinative and integrative mechanisms). Stated differently, which actors, agents, or agencies will be/must be responsive to change on its Jewish education agenda.

IV. MISSION OR VISION STATEMENT

"Iewish education must find a way to transmit the essence of what Jewish life is all about, so that future generations of Jews will be impelled to search for meaning through their own rich traditions and institutions. Judaism must be presented as a living entity which gives the Jews of today the resources to find answers to the fundamental questions of life as readily as it did for our ancestors through the centuries."

A Time to Act, P. 27

Rationale

The heart of a strategic plan is a mission (or, vision) statement, which should project a clear view of the aspirations of the community. The mission statement for the lead community should project a self-image of the community in relation to the enabling options for Jewish education. A good mission statement not only suggests what the community wants to accomplish but what it does not seek to accomplish; at the broadest level, it identifies whom it seeks to serve and how.

The mission statement is the result of a process that includes deliberation by and consultation with a broad cross section of the community — lay leaders, scholars, rabbis, educators and communal professionals, parents and other stakeholders.

Deliverable

A concise mission statement.

Benchmarks and Methods

Because of its importance, and the difficulty of crafting a good one, the mission statement needs to be the product of substantial analysis and discussion; it should be prepared in the middle of the planning process, not at the beginning. The CIJE goals project may be of help to communities as they formulate missions.

It should represent the resolution of mission-level critical issues and frame a broad response to the needs assessment. Some parts of the mission statement are not likely to be very controversial; others might be. It is helpful to identify the major options in relation to each critical issue as a framework for the key discussion at which the mission statement gets formulated (see illustration in Box 12 below):

CRITICAL ISSUES	OPTION A	OPTION B	OPTION C
1.0 Depth or breadth in near term (i.e. next 1-1/2 years) new programs for personnel	Resources should be targeted on one key group of Jewish educators, such as senior educators in schools and informal settings	Programs should be designed to impact on all categories more or less equally of Jewish educators	Every Jewish educator should some benefit from a new program, however, at least xx% of the total new resources should be targeted to a single group
2.0 Priority for leadership training recruitment	Senior leaders should be recruited	Promising young talent, future leaders, should be recruited	Placement in programs based on motivation and self selection, on a first come first served basis
3.0 Community posture on an Israel experience for young people	Community responsibility to insure that every young person has an Israel experience opportunity	Joint community- congregation-family responsibility to insure that every young person has an Israel experience opportunity	Community responsibility to insure that xx% of young people have an Israel experience opportunity

V. SETTING STRATEGIES AND PRIORITIES

"... the needs of education have seemed to be less urgent, less insistent, more diffused [than other issues]; a problem that could be dealt with at some point in the future when more pressing problems have been solved. This is an illusiom. ... we can no longer postpone addressing the needs of Jewish education, lest we face an irreversible decline in the vitality of the Jewish people."

A Time to Act, p. 28

Rationale

The purpose of this part of the planning process is to insure that Jewish communal resources available for Jewish education are directed to the lead community's needs and mission. This is accomplished by selecting effective strategies or policies, and setting appropriate priorities.

The policies in the plan represent resolutions of the critical issues identified above. Resolution of an issue need not strictly adhere to the alternatives that were considered when the issue was defined. It may combine elements of several choices or be an alternative not previously thought of.

Establishing priorities for any community is extremely difficult: first, because of the large number of programmatic options it would be desirable to undertake to increase community support or to build the Jewish education profession (e.g., increase salaries, upgrade senior educators, recruit new talent, expand training programs, open a resource center, develop a mentoring program, etc.); and second, because of the multiplicity of constituencies, and their differing values. A particular educational service may be very important to one group and unimportant to another. The challenge is to develop an approach in which all important views are heard, and then strategies and priorities are developed to insure that the community does not scatter its limited resources.

"Priorities" are seen as judgments about relative importance that inform decisions about use of non-fiscal resources (such as leadership and staff of community agencies), resource development (such as foundation and endowment development), as well as dollar allocation decisions in the budgeting process.

Deliverables

- List of policy recommendations for the improvement of community mobilization
- Recommended priority rank and desirable sequence for each recommendation
- List of criteria used to select and rank policy recommendations

Renchmarks and Methods

Good methods of priority analysis inform and support human judgment, but do not try to supplant it; formulas or mechanical weighing or scoring methods are typically not useful.

Options are the items to be ranked in setting priorities for improving personnell and mobilizing the community. In other words, an "option" is a direction, service, or new initiative that is a potential recipient or user of a commission resource. An options structure is an organized, systematic listing of all the possible options. The decision as to what to list as an option is an absolutely crucial one; for once that decision is made, it defines what gets ranked im priority-setting.

A good structure for priority-setting should help decision makers connect broad concerns with specific services or programs —both those that exist as well as those program or services that do not, but that reflect community concerns.

There are three sources of criteria relevant to setting priorities among options:

- Criteria that are suggested by analyses of community needs in other areas. Other things being equal, one would tend to give priority to settings where the total needs are very large (e.g. personnel for supplementary schools) or where the gap between existing and needed services is the largest (e.g. in-service education).
- Chiteiathatdeivefromthecommunity's mission statement.
- CIJE may be able to provide assistance in this area.

Sample criteria for the selection of effective strategies (policies) and priorities are illustrated in Box 13.

Box 13: Sample Criteria for Selecting Strategies and Priorities

- Supports professionalization of principals, teachers, and educators in informal settings including incentives for higher levels of education.
- · Broadens lay leader involvement and support of Jewish education.
- Maximizes effective utilization of resources (minimize duplication).
- Maximizes the opportunity to integrate formal and informal educational techniques (e.g., family shabbatonim; camping + study programs; Israel study programs).
- Incorporates principles and methods that work, as documented by CIJE's "Best Practices" project

VI. DESIGNING PROGRAMS/PILOT PROJECTS

"Jewish education must be compelling -- emotionally, intellectually, and spiritually -- so that Jews, young and old, will say to themselves: 'I have decided to remain engaged, to continue to investigate and grapple with these ideas, and to choose an appropriate way of life.' "

A Time to Act, p. 26

Expanded, modified, and new programs of course are the most tangible part of the efficient to improve Jewish education throughout the community. In the context of a lead community, they are important not just for the promise they hold to improve the enterprise, but also because they can serve as visible demonstrations that help attract larger circles of adherents.

The recent history of Jewish education, as with many other enterprisess, contains instances off programs hastily put together to address frustrating problems. Here we hope to shift the emphasis toward the tried, proven and planned. "Best Practices," a CUE project that is documenting successful programs throughout the continent and organizing them in a variety of categories, should be immensely helpful here. "Best Practice" programs are being classified in six areas:

- Supplementary schools
- H Early childhood Jewish education
- **■** JCCs
- Israel experience
- M Day schools
- Jewish camping

The "Best Practices" project is now developing a method by which lead community planners and educators can learn from the best practices it has document and begin to introduce adaptations of those ideas into their own communities. This can occur through a wide range of activities including: site visits by lead community planners to observe best practices in action; visits by best practice practitioners to lead communities; workshops with educators in lead communities, etc.

We envision programs being launched in two stages: first a few pilot projects to get started; and a subsequent series of programs reflecting the vision and priorities of the Commission.

Pilot Projects

A community may wish to launch a small number of pilot programs early in the process to begin getting results, to test ideas about which it has a reasonably high level of confidence of success, to gain visibility for its lead community project, and to mobilize the community and

entents a sense of excitement. Programs selected as pilot should be ones which are likely to be consistent with long term directions, or likely to show results in a short period of time. Box 15 contains sample criteria for use in selecting pilot projects.

Selecting pilot projects that address high priority enabling options — namely personnel and community mobilization — is another way of helping to ensure the viability of the effort. Sample pillot programs are listed in Box 16.

Box 15: Sample Criteria for Pilot Project Selection

- Improves the profession (teachers, principals, and informal educators)
- High visibility -- likely to reinforce community mobilization efforts (e.g. catalyze stakeholder support)
- Maximizes the opportunity to replicate good results from other communities (e.g., via "Best Practices")
- Promotes multi-agency programming and cooperation
- " Draws upon the resources and expertise of national training organizations (i.e., via CIJE partnerships)
- · Can feasibly be implemented quickly

Box 16: Sample Ideas for Pilot Projects

Personnel

- Im-service training for educational leadership —school principals and JCC program directors.
- In-service training for 2 teachers and 2 informal educators from each institution.
- Summer seminar in Israel for selected educators

Community Mobilization

- · Leadership training program for congregational and agency board members *
- A series of public forums on the Lead Community idea, "Best Practices" and/or goals and visions for Jewish education

Commission Programs

A coherent set of programs should evolve from the commission process, reflecting the vision, strategies, priorities, and recommendations of the Commission. A refined set of criteria for program selection should also naturally evolve from those deliberations.

<u>Program Selection</u>: There are several methods for developing programs and working out program implementation details:

- Delegate responsibility for specific recommendations to agencies
- Empower task forces as part of commission deliberations.

Box 17 offers suggestions for developing program recommendations which, with some modifications, apply to each of the above selection approaches.

Box 17: Steps in Developing Program Recommendations

- · Adapt commission criteria for evaluating ideas
- Develop list of promising program ideas: review "Best Practices" materials for promising programs, confer with CIJE, best practices sites, and/or national institutions
- · Review most promising ideas for content, scope of impact, and quality
- Test assumptions: define questions and obtain answers
- Review with CIJE, national experts, and local users
- Detail program needs, operations and implementation
- Estimate costs
- Set priorities and phasing among program ideas
- Present priorities and justification to Commission

,

34

VH. FINANCIAL RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT

"... the environment in the Jewish community is not sufficiently supportive of the massive investment required to bring about systemic change. This affects the primority given to Jewish education, the status of the field of Jewish education and the level of founding that is granted."

A Time to Act, p. 41

Lead communities will need to develop a short-term and a long-term strategy for obtaining funding to support Commission initiatives. Obvious potential categories include:

- Annual campaign allocations/ for local services (either increased amounts of reallocations)
- Creation or expansion of a fund for Jewish education
- Major donors
- Foundations (Jewish oriented, and possibly secular ones also)

Naturally, early on primary attention will focus on obtaining resources for start-up efforts. CIJE will assist lead communities by establishing and nurturing contacts between foundations interested in specific programmatic areas, and lead communities that are developing, modifying, or expanding their efforts in those areas.

We recommend that fundraising for this effort proceed in a plantul way, much like the annual campaign:

- 1. Identify potential funders in different categories, e.g.:
 - o Major donors
 - O Medium/large donors
 - O Family foundations
 - o Community foundations
 - O National foundations
- 2. Review strategies with CIJE
- 3. Match programs to funder interests
- 4. Identify person/team to make first contact. Consider enlisting Commission members for this role.
- 5. Follow-up, as appropriate.

This Guide was developed and written by Dr. James Meier of Ukeles Associates, Inc. Dr. Jacob Ukeles, President of UAI, contributed to revisions in the document. A number of people reviewed drafts of the Guide and offered valuable comments during its preparation. Thanks go to: Shulamith Elster, Annette Hochstein, Mitchell Jaffe, Virginia Levi, Arthur Rotman, and Jonathan Woocher.

COUNCIL FOR INITIATIVES IN JEWISH EDUCATION

Board of Directors

Morton L. Mandel, Chair Charles Goodman, Vice Chair Neil Greenbaum, Vice Chair Matthew Maryles, Vice Chair Lester Pollack, Vice Chair

Max Fisher, Honorary Chair

David Arnow Mandell Berman Charles Bronfman

Gerald Cohen
Jo Colman
Maurice Corson
Susan Crown
Irwin Field

Alfred Gottschalk Arthur Green

Thomas Hausdorff David Hirschhom Ludwig Jesselson Henry Koschitzky Mark Lainer

Norman Lamm

Seymour Martin Lipset

Florence Melton
Melvin Merians
Charles Ratner
Esther Leah Ritz
Richard Scheuer
Ismar Schorsch
Isadore Twersky
Bennett Yanowitz

Consultants, Advisors and Staff

Henry L. Zucker, Executive Director

Shulamith Elster
Sf 10ur Fox
Adam Gamoran
Ellen Goldring
Roberta Goodman
Anmette Hochstein
Stephen Hoffman
Barry Holtz
Wantim Kraar

Virginia Levi
James Meier
Arthur Naparstek
Arthur Rotman
Claire Rottenberg
Julie Tammivaara
Jacob Ukeles
Jonathan Woocher



THE CHALLENGE OF SYSTEMIC REFORM: LESSONS FROM THE NEW FUTURES INITIATIVE FOR THE CUE

Adam Gamoran University of Wisconsin-Madison

A paper prepared for circulation within the Council for Initiatives in Jewish Education (CIJE).

January, 1992

THE CHALLENGE OF SYSTEMIC REFORM: LESSONS FROM THE NEW FUTURES INITIATIVE FOR THE CUE

In 1988, the Annie E. Casey Foundation committed about \$40 million over a five-year period to fund community-wide reforms in four mid-sized cities: Daytom, Ohio; Little Rock, Arkansas; Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania; and Savannah, Georgia. The reforms were aimed at radically improving the life-chances of at-risk youth, and at the core of the agenda were changes in educational systems and in relations between schools and other social service agencies. Despite major investments, not only financial but in time, energy, and good will, from participants as well as the Foundation, the New Futures Initiative has made little headway in improving education.

According to a three-year evaluation:

The programs, policies, and structures implemented as part of New Futures have not begun to stimulate a fundamental restructuring of schools. For the most part, interventions were supplemental, leaving most of the basic activities and practices of schools unaltered. At best, these interventions have yet to produce more than superficiall change (Wehlage, Smith, and Lipman, 1991, p. 51).

This is not a matter of failing to allow time for programs 10 Lake effect, nor is it the problem that weak outcome indicators prevented recognition of the benefits of innovative programs. Rather, the programs themselves have been weakly conceived and poorly implemented.

There are striking similarities between the action plans of New Futures and the CIJE's lead communities project. Consideration of the struggles of New Futures therefore provides important lessons for the CIJE which may allow us to avoid the pitfulfs that New Futures has encountered. In this paper, I will describe the design and implementation of New Futures, and show its similarities to the CIJE's agenda. Next, I will summarize New Futures' successes and frustrations. Finally, I will explore the implications of the New Futures experience for the CIJE.

The Design of New Futures

Just as the CIJE was born out of dire concern for the fate of American Jewry, the New Futures Initiative emerged in response to a sense of crisis in urban America. Like the CUE, New Futures is concentrating major assistance in a few locations, and emphasizing community-wide (or systemic) reform, rather than isolated improvements. At the heart of New Futures' organizational plan are community collaboratives: local boards created in each of the New Futures cities which are supposed to build consensus around goals and policies, coordinate the efforts of diverse agencies, and facilitate implementation of innovative programs. These collaboratives began with detailed self-studies which served both as part of their applications to become New Futures cities, and as the groundwork for the agendas they developed subsequently. Each city developed a management information system (MIS) that would gauge the welfare of youth and inform policy decisions. Like the CUE, the Casey Foundation listed certain areas of reform that each city was required to address, and encouraged additional reforms that fit particular contexts.³

Another similarity between New Futures and the CIIE is the decision to play an active part in the development and implementation of reforms. Unlike the sideline role played by most grant-givers, New Futures provided policy guidelines, advice, and technical assistance. New Futures has a liaison for each city who visits frequently. According to the evaluators, "the Foundation attempted to walk a precarious line between prescribing and shaping New Futures efforts according to its own vision and encouraging local initiative and inventiveness" (Wehlage, Smith, and Lipman, 1991, p. 8).

The New Futures Initiative differed from the CIJE in that it began with clear ideas about what outcomes had to be changed. These included increased student attendance and achievement, better youth employment prospects, and reductions in suspensions, course failures, grade retentions, and teenage pregnancies. New Futures recognized, however, that these were

from goals, and they did not expect to see much change in these outcomes during the first few years. The three-year evaluation focused instead on intermediate goals, asking five main questions (Wehlage, Smith, and Lipman, 1991, p. 17):

- 11. Have the interventions stimulated school-wide changes that fundamentally affect all students' experiences, or have the interventions functioned more as "add-ons"...?
- 2. Have the interventions contributed to ... more supportive and positive social relations. ... throughout the school?
- 3. Have the interventions led to changes in curriculum, instruction, and assessment...than generate higher levels of student engagement in academics, especially in problem solving and higher order thinking activities?
- 4. Have the interventions...give(n teachers and principals) more autonomy and responsibility...while also making them more accountable...?
- 5. Have the interventions brought to the schools additional material or human resources...?

Although Wehlage and his colleagues observed some successes, motabily the establishment of management information systems, and exciting but isolated innovations in a few schools, by and large the intermediate goals were not met: interventions were supplemental rather than fundamental; social relations remained adversarial; there was virtually no change in curriculum and instruction; and autonomy, responsibility, and community resources evidenced but slight increases.

New Futures' Limited Success

New Futures' greatest achievement thus far may be the "improved capacity to gather data on youths" (Education Week, 9/25/91, p. 12). Prior to New Futures, the cities had little precise information on how the school systems were functioning. Basic data, such as dropout and achievement rates, were not calculated reliably. Establishing clear procedures for gathering information means that the cities will be able to identify key areas of need and keep track of progress. For example, the data pointed to sharp discrepancies between black and white

suspension rates, and this has mude suspension policies an important issue. The outcome imdicators showed little change over the List three years, but they were not expected to. New Futures participants anticipated that data-gathering will pay off in the future.

The intermediate outcomes, which were expected to show improvement from 1988 to 1991, have been the source of frustration. None of the five areas examined by Wehlage's team showed major improvement. For example, the most extensive structural change was the nearrangement of some Little Rock and Dayton middle schools into clusters of teachers and students. This plan was adopted to personalize the schooling experience for students, and to offer opportunities for collaboration among teachers. Yet no new curricula or instructional appropriaties resulted from this restructuring, and it has not led to more supportive teacher-student relations.

Observers reported:

((A))t classiter meetings teachers address either administrative details or individual studients. When students are discussed, teachers tend to focus on personal problems and attempt to find idiosymeratic solutions to individual needs. They commonly perceive students': problems to be the result of personal character defects or the products of dysfunctional homes. "Problems" are usually seen as "inside" the student and his/her family; prescriptions or plans are designed to "fix" the student. Clusters have not been used as opportunities for collaboration and reflection in developing broad educational strategies that could potentially address institutional sources of student failure (Wellinge, Smith, and Lipman, 1991, p. 22).

The failure to take advantage of possibilities offered by clustering is symptomatic of what the Weblage team saw as the fundamental reason for lack of progress; the absence of change in the culture of educational institutions in the New Futures cities. Educators continue to see the sources of failure as within the students; their ideas about improvement still refer to students' buckling down and doing the work. The notion that schools might change their practices to meet the needs of a changed student population has yet to permeate the school culture.

Another example of unchunged culture was manifested in strategies for dealing with the suspension problem. As New Futures began, it was not uncommon for a third of the student

____^ **\$**

body in a junior high school to ressive suspensions during a given school year. In some cases, suspended students could not make up work they missed; this led them to fall further behind and increased their likelihood of failure. In response, several schools began programs of in-school suspensions. However, out-of-school suspensions remained common, and in-school suspensions were served in a harsh and punitive atmosphere that contradicted the goal of improxing the schools' learning environments.

The newspaper account of New Futures' progress focused on a different source of frustration: the complexity of coordinating efforts among diverse social agencies, schools, and the Foundation. This task turned out to be much more difficult than anticipated. The article quoties James Van Vleck, chair of the collaborative in Dayton: "As we've sobered up and faced the issues, we have found that getting collaboration between those players is a much more complicated and difficult game than we expected" (p. 12). Part of the difficulty lay in not spending enough time and energy building coalitions and consensus at the outset. Otis Johnson, who leads the Savannah collaborative, is quoted as saying: "If we had used at least the first six months to plan and to do a lot of bridge-building and coordination that we had to struggle with through the first year, I think it would have been much smoother" (p. 13).

The push to get started led to an appearance of a top-down project, though that was not the intention. Teachers, principals, and social workers—those who have contact with the youth—were not heavily involved in generating programs. Both the news account and the evaluation report describe little progress in encouraging teachers and principals to develop new programs, and school staff appeared suspicious about whether their supposed empowerment was as real as it was made out to be (see Wehlage, Smith, and Lipman, 1991, p. 31).

Inherent tensions in an outside intervention contributed to these difficulties. The use of policy evaluation has made some participants feel "whip-sawed around" (Education Week, 9/25/94,

p. 15). A Dayton principal explained, "We were always responding to ... either the collaborative or the foundation. It was very frustrating for teachers who were not understanding why the changes were occurring" (Education Week, 9/25/91, p. 15). Another tension emerged in the use of technical assistance: While some participants objected to top-down reforms, others complained that staff development efforts have been brief and limited, rather than sustained.

According to the evaluation team, the New Futures projects in the four cities have suffered from the lack of an overall vision of what needs to be changed. How, exactly, should students' and teachers' daily lives be different? There seem to be no answers to this question. Implications: How Can the CIJE Avoid Similar Frustration?

'Fhe New Futures experience offers four critical lessons for the CIJE: (1) the need for a vision about the <u>content</u> of educational and community reforms; (2) the need to modify the <u>culture</u> of schools and other institutions along with their structures; (3) the importance of balancing enthusiasm and momentum with coalition-building and careful thinking about programs; and (4) the need for awareness of inherent tensions in an intervention stimulated in part by external sources.

The importance of content. Although New Futures provided general guidelines, no particular programs were specified. This plan may well have been appropriate in light of concerns about top-down reform. Yet the community collection sites also failed to enact visions of educational restructuring, and most new programs were minor "add-ons" to existing structures. Wehlage and his colleagues concluded that reforms would remain isolated and ineffective without a clear vision of overall educational reform. Such a vision must be informed by current knowledge about education, yet at the same time emerge from participation of "street-level" educators—those who deal directly with youth.

This finding places the CIJE'S "best practices" project at the center of its operation.

Through a deliberate and wide-ranging planning process, each lead community must develop a broad vision of its desired educational programs and outcomes. Specific programs can then be developed in collaboration with the CIJE, drawing on knowledge generated by the best practices project. In addition to information about "what works," the best practices project can provide access to technical support outside the community and the CIJE. This support must be sustained rather than limited to brief interventions, and it must be desired by local educators rather than foisted from above. In short, each lead community must be able to answer the question, "how should students' and educators' daily lives be different?"; and the best practices project must provide access to knowledge that will help generate the answers.

Changing culture as well as structure. Jewish educators are no less likely than staff in secular schools to find sources of failure outside their institutions. Indeed, the diminished (though not eradicated) threat of anti-semitism, the rise in mixed-marriage families, disillusion with Israel, and the general reduction of spirituality in American public and private life, all may lower the interests of youth in their Jewishness and raise the chances of failure for Jewish education. Thus, Jewish educators would be quite correct to claim that if North American youth fail to remain Jewish, it is largely due to circumstances beyond the educators' control. But this is besides the point. At issue is not external impediments, but how educational and social agencies can respond to changing external circumstances. In New Futures cities, educators have mainly attempted to get students to tit existing institutions. If CIJE communities do the same, their likelihood of failure is equally great. Instead, lead communities must consider changes in their organizational structures and underlying assumptions to meet the needs of a changing Jewish world.

How do CUE plans address this concern? The intention to mobilize support for education, raising awareness of its centrality in all sectors of the community, is an important first step, particularly since it is expected to result in new lay leadership for education and community collaboration. New Futures' experience shows that this tactic is necessary but not sufficient. In New Futures cities, community collaborations galvanized support and provided the moral authority under which change could take place. Yet little fundamental change occurred. Educators have:

not experimented much with new curricula, instructional methods, responsibilities or rolles, because their basic beliefs about teaching and learning have not changed.

It is possible that the CIJE's strategy of building a profession of Jewish education address this problem. Perhaps unlike the secular educational world, where methods are well-entrendiral, professionalization in Jewish education will carry with it an openness to alternatives, encouraging deathers to create and use new knowledge about effective programs. Professionalization may bring out the capacity to experiment with "best practices" and a willingness to adopt them when they appear to work.

Balance enthusiasm with careful planning. Those involved in New Futures believe they should have spent more time building coalitions and establishing strategies before introducing new programs. Douglas W. Nelson, executive director of the Casey Foundation, regrets that more time was not taken for planning. He observed: "We made it more difficult, in the interest of using the urgency of the moment and the excitement of commitment, to include und get ownership at more levels" (Education Week, 9/25/91, p. 13). Again, it is not just the structure that requires change—this can be mandated from above: but the unspoken assumptions and beliefs that guide everyday behavior which require redefinition. Institutional culture cannot be changed by flut, but only through a slow process of mutual consultation and increasing commitment.

Lead communities also need a long planning period to develop new educational programs that are rich in content and far-reaching in impact. This process requires a thorough self-study, frank appraisal of current problems, discussions of goals with diverse members of the community, and careful consideration of existing knowledge. If "lead communities" is a twenty-year project, surely it is worth taking a year or more for preparation. Deliberation at the planning stage creates a risk that momentum will be last, and it may be important to take steps to keep enthusiasm high, but the lesson of New Fulures show that enthusiasm must not overtake careful planning. The current schedule for the lead communities project (as of January, 1992) appears to have taken account of these concerns.

Awareness of unavoidable tensions. New Futures' experience highlights tensions that are inherent to the process of an outside intervention, and the CUE must be sensitive so the effects of such tensions can be mitigated. The CUE must recognize the need for stability after dramatic initial changes take place. The CIJE's evaluation plan must be developed and agreed upon by all parties before the end of the lead communities' planning period. Technical support from the CIJE must be sustained, rather than haphazard. While the CIJE cannot hold back constructive criticism, it must balance criticism with support for honest efforts. Mamy of these tactics have been used by New Futures, and they may well account for the fact that New Futures is still ongoing and has hopes of eventual success, despite the frustrations of the early years.

Conclusion

The New Futures Initiative, the Casey Foundation's effort to improve the lot of at-risk youth in four American cities, has been limited by supplemental rather than fundamental change, the inability to modify underlying beliefs even where structural changes occur, and by the complexities of coordinating the work of diverse agencies. Although it will be difficult for the CUE to overcome these challenges, awareness of their likely emergence may help forestall them

or mitigate their consequences. In particular, the CUE should help lead communities develop their visions of new educational programs; think about cultural as well as structural change; ensure a thorough self-study, wide-ranging participation, and careful planning; and remain sensitive to tensions that are unavoidable when an outside agent is the stimulus of change.

Lo alecha ha-m'lacha ligmor, v'lo ata ben horin l'hibatel mi-menalh. Ha-yom kutzar v'ha-m'lacha m'rubah, V'ha-poalim atzcylim, v'ha-sahar harbeh. U-va'al ha-bayil dohok --- Pirke Avot.

(It is not your responsibility so finish the task, but neither are you free to shirk it. The day is short and the task is large, the workers are lazy, and the reward is great. And the Master of the House is pressing — Sayings of the Fathers.)

NOTES AND REFERENCES

- 1. Lawrence, Massachusetts, was originally included as well, with an additional SID million, but it was dropped during the second year after the community failed to reach consensus on how to proceed.
- 2. This account relies largely on two sources. One is an Education Week news report by Deborch L. Cohen, which appeared on Sept. 25, 1991. The second is an academic paper by the Casey Foundation's evaluation team: Gary G. Wehlage, Gregory Smith, and Pauline Lipman, "Restructuring Urban Schools: The New Futures Experience" (Madison, WI: Center on Organization and Restructuring of Schools, May 1991).
- 3. The reforms required (or "strongly encouraged") by the Casey Foundation were site-based management, flexibility for teachers, individualized treatment of students, staff development, and community-wide collaboration. This list is longer than the CIJE's, whose required elements are building the educational profession and mobilizing community support.
- 4. On the decline of spirituality in America, see Robert N. Bellah et. al., Habits of the Heart (Berkelry, CA: University of California Press, 1985).

The Shopping Mall High School: wirings 400 was wift to wir make the state of the st

ESPECT 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 eriticize 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 litanies about programs that are practical, interesting, and relevant. They urged that dropouto 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 attenting. 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 iff 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-firee, 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 iff 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.

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

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, untill 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 stanted. 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 of another. Many of these efforts — most recently, the 4950s 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.

GROUP PORTRAIT OUNGERS AND GULTIEST (IV), AFFLERENS; HIS?

and learn the difference between my own inhibitions and sears and the real warnings of danger. Perceptions of today's high schools, therefore, are plagued by romanticized remembrances of "the old days" and anxiety about the menacing stage of adolescence. Both of these responses tend to distort society's view of high schools and support the general tendency to view them as other than good.

PERMEABLE BOUNDARIES AND INSTITUTIONAL CONTROL

The standards by which schools define their goodness are derived from internal and external sources, from past and present realities, and from projected future goals. One is struck by how much more control private schools have over definitions and standards of goodness than their public school counterparts. In St. Paul's, for example, there is a sustained continuity of values and standards that is relatively detached from the mercurial changes in the wider society; it is a continuity that is internally defined. Surrounded by acres of magnificent woods and lakes and secluded in the hills of New Hampshire, it feels faraway from the harsh realities faced by most public secondary schools. The focus is inward and backward. Movement towards the future is guided by strong and deeply rooted historical precedents, ingrained habits, and practiced traditions. The precedents are fiercely defended by alumni who want the school to remain as they remember it, old and dedicated faculty who proudly carry the mantle of traditionalism, and the rector who sees the subtle interactions of historical certainty and adventurous approaches to the future. It is not that St. Paul's merely resists change and blindly defends traditionalism, but that it views history as a solid bedrock, an anchor in a shifting and turbulent sea.

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 subtile 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

seem to develop between the sexes. Although the decision to become conducational 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.

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. Poised 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.

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 feminist 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 the traditional sexrelated patterns have been largely re-established and the increased competition, rigid status hierarchies, and return to subjects that will "pay off" echo the resurgence of conservative attitudes abroad in society. An oldtimer on the Highland Park faculty, who has watched the shifting trends for almost three decades, refuses to become invested in the newest wrinkle. 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 it experiences similar societal reverberations within its walls, but it has also taken a more deliberate, initiating stance in relation to them. In the mid-to-late 1970s, the increased diversity of the student body caused factionalism, divisiveness, and cruptions of violence in the school. A counselor speaks

Of these harsh encounters as distinct echoes of the racial strife in the M Wider Boston community. Under the new leadership of Bob McCarthy, ischool violence was no longer tolerated. First, McCarthy helped him teachers express their long-suppressed rage at the inappropriate stutient behavior; second, there were immediate and harsh punishments hantled fi 88WA to all of the aggressors; and third, the school began to look upon w "the problem" of diversity as a rich resource. The battle against factionalism is not won. The shifts in consciousness are clusive and difficult to implant in community life. Everyone continues to speak of the stark divid-Sions among racial and ethnic gro'tps; 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 VEFSAtility. 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 differ-Ent 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 counter plans. 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-

libberate attempts to define boundaries between inside and out. Bob Mastruzzii recognizes the need to be knowledgeable about the social, economic, and cultural patterns of the surrounding community; the need to have a 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 his devoted community work, Mastruzzi fears the school would face politically dehilitating negativism from neighborhood forces. But Mastruzzii 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, buttless 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, Mastruzzi's concern with defining workable boundaties 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, Mastruzzi 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 abundamt 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. The inequalities are dramatic, the societal injustices fla-

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 believens." 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 communies. 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 Benson 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

THE RESIDENCE THE THE PARTY OF THE PROPERTY OF THE PARTY OF THE PARTY

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 idealogy. Without the buffers of land and wealth, Carver must fashiom a strong ideological message. It is not a surprising message. Even with the newly contrived rhetoric of "interfacing" and "metworking" used by Dr. Hogans, 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 Hogans'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 damgers of disruption and warned about acting "uppity" or amogant. 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 idelogical stance, enthusiastically articulated by Hogans, echoes these early admonitions—be good, be clean, be mamnerly, and have a great deal of faith. Recognize the rigged race but rum as hand 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. Hogans'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 Hogans creates for the immediate gratification of success and profit and to the connections be 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. Hogans tells them their dreams can come true, The work programs at Carver provide the daily experiences of industry,

students reaching out to one another through a haze of drings innouder to reduce feelings of isolation and dislocation. Drings are through a false sense of connection and less aning the magging ppin. A minority of students are spated the long lines and only a few carration and reference "the problem," but it is visible to the stranger who misses "the school spitit."

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 Coulinan 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 Coulinan calls "encompassing tendencies" that wrap their members up in a web of identification and affiliation, that inspire loyalty.

Schools must find way of inspiring devotion and loyalty in teachers and students, of marking the boundaries between inside and outsitte, of taking a psychological hold on their members. Some schools explicitly mark their territories and offer clear rules of delimention. Panachial 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. O 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 utging 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 noles as a "balancing act." They walk the treacherous "tightnope" between clossed and open doors, between altonomy and symbiosis. Schools need to provide asylum for adolescents from the rusged 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 adood, most students would find the school's rituals employ. It is this connection that motivates them.

Fre Carvers indeeds, it is a a chear exchange. "It I committed self toosebool for the opposition of a a job.... otherwise foreget it;" says a a journar who deese these himself as "supper realities." Million Accultury symbolizes the attempts at the last mee between separation and connection in its public redations make id. The candrague cover pictures the quiet, suburban campus with the city bouning in the background. The director of admissions speaks enhansisiseally about the masting of utopian idealism and digcity-realities. The day students arrive cash morning and "thing the world with them." The seniors speak about the clash between the schools humanitarian sprift and the gueling requirements of collage 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.

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." 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 harrasment; and must be the public imagemaker and spokesman for the school: 1 In high schools the principals are dispropontionately male, and the images and metaphors that spring to mind are stereotypically masculine. One thinks of the military, protecting the flanks, guarding the fortiess, defining the territory. The positive is often seen as defensive, the style clear, rational, and focused.



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 upom, 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 immstitutions 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 imstitutions of higher Jewish learning in North America (W.U., J.T.S.A. and H.U.C.), the Melton Centre at the Hebrew Umiversity 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 Twereky, 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 aducational 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 im the following ways:

- 1. Emcourage the imstitutions 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.

COMMISSION ON JEWISH EDUCATION IN NORTH AMERICA

AMERICAN JEWISH

The Preparation of Jewish Educators in North America: A Status Report

Aryeh Davidson, Ph.D.

June, 1990

The Preparation of Jewish Educators in North America: A Status Report

Aryeh Davidson, Ph.D.

June, 1990

A Report Submitted to
The Commission on Jewish Education in North America

Aryeh Davidson is Assistant Professor of Education and Psychology and Head of the Department of Education at the Jewish Theological Seminary of America.

The Commission on Jewish Education in North America was convened by the Mandel Associated Foundations, JWB and JESNA in collaboration with CJF. The ideas expressed in this report are those of the author and do not necessarily reflect the views of the Commission.

For more information about the Commission, contact the Mandel Associated Foundations, 4500 Euclid Avenue, Cleveland, Ohio 44103. Tel.: (216) 391-8300.

Commissioners

Morton L. Mandel Chairman Mona Riklis Ackerman

Ronald Appleby David Arnow Mandell L. Berman

Jack Bieler

Charles R. Bronfman John C. Colman Maurice S. Corson Lester Crown David Dubin

Stuant E. Eizenstat

Joshua Elkin Eli N. Evans Irwin S. Field Max M. Fisher Alfred Gottschalk

Anthur Green
Inving Greenberg
Joseph S. Grass
Robert I. Hiller
David Hirschhorn

Carol K. Ingall

Ludwig Jesselson Henry Koschitzky Mark Lainer Norman Lamm Sara S. Lee

Seymour Martin Lipset Haskel Lookstein

Robert E. Loup Matthew J. Maryles Florence Melton

Donald R. Mintz Lester Pollack Charles Ratner Esther Leah Ritz Harriet L. Rosenthall

Alvin I. Schiff
Lionel H. Schipper
Ismar Schorsch

Harold M. Schulweis Daniel S. Shapiro Margaret W. Tishmam

Isadore Twersky Bennett Yanowitz Isaiah Zeldin

Senior Policy Advisors

David S. Ariel
Seymour Fox
Annette Hochstein
Stephen H. Hoffman
Mantim S. Kraar

Arthur Rotman Herman D. Stein Jonathan Woocher Henry L. Zucker

Director

Henry L. Zucker

Research & Planning

Seymour Fox, Director Annette Hochstein, Associate Director

Staff

Estelle Albeg Mark Gurvis Virginia F. Levi Debbie Meline Joseph Reimer

Table of fc Canthasts

Introduction	11
Research Questions Research Questions	11
Methodology Methodology	22
Data Analysis and Presentation Data Analysis and Presentation	22
Limitations of the Study Limitations of the Study	22
The Historical Context The Historical Context	33
The Current Picture The Current Picture	44
1. Training Programs 1. Training Programs	,9
1.1 B.A. Level Programs	99
1.2 M.A. Programs	10
1.2.1 Program philosophies and goals	10
1.2.2 Program standards	13
1.2.3 Program curricula	14
1.2.4 Part-time/full-time students	146
1.3 Boctoral Programs	117
1.4 Administrative Certificate Program	1188
1.5 Special Programs	169
2. Student Profile	241
2.1 Demographic Factors	241
2.2 Jewish Educational Backeround	232
2.3 Motivation to Pursue Jewish Education as an Career	232
2.4 Academisc Prefromance	23/3
2.5. How Students Support Themselves	233
2.5 Summary	224
3. Faculty Profile	
3.1 Summary	29
4. Summary of Training Programs Pricuspectand Prospect	

5. Alternative Training Programs s	33
5.1 Short-Term Training Programs	33
5.2 Semior Educator Programs	34
5.3 Im-Service Training Programs	34
6. Training Informal Jewish Educators s	39
Nobese s	41
Taibles	
Table 1: Institutions of Higher Learning Granting Jewish Education Degrees and Certificates	43
Table 2: Enrolled and Graduating Jewish Education Studies from Institutions of Higher Learning	44
Table 3: Distribution of Jewish Education Faculty in Institutions of Higher Learning	44
Appendices	
Appendix A: Semii-structured Interview Schedule	45
Appendix B: Accreditation and Institutions of Higher Jewish Learning	47
Reflevences	49

Introduction

The preparation of Jewish educators, perhaps more than any other area of Jewish education, reflects the complexity of issues, problems and needs confronting the future of Jewish education in North America. The recruitment of students, the development of appropriate training programs, the placement of graduates, the preparation of prospective faculty, the professionalization of the field, the relationships among the academy, the community and the school, are all issues that embody many of the challenges for Jewish education in the 1990s.

Recognizing the centrality of these issues, the Commission on Jewish Education in North America commissioned this study to describe the nature and scope of the preparation of Jewish educators in North America. 1

Research Questions

The study was designed with the input of the staff of the Commission to examine four areas in depth:

- 1. The nature and scope of training: What institutions of higher learning are preparing personnel for Jewish education? How do these institutions perceive their mission vis-a-vis Jewish education? What are the funding patterns for these programs? What is the range of educational preparation programs offered by these institutions?
- 2. Approfile of those students studying to become Jewish educators: How many students are being trained to become Jewish educators? What motivates students to pursue training in Jewish education? How much does it cost to complete one's training as a Jewish educator?
- 3. Approfile of faculty engaged in preparing future Jewished accours: How many faculty members prepare Jewish educational personnel and who are they? How do they perceive their roles?
- 4. The identification of issues and problems confronting Jewish institutions of higher learning: What do these institutions see as the issues and roles they will confront in the next decade? Are the issues confronting these institutions comparable to those in general education?

Although Jewish educators trained in North America may engage professionally in formal and/or informal education (Hochstein, 1986; Ettenberg & Rosenfield, 1988; Reisman, 1988), Jewish institutions of higher learning primarily prepare personnel

for formal settings. Consequently, the research questions are aimed towards gaining a better understanding of the preparation of those entering and engaged in formal Jewish education by institutions of higher learning. Some attention will also be given to identifying issues relating to the preparation of Jewish educators serving in informal Jewish educational settings.

Methodology

Two forms of information, written documentation and interviews, were collected and provided the basis for developing a description of the current state of preparing Jewish educators. Written documentation, i.e., school bulletims, program descriptions, published and unpublished institutional reports, and research studies on the preparation of Jewish educational personnel were reviewed and analyzed. Between September 15 and November 20, 1989, the investigator conducted a total of 70, one to two and one-half hour semi-structured interviews with personnel and others engaged in the preparation of Jewish educators throughout North America. (Appendix A, p. 45, contains the schedule that guided each interview.) Seventy-three students enrolled in Jewish education programs participated in group and individual meetings led by the investigator.

Data Analysis and Presentattioon

Answers to quantitative research questions, relating to the numbers and types of faculty and students, are presented in tabular form and discussed in the text. Descriptions of programs, analysis of training issues and problems discussed in the text are based on written documentation and interview data. Excerpts from interviews are used extensively to present the views and perspectives on the current state of training.

Limitations of the Study

The study is not comprehensive, thereby limiting the conclusions that may be drawn from it. A narrow time required that existing available data, which is sometimes incomplete, be relied on, and the promise of confidentiality to those interviewed prevented reporting profiles of individual institutions. Consequently data are presented and interpreted in aggregate form, and the discussion presents an overview of those issues relating to all training institutions.

The Historical Context

Beginning in the late 19th century, Jewish leaders such as Mordecai Kaplam, Judah Magnus and Samson Benderly (Kaplan & Crossman, 1949; Margolis, 1968; Sherwin, 1987), and the organized Jewish community were concerned with the education of large immigrant Jewish populations. They worked towards establishing teacher training institutions in large urban areas to prepare a generation of Hebrew teachers particularly suited for educating American Jewish youth on the elementary and high school levels. 4 Between 1897 and 1954 eleven such institutions were established. 5

Although some were established as denominational schools and extensions of nationally-based seminaries (e.g., Teachers Institute of the Jewish Theological Seminary of America, Teachers Institute of Yeshiva University), most were designed to serve the needs of the entire Jewish community (e.g., Boston Hebrew Teachers College, Gratz College, The College of Jewish Studies). Differences in ideology and religious orientation did not prevent them from being viewed by American Jews as having one primary function: the training of Hebrew teachers who would ensure continuity from one generation to the next (Honor, 1935; Hurwich, 1949). When Leo Honor conducted the first comprehensive study of the curricula of eight Hebrew Teachers Colleges in 1935, he found that these institutions shared three characteristics: an emphasis on the study of classical Jewish texts; an emphasis on Hebrew language/cultural Zionism; and the assumption of additional functions beyond their original mission of training Hebrew teachers. The additional functions included adult education, advanced Hebrew studies, and the training of Sunday School teachers.

Fourteen years after Honor's study, Hurwich (1949) reported that the Hebrew Teachers Colleges were moving further away from their mission of training Hebrew teachers. He found that only 20 to 25 percent of the annual need for new teachers was met by the training institutions. Moreover, the schools actively encouraged students to pursue a full course of study in secular colleges, leading to professional careers other than Hebrew teaching.

In the years that followed, Hebrew Teachers Colleges continued to expand their course offerings and programs to meet the broad Jewish educational needs of the community. Several established joint degree programs with universities (e.g., Jewish Theological Seminary and Columbia University; Spertus College of Judaica and Roosevelt University; Gratz College and Temple University). New programs in Judaic studies, Jewish communal service, adult education and high school education were also established.

In 1981, when Mirsky examined the eleven accredited institutions that constituted the Iggud Batei HaMedrash (Association of Hebrew Teachers Colleges, refer to Appendix B, p. 47), he noted that with the exception of one, all of the colleges had removed "Teachers" from their names. Moreover, Hebrew was the language of instruction in

only 20% of the courses. The colleges also reported shifts in their student populations and viewed their respective missions as changing.

The Iggud Schools have begun to develop courses, and sometimes entire programs, to meet the needs of the general community, and to enroll more and more students... non-traditional learners.... This, of course, can be seen as a positive development—a guarantee for the continued growth and viability of these institutions—or as a negative development—a sign of decline and change of mission, with the possibility that Hebrew teacher preparation programs may gradually lose importance in the institutions, and may even disappear (Mirsky, 1981, p. 18).

Over a seventy-year period the Hebrew Teachers Colleges, imstitutions originally established for the sole purpose of preparing Hebrew teachers, expanded their roles within the Jewish community. They currently have thousands of students enrolled in adult education courses, in-service education courses, and secondary level programs. A perusal of their course bulletins shows that they offer a variety of degrees in Judaica, liberal arts, social service, and administration. Their long-range planning and mission statements indicate that they view themselves in broad terms as serving a variety of constituencies and addressing contemporary cultural, educational, and religious needs of the American Jewish community. A profile of each would demonstrate that the institution responds to a complex set of factors which are different for each school.

The Currentt Picture

There are currently fourteen Jewish institutions of higher learning offering programs for the preparation of Jewish educators. Between September 15 and November 20, 1989, the investigator visited eleven of these institutions. Each visit consisted of a tour of the facilities and interviews with various administrators, faculty, and students. Where possible, personnel involved with the community were also interviewed. The institutions fall into three categories: 1) independent community-based colleges founded and supported by the organized Jewish community; 2) denominational schools established by religious movements as part of their respective seminaries; 3) university-based programs established by the community and/or individuals within the framework of a general university.

Independent community-based colleges
Gratz College, Philadelphia
Baltimore Hebrew University
Spertus College of Judaica, Chicago
Cleveland College of Jewish Studies
Hebrew College, Boston
Midrasha (Teacher Training Institute), Toronto

Denominational schools

Hebrew Union College: Rhea Hirsch School of Educatiom, Los Angeles; The School of Education, New York

Jewish Theological Seminary of America, Graduate School, Department of Jewish Education, New York

Yeshiva University, New York: Azrielli Graduate Institute; Isaac Breuer College; Stern College

University of Judaism, Fingerhut School of Education, Los Angeles

University-based programs

Hornstein Program for Jewish Communal Service, Brandeis University, Waltham, MA.

School of Education, George Washington University, in association with the College of Jewish Studies, Washington, D.C.

Department of Jewish Studies, York University, Toronto

Department of Judaic Studies, McGill University, Montreal

Before addressing the major research questions relating to training of Jewish educators an overview of the institutions visited will be presented.

Physical plants

The facilities of each institution are comfortable, well-maintained and generally perceived by school personnel and students as providing adequate space. Both the denominational and university-based programs provide housing for students, whereas none of the independent community colleges have housing facilities. Each institution has a library of Judaica, including an education collection, which meets the standards of the respective regional accrediting associations for institutions of higher learning.

Funding

The operating budgets of the institutions vary significantly. The independent community colleges report budgets ranging from approximately \$400,000 to \$2,300,000. Income is generated through tuition, gifts, and local federations which contribute between 20-90% of the budget. It is difficult to assess what percentage of the total budgets of the denominational and university-based schools is allocated for their education training programs. Their income is generated through tuition, relatively small endowments, grants, and fundraising. None of the denominational institutions are eligible for Jewish community (e.g., federation) funding because of their perceived sectarian status. University-based programs, in contrast, do receive considerable community support in the form of federation allocations, grants, and tuition subventions.

Governance

All of the institutions have independent Boards of Trustees. The amount of authority and control a board exerts is contingent on the status of the institution (university-based, denominational, independent community) and its dependence on the federation. All independent community schools must have their budgets approved by the federation and are included in the long-range planning activities of the federation. University-based programs often have rather complicated relationships with their respective federations and departments of Jewish studies.

Acqueditation

The institutions listed in Table 1 (p. 43) all have some form of state (U.S.) or provincial (Canada) accreditation. Most are also accredited by regional accrediting associations and accepted by the National Board of License for Teachers and Supervisory Personnel in American Jewish Schools (NBL) as institutions preparing educators for Jewish schools. (Appendix B, p. 47, provides a description of each type of accreditation.)

Mission

Examination of the mission statements of the respective institutions and the interview data indicate that they share common goals in the following areas:

- the preservation and perpetuation of Jewish culture;
- the preparation of Jewish professionals;
- the support and promotion of Jewish scholarship.

Independent community colleges, in addition to supporting these goals, stress their commitment to serving the needs of their respective communities through various forms of outreach and direct service, including secondary school Jewish education, im-service teacher education programs, and adult education programs. In addition they are responsive to the changing priorities and needs identified by the local federation for the community. The president of a community-based college remarked:

We're experiencing a large influx of Russian immigrants in our community. The College is responding by working together with (: :) to sponsor ESL programs. We're also thinking about other programs that will involve them in the study of Jewish culture. We see ourselves as serving local needs; that means assessing and being responsive to local constituencies and issues: . . . In a few years we may consider expanding to serve the entire region but I don't see us attracting a national student population, nor attempting to compete with the nationally-based seminaries.

By way of contrast, the administrator of another community-based college indicated that the College was attracting a national student body and would continue to aspire to be perceived as responding to national as well as local needs.

Our recent long-range planning study indicates that we have the potential to train administrators and educators extending beyond (. . .). We are planning to build a dormitory and actively seek fellowship funds to attract students.

With respect to the role of Jewish education and its prominence within the college, each institution has a rather unique perspective. One is engaged in re-establishing a Jewish education program which will require adding faculty and actively recruiting students. The president of another community-based college takes a rather dim view of the prospects for Jewish education.

Frankly, there is no profession of Jewish education; salaries are low, status is low and there is no incentive for us to build our Jewish education program at this point in time. The field of Jewish education needs to change as a profession out there before we can build our programs to train Jewish educators.

Structurally, the community-based colleges do not have distinct academic departiments of education, rather they offer programs in Jewish education which do not necessarily have full-time education faculty (see section 3).

Each denominational school has a department, school or institute of Jewish education which focuses on the preparation of educational personnel, and has appointed full-time education faculty (see section 3). By virtue of their ideological affiliation, they emphasize their commitment to the specific needs of their religious movements through programs, outreach and scholarship. They also view themselves as serving the meeds of mational and international constituencies.

The missions of university-based programs focus on the preparation of educators and communal professionals uniquely trained to serve Jewish communities. They tend to stress an interdisciplinary approach to training and scholarship as part of a university, and a pluralistic attitude towards developing leadership. Structurally, programs in Jewish education are components of either Judaic studies or Jewish communal service programs of the university.

Programs and Activities

Although a profile of each school's program activities is beyond the scope of the present study, each institution sponsors programs in some or all of the following areas:

Training programs—pre-service and in-service programs designed to prepare and provide continuing education to rabbis, Jewish communal service workers, cantors and Jewish educators;

Jewish Studies programs - academic degree programs in Judaica;

Adult education—courses, lectures, workshops and retreats designed for local and regional Jewish communities;

Secondary level supplementary schools—intensive Jewish studies programs designed for motivated adolescents;

Special projects —museum programs, joint programs with universities, library training workshops and research institutes.



1. Training Programss

As indicated above, each of the institutions offers programs to prepare Jewish educators, but the type and orientation of the programs differ significantly, depending on the particular academic degree and institution. Table 1 (p. 43) lists the training institutions and the various programs they offer in Jewish education. Most offer degree programs at the B.A. and M.A. levels. A growing number are also beginning to offer advanced degrees (doctorates) and principal certification. After each degree program is examined, the common issues confronting training institutions will be reviewed. Because most students are enrolled in graduate programs, an extensive discussion is devoted to an analysis of the M.A. programs.

1.1 B.A. Level Programss

Those institutions which offer a concentration or major in Jewish education are listed in the column marked B.A. of Table 1. These programs by and large conform to the requirements of the NBL (refer to Appendix B) for licensing teachers at the elementary and secondary level. Requirements for licensure include: 42 credits of Judaica (Bible, literature, history, customs and prayer); Hebrew language proficiency; and 18 credits in Jewish education including a student teaching experience. In addition, candidates for the NBL license must earn 90 points of liberal arts credit from an accredited college or university. As indicated in Table 1, only the denominational and community-based colleges offer B.A. level or certification programs.

There are a total of 68 students currently enrolled in B.A. degree programs who major or concentrate in Jewish education. Although accurate comparisons with previous enrollment figures are not available, it is clear that there has been a steady decline in the number of B.A. education majors over the past twenty years (Mirsky, 1981; Schiff, 1974). Declining education enrollments at the B.A. level have also been reported for general colleges and universities. They are attributed in part to poor salaries and the low status of the teaching profession (Carnegie Forum, 1986; Feistritzer, 1984). Aside from these factors, Jewish institutions of higher learning are encouraging students considering careers in education to complete a liberal arts education and then pursue an M.A. in Jewish education.

In response to your question, we are trying to phase out the B.A. major in Jewish education at (...). In order to professionalize the field we need educators with graduate degrees. . . . It also doesn't make sense for us to place undergraduates in the same courses with graduate students. We don't have the budget to run parallel courses at the B. A. and M.A. levels.

Most of the institutions listed in Table 1 and all of the Canadian-based programs offer courses on the undergraduate level to meet NBL teacher license requirements.

Forty-three students are enrolled in teacher certification programs (refer to Table 2) as mon-matriculating students. They generally enroll in the school for the requisite 18 credits im Jewish education courses and take Judaica courses in other institutions. Sevenal interviewees felt this approach to teacher certification worked against the professionallization of the field.

Students who come here to take a few courses in education may not even be acceptable candidates for our degree programs. Since they are here as non-matriculating students we aren't supporting their candidacy for a license; we're just letting them take courses. We need to nethink, on a national level, the whole area of teacher certification.

1.2 M.A. Programs

The M.A. program has become the primary vehicle for preparing Jewish educators in North America. With the exception of the undergraduate colleges and the Toromto Midrasha, all institutions now offer an M.A. in Jewish education. Most Jewish education programs are registered by their respective state's departments of education as part of the institution's graduate school of Judaica. Consequently, a student enrolled in an M.A. program in Jewish education will also need to meet the requirements of the particular graduate division of the school. All students receiving M.A. degrees in Jewish education from an accredited institution are automatically eligible for a teaching license from the NBL (refer to Appendix B).

The majority of programs make provisions for both full and part-time study. The exceptions, Brandels, HUC-Los Angeles, and the University of Judaism, will only accept full-time students. Full-time students complete the program in two to three years, depending on their background and the program. Part-time students take between three to five years for completion of the degree. As indicated in Table 2, in June, 1989, 62 students received M.A. degrees in Jewish education. Of those, approximately 40 were full-time students and 22 attended part-time.

The M.A. programs differ substantially from each other in numerous ways. Unfortunately, these differences cannot be easily classified into a typology 6 and a detailed analysis of each program is beyond the scope of this study. Despite these differences, the data analyses indicate that there are several foci or issues around which programs may be better understood and discussed. Three such issues emerge from the data, and also have relevance to the literature on teacher training: the programs' philosophical orientation, standards, and curricula.

1.2.1 Program philosophies and goals

The various programs reflect different educational philosophies and models of teacher training. At a symposium entitled New Models for Preparing Personnel for Jewish Education (Jewish Education, 1974), leading Jewish educational thinkers dis-

cussed their respective programs. Three distinctive models of training were discussed:

1) Generalist

The educator prepared as the generalist (Cutter, 1974) should be familiar with classical texts, fluent in Hebrew, knowledgeable about the worlds of both Jewish and general education, and have experience in curriculum writing, teaching and supervision. The generalist is prepared to serve as both a resource to the Jewish educational community and a leader in a variety of settings including the congregational school, the day school, the bureaus of Jewish education, the JCC and camps.

2) Crittical translator

Lukinsky (Lukinsky, 1997/4), discussing the program at the Jewish Theological Seminary, described a model or approach to training that emphasizes Jewish scholarship and its translation to the classroom; provides educational experiences that stress struggling with real problems in our world; and prepares Jewish educators to think critically.

3) Reflective educator

The model developed at Brandeis University described by Wachs (Wachs, 1974) and elaborated by Shevitz (Shevitz, 1988), underscored the training of the Jewish educator through self-awareness and reflection; socialization within a community of faculty and students; focused field experiences in the Jewish community; and the development of professional competence.

4) Practitioner

A fourth model, not addressed in the symposium but clearly reflected in the literature of several of the institutions under study, focuses on preparing the practitioner—a Jewish educator committed to and expert in the art and science of teaching.

These four models—the generalist, the critical translator, the reflective educator and the practitioner—are not pure models in theory or practice. However, by virtue of providing a vision and model of the Jewish educator, each model guides the preparation of educators, provides direction to students and faculty, and helps to inform the Jewish community of the purpose and goals of Jewish education. Implicit in each model is the notion of the Jewish educator as a religious educator, but this emphasis varies depending on the program and its ideological orientation.

In reality, few of the schools preparing educators have clearly articulated a philosophy of Jewish teacher education. Many of the programs refer to themselves as eclectic, borrowing, combining and applying concepts from a number of areas. It is questionable to what extent this eelecticism has been integrated into a Jewish philosophy of education.

There is a clear and burning need for classroom teachers, persons who are grounded in the study of text and fluent Hebrew speakers. Theories and philosophies aren't all that helpful when fires need to be put out.....Quitethousstly,disadlopingaactearphilosophy is a luxury we can't afford at this time.

We (students) often sit around talking about the lack of direction in our program. Some of the courses are excellent but the parts don't hold together. I couldn't tell you what the philosophy of this program is.

We've prided ourselves on the development of a clear statement of what kind of educators we want to prepare at (...). But, it has required an inordinate amount of work on the part of faculty and administration. We spend three hours per week in weekly meetings to discuss goals, philosophy and the more mundane stuff.

These excerpts from the interviews capture some of the problems and issues training programs face in relationship to the development of a program philosophy. Most programs just do not have the resources, with respect to time and personnel, to do the needed work in this area. Many interviewees observed that when there is a lack of vision and guiding philosophy of training, all aspects of the program suffer and contribute to the sense that Jewish education is not a real profession.

In the general world of education a good deal of attention is being focused on commissions (Carnegie Forum, 1986; Holmes Group, 1986) that advocate reconceptualizing teacher preparation programs and their philosophies of training. Referring to this work, a faculty member concluded the interview with the following comment:

American education has been struggling with the purpose and philosophy of its education schools for decades. . . . It's taken seriously, and every ten to fifteen years, after considerable research and deliberation, reports are issued which lead to proposed reforms that are heard both by the educational community and Washington. We've been struggling with comparable issues for hundreds, thousands of years, but we haven't in recent years taken Jewish education seriously enough to give it the thought and reformulation it needs. We have a lot to learn from our colleagues in American education. Interestingly, analysis of the data found that most program goals or mission statements, reflected little explicit concern with the religious dimension of the educator. With the exception of the denominational schools, course descriptions, self-studies, and interviews suggest ambivalence about identifying Jewish education programs as preparing religious educators.

Let me outline our missions: providing a quality educational program of Judaic and Hebrew studies; the training of Jewish educators and communal service workers; serving as a cultural resource, serving as a scholarly resource, housing a Jewish library; and providing a community Hebrew high school. Religious development per se is not part of our mission. To the extent that adults seeking meaning take our course. I guess you could say we are involved in religious education.

As one engaged in the development of Jewish educators, I am very concerned with their spiritual life. As Jewish educators they are first and foremost crafting learning opportunities where learners can create personal religious meaning, from the text, from the experience:... We have a lot to learn from religious educators in the Christian world who are doing some fantastic things in this area.

1.2.2 Program standards

The development of rigorous standards to improve the profession of education is high on the agenda for reform of the American educational system (Clifford & Guthrie, 1988; National Board for Professional Teaching Standards, 1989). Similarly, the establishment and enforcement of standards for Jewish educators is viewed as necessary to the professionalization of the field (Aron, 1990). In the course of data collection, standards were often mentioned with reference to two issues: the perceived low status of teacher training institutions, addressed by accrediting and licensing agencies (Appendix B); and standards within individual programs relating to admission criteria, Judaica background, and Hebrew language proficiency.

With the exception of two schools, all of the administrators and Jewish professionals interviewed want to increase their programs' enrollments and out-reach to untapped potential student populations. In fact, several schools have begun to recruit bright, motivated people who desire careers in Jewish education but who lack extensive Jewish backgrounds. This tension between attracting new blood to the field and maintaining standards was expressed repeatedly in the interviews. Schools have responded in different ways. A few have developed mechina (preparation) programs in Israel; two have initiated special summer institutes enabling students to study Judaica and Hebrew; one school requires weak students to spend a "preparatory" year of study at the institution before they are formally accepted into the program. None send the message that "students with weak Judaica backgrounds need not apply."

The overall results of these strategies are questionable. The mechina and special programs receive mixed reviews from faculty, students, and administration, with respect to their ability to compensate for weak Judaica backgrounds. They impose serious financial burdens on students and often discourage them.

(...) was a good program; it gave me some of the basic skills, but I feel that breaking my teeth over Talmud isn't exactly what I need in order to teach kids in Hebrew school. I don't know if I can make it through another two and one half years.

Psychologically I never expected it to be so difficult to be in a learning situation where I feel infantalized because the material is so foreign and, from my current vantage point, interly useless for my intended career, working as a Jewish family educator.

A faculty member commented:

The quality of preparation our students receive in the Israel program is questionable. And standards are non-existent: We have no control and little input..... They study text, but they could also attain comparable gain here:

Standards are also an issue with respect to teaching competency. Although all schools have some type of practicum, most have not developed effective forms of

evaluation to assess a student's ability to teach. A few programs zealously adhere to self-imposed standards, but that does not mean that their programs conform to the standards of the NBL (refer to Appendix B).

We have committed ourselves to a quality program meeting self-imposed criteria. We will maintain the requirements of full-time study, numerous field placements, study in Israel, because they all flow from our vision of what is required to train a Jewish educator. We realize that our standards inhibit growth of the program but that is how we maintain standards of excellence for ourselves and the field.

1.2.3 Program curricula

Issues of curriculum, i.e., the content of training programs, appear to be directly influenced by institutional positions towards standards and philosophical orientation. Programs which have clearly articulated goals and a guiding educational philosophy are perceived by students and faculty as having courses and practical experiences which complement each other and help create a unified program. By way of contrast, programs which are not grounded in a philosophy are often perceived as diffuse, a collection of courses that do not hang together. This sense of diffusion was particularly obvious within programs which primarily serve part-time students.

In contrast to my work at (...) where I deal mostly with students who have a full-time commitment to graduate study, the students here check in and out, hardly know each other, seem to be taking courses in any sequence that meets their schedule, and have very little sense of what it means to be a professional Jewish educator. I certainly don't have a sense of a program where students and faculty fully participate, and I don't know if students perceive it any differently.

Irrespective of students' and faculty's perceptions of the program curricula, analysis of the program and course descriptions do indicate specific areas of curricular content and emphasis. All programs require courses in three areas of concentrations:

Judaica — classical Jewish text study (e.g., Bible, rabbinic literature), Jewish literature, Jewish history, liturgy, customs and ritual;

Jewish education—foundations (e.g., philosophy of Jewish education, human development), methodology skills, specialization courses (e.g., informal education, special education, adult education)

Supervised practicum experience—student teaching or internship (paid training experiences tailored to the needs and career aspirations of each student).

Aside from these core areas of concentration, programs may require courses on contemporary Jewry, administration, and supervision, or departmental seminars. All programs also require that students demonstrate proficiency in Hebrew language. "Proficiency" is determined and evaluated by each institution.

A program's course requirements play a large role in determining its duration. Programs which emphasize all of the aforementioned areas are three year programs requiring approximately 60 credits. Programs comprised of the three areas of concentration generally consist of 35-40 credits.

The curricula of training programs vary significantly with respect to the relative emphases that are placed on the areas of concentration and the additional areas noted above. Although a detailed curricular analysis of each program would be useful, it is beyond the scope of this study.

Program specialization also affects the curricular models adopted by each school. From their inception, teachers colleges focused on training of the Hebrew school teacher. The term connoted a rather specific type of occupation that resulted in a narrow conception of training. In response to community needs, occupations in Jewish education have burgeoned to include day school teachers, early childhood specialists, special educators, resource personnel, curriculum specialists, supervisors, family educators, Jewish community center educators, and summer camp educators. Many of the faculty interviewed felt that their schools have not kept pace with the changing needs of the Jewish community. Tinkering with a training model designed for preparing supplementary school teachers may not be an appropriate response to the need for new training programs. What are those training models most appropriate for preparing family educators, day school teachers, and other specialists?

Two curricular issues were repeatedly mentioned in the interviews: the tension between theory and practice and the nature of the role of the practicum.

1) The tension between theory and practice

Schools and departments of education are continually faced with the problem of balancing the theoretical aspects of teaching and learning with the practical (Zeichner, 1988). Jewish educators are keenly aware of the need to integrate these elements. At many of the training institutions this issue frequently appears as an agenda item for faculty meetings. Students often clamor for more practical courses that will provide them with teaching skills, whereas faculty members are prone to stress a theoretical approach to understanding practice. Few schools have taken an either/or position, i.e., stressing either a practical or theoretical orientation to the detriment of the other. Most programs reflect a tension between the two, exacerbated by the significant Jewish content of programs which also has its theoretical and practical aspects. The tension between theory and practice is also reflected in the various practica and student teacher experiences of the programs.

2) The role of the praeticum

According to the guidelines of the NBL, all students are required to complete a supervised field experience (practicum) to be eligible for a teaching license. The nature and design of the practicum in Jewish schools depends on a variety of factors,

including: the orientation of the program, its ideological affiliation, student schedules, geographic locations of educational facilities, the availability of master educators, and economic realities. For those preparing to assume positions in supplementary schools, there is a good deal of flexibility in arranging the field placement. Students take their courses in the morning and use their afternoom teaching jobs to fulfill their practicum requirement. Such accommodation is not feasible for those training to become day school educators. They must be available during the day time for their placement and also take courses. This affects only two training programs which have day school tracks. One has developed an internship model which reduces the student's course load; the other has students take course work during the summers.

Students enrolled in general education programs rate their practicum experience as the most significant, interesting, and helpful part of their training (Feiman-Nemser, 1989). Among Jewish educators in training this often is not the case:

When I hear the words 'field placement' the first thing that comes to mind is commuting, getting in the car and driving 10 hours a week for a 14 hour field placement. Overall, I fixed the placement looms too large in our program. I've had a good deal of experience in Jewish education; I need more basic Judaica knowledge, not more field experience.

The kids are great, but the administration just doesn't use me properly. I'm the goffer, the substitute, the small group teacher, and lowest person on the totem pole. It's infantalizing.

The administration just doesn't realize how labor and time-intensive the supervision of student treachers is. We should have a ratio of one faculty person to five students. I commently supervise eight students and teach an additional three courses per semester.

The quality of the practicum experience is significantly influenced by the supervisiom a student receives. General programs for teacher training tend to borrow from several models of supervision (e.g., peer supervision, on-site supervision, university-based supervision, see Woolfolk, 1988). All of the models require trained personnel to provide supervision. Many students and faculty discussed with the investigator their concern about the lack of supervision in their field placements. In most instances on-site supervisors, burdened with their own job responsibilities, visit students infrequently. Faculty who supervise students spoke of their frustrations in not finding enough time to provide adequate supervision. In contrast, programs which have full-time requirements do not have the same degree of difficulty because they have adequate staff to supervise.

1.2.4 Part-time/full-time students

Issues relating to the differences between full and part-time students were raised repeatedly during the interviews. Those who invested in full-time study clearly felt it

was superior to part-time enrollment with respect to the overall quality of the training experience.

When students are part of a full-time program they form a learning community, a sense of professionalism, and a strong knowledge and skill base....Italisonakes saddifference for me—when working with part-time students, I feel they sort of squeeze my course into their busy schedules. I also feel I have to be more sympathetic to their external pressures outside of my class. Consequently, I'm embarrassed to say, I tend to be less demanding of part-time students.

I just love the opportunity to be in school full-time. It's not just the learning, it's the fellowship I feel part of. Jewishly, socially, and academically its very supportive.

The superiority of full-time study is by no means a matter of consensus. Most of the training institutions are invested in programs for part-time students (see section 2.5). Historically, Hebrew Teacher Colleges always had students who attended on a part-time basis (Margolis, 1968; Janowsky, 1967) while they taught in Hebrew schools and attended secular universities. Aside from tradition, several of those interviewed felt that it would not be economically viable for students preparing to be supplementary school teachers to attend a full-time training program.

From my perspective an education program that is designed for full-time students in this community is neither possible nor desirable. Those interested in studying at (...) generally have families and need to work. Even with fellowship money they would not be able to study full-time. Secondly, I'm not at all convinced that the preparation of Jewish educators for supplementary schools requires one to study full time. . . . We produce some excellent teachers who teach in schools and take one or two courses a year. The work and study complement each other.

1.3 Doctoral Programs

There are 67 students (Table 2) enrolled in doctoral programs—Ph.D., D.H.L. (Doctor of Literature), and Ed.D. (Doctor of Education)—at three institutions. The majority (58) are part-time, taking between one and three courses per year. However, schools offering a Ph.D. in Jewish education have a two-year full-time study residency requirement. Course requirements for all doctoral students include taking approximately 35 credits beyond the M.A. and the writing of a dissertation; the Ph.D. also has foreign language requirements.

Doctoral students may be classified into three overlapping eategories:

1) Continuing education

The majority of students (55%) view a doctorate as a way of continuing their studies and improving their skills. Students in this category hold full-time positions as educational leaders. Although they associate the title "Doctor" with status, its attainment will not affect their marketability or economic situation. These "continuing

education" students are most likely to complete their course work in four years, but often do not complete writing a dissertation.

2) Career advancement

About 30% of the doctoral students view the degree as a credential for improving their professional status and marketability. The majority of career advancement students are Israelis who study full-time and complete all course work and their dissecutations in four years or less and then return to positions in Israel.

3) Scholarship

This category includes doctoral students who have academic and research interests (approximately 15%). They are generally full-time students who view doctoral study as preparing them to assume leadership responsibilities in academic or research settings. They are perceived by many as representing the cream of the crop and therefore assume teaching and administrative responsibilities before completion of their dissertations. Students in this category often take upwards of eight years to complete their dissertations.

There are also many who enroll in doctoral programs because they are continuing to take course work past the M.A. level and decide to have those courses count towards a degree. Many do not complete their degrees; they stop short of writing the dissertation.

Unlike in most schools of general education, the doctoral education students in Jewish institutions of higher learning do not tend to function as active members of the school, i.e., they do not assume roles as research assistants, instructors or supervisors. To a large extent this seems to be a function of their part-time status and economic pressures to maintain full-time positions outside of the institution.

1.4 Administratiiwe Certificate Program

Four institutions currently sponsor programs to certify school principals and thereby train senior personnel. These programs are modelled after general education programs, tailored to enable full-time educators to study on weekends and during summers (Clifford & Guthrie, 1988). The programs require course work during the summers—courses in administration and supervision which may be taken at general universities—and an internship. Approximately half of the 42 students enrolled in these programs (see Table 2) already hold administrative positions. The schools and bureaus of education feel these programs should be expanded to prepare more senior educators and to fill informal and formal education positions. Most of the programs seem to be modelled after programs observed in general education (Clifford & Guthrie, 1988). Jewish professionals and faculty who were interviewed voiced enthusiasm for the expansion and reinforcement of principal and educational leadership programs.

These programs provide us with opportunities to create new models specifically tailored to the needs of the Jewish community.

1.5 Special Programs

The growing needs in the field of Jewish education have created new positions for personnel—day school teachers, special educators, family educators, and early childhood specialists (Hochstein, 1985; CAJE Newsletter, 1989). Interviewees maintain that the training institutions are not able to adequately respond to those needs. The data indicate that among the 14 institutions, three have begun early childhood programs in conjunction with local universities or BJEs. Although five have courses in special education, none have comprehensive training programs in that area. None have developed programs in family education. Day schools have flourished in the past decade, but there are only four institutions that have developed a capacity for the preparation of day school personnel and the unique challenges it involves. Day school teachers need extensive knowledge of Jewish texts, fluency in Hebrew language, and a willingness to work for low salaries (see Aron, 1990). Paradoxically, the training required for school administrators and "generalists" assuming leadership positions involves fewer demands in the areas of text study and Hebrew language but results in significantly higher salaries. The issues in the development of day school programs are directly related to the student applicant pool, financial support, and personnel.

It's very unlikely that we will ever be in a position to develop a training program for day school educators. Even if the demand is there, and that's debatable, we don't have the personnel. I doubt if we could recruit students to enroll in a three or four year program with the hope of going out and earning \$25,000. It makes more sense for them to consider an administrative program. Theoretically, we could develop a joint program with (. . .) in early childhood, special education, even family education. But a day school program, we'd have to do that on our own. We would need enormous resources.

2. Student Profile

The last comprehensive study of students enrolled in Hebrew Teachers Colleges was conducted by Alvin Schiff in 1965 (Schiff, 1967). He reported that a total of 1835 students were enrolled in all programs of the ten colleges studied. Of those, approximately 500, or 27% of the college population, preferred Jewish education as a cancer choice on the survey Schiff administered. (There is no follow-up data to indicate whether these students did indeed become Jewish educators.) By and large the majority of students enrolling in Hebrew Teachers Colleges during the early sixties, prior to the proliferation of Judaic studies programs at universities, chose these colleges because they wanted to study Judaica seriously on the undergraduate level, while pursuing a liberal arts degree. For most, Jewish education as a field of study and subsequent career was viewed as an option, but not the primary reason for entering the school.

On the basis of the survey responses from Hebrew College students, Schiff drew a profile of students most likely to pursue careers in Jewish education. They tended to be female (80%), 21 years or older, were products of day school education, and wonshipped in Orthodox synagogues. They were satisfied with their previous Jewish learning experience, demonstrated strong Judaic and Hebraic backgrounds, desired positions teaching Jewish studies and Hebrew, and were motivated by idealism to promote Jewish life.

2.1 Demographic Factors

Analysis of the interviews and institutional literature yielded information for drawing im broad strokes a picture of the current student population of Jewish institutions of higher learning.

It is estimated that as of November, 1989, approximately 1500 students were enrolled as matriculating students in both the undergraduate and graduate programs of the 14 institutions under study. Of those, 358 students (refer to Table 2) or 24% of the total student population were enrolled in Jewish education degree programs, a percentage comparable to the 1965 survey. The teacher preparation programs are comprised primarily of women (75%). In contrast, the Judaica programs of these institutions are comprised of 35% males and 65% females. Although male/female ratios vary considerably from school to school, as in general education (Feistritzer, 1986), Jewish education programs have a disproportionate number of women.

The denominational and university-based programs draw students from a national pool, whereas the independent community schools primarily attract students on a

llocal or regional level. On the graduate level, the majority of students have had some prior work experience in either formal or informal Jewish education. Although they tend to be in their mid-twenties, increasingly administrators report that students thirty and older, seeking a career change, are applying to their programs.

2.2 Jewish Educational Background

With respect to students" Jewish background, there is considerable inter- and intrainstitutional wariation. Nevertheless, certain patterns are clear. Unlike the 1965
sample, current students generally do not come from Orthodox backgrounds, nor are
they graduates of day schools. Many seem to be dissatisfied products of congregational schools who only began to take serious interest in Judaica in Jewish studies
courses on the college level. While there has been a proliferation of day schools over
the past two decades, their graduates have a disproportionately low representation in
programs for preparing Jewish educators. Denominational institutions are increasingly attracting students who are not affiliated with a particular movement and view
themselves as serving the Jewish community at large.

2.3 Motivation to Pursue Jewish Education as a Career

There are no studies that examine why people enter Jewish education. Group interviews with students suggest that as with the 1965 student population (Schifff, 1967), idealism plays a prominent role in the decision to pursue a career in Jewish education. The following comments by students also point to the students' belief that their roles as Jewish educators center on identity development and the transmission of Judaism.

I chose Jewish education because I'm concerned about the future of the Jewish community, and being an educator is a way to make a difference.

For me, the transmission of knowledge and Jewish culture are the essence of being a Jewish educator:

I think that as an American Jewish educator my work must focus on transmitting Jewish values and shaping Jewish identity.

In choosing a program for graduate study in Jewish education students were keeply aware of their career options, which guide their choice of program. Programs which stress teaching tend to attract those who want to teach, whereas programs designed for administrators attract students who are primarily interested in affecting change in

Jewish educational systems. Nevertheless, when queried, students don't see themselves staying in teaching for more than a few years.

I love kids and teaching but you can't make ends meet on \$18,000 a year. I figure that after a year or two I'll become a principal.

My student teaching experience reinforced my decision to go teach in a day school next year. It's important to teach before you move on to administration.

I think the only way teaching in a Jewish school can become a real profession is if more people from our program go into teaching instead of administration. On the other hand I'll probably end up in administration in a few years.

Among all student groups interviewed a visit or period of study in Israel was noted as a factor contributing to the decision to pursue Jewish education.

Studying in Israel for a year helped me clarify that I wanted to pursue a career as a Jewish profissional... improving the quality of Jewish life.

I think it was the people I met in Israel, charismatic, intellectual Jewish doers, who had the greatest impact on my decision to enroll in....

Fin not sure if it was being in Israel, the country, or the people, that played the most significant role in my decision. But somehow, I don't think I would have made the decision in the same way if I would have been in the States.

Intensive study in Israel proved to me that I could do it. I felt confident, for the first time, in my ability to understand Jewish texts and teach Judaica.

2.4 Academic Performance

Feistritzer (1986), in her comprehensive study of students enrolled in teacher education programs reported that education students, as compared to other graduate students, tend to be academically inferior, scoring below the 35th percentile on national test norms. Interviews with administration and faculty indicate that Jewish education students are by no means academically inferior and fall above the 60th percentile on standardized tests (GREs, MAT) when compared to other graduate students in the humanities. With respect to their academic performance, education students do as well or better than those enrolled in Jewish studies programs.

2.5 How Students Support Themselivess

Until recently, financing one's education in a Hebrew Teachers College was not considered a factor affecting student enrollment. In 1967, Ackerman reported that tuition costs in the teacher training institutions were nominal—ranging between \$5

and \$80 per credit. He commented "... no student will be denied the opportunity of studying because of his inability to pay the required tuition" (Ackerman, 1967, p. 51). To a large extent Ackerman was referring to full-time undergraduates and working teachers taking courses on a part-time basis. The realities of the 1980s present a different picture. Tuitions at the institutions studied are high (\$150-\$350 per credit). Depending on the particular school fees, a full-time student (12-15 credits per semester) can expect a tuition bill of \$3,600 to \$ 10,000 per year, exclusive of living expenses. Administrators know of several students who deferred admission or declimed to come to the program because of its prohibitive costs. Some of the institutions do have small scholarships and a few fellowships are available. However, the majority of full-time students require financial aid in the form of government loams, which must be paid back once the student graduates. Full-time students take out loans ranging from \$2,000 to \$14,000 per year of study.

My wife and I are both students. When I complete my M.A. we will have between us \$45,000 in loans to pay back.

If I'm lucky I'll have a starting day school salary of \$22,000. I'll also have outstanding loans of \$18,000. Although I haven't graduated I'm beginning to get depressed about my ability to make ends meet.

The Wexner fellowships are great for those very few who are eligible. But for most of us there just isn't any scholarship money of significance.

Although I love school, I'm very angry that the Jewish community doesn't provide scholarship moneys for my schooling. It's just one more sign of the low priority Jewish education has on the community's agenda.

2.6 Summany

The profile of current students underscores the continuing changes within the institutions studied. In contrast to previous generations of students, they enter programs less Judaically knowledgeable, older, are interested in pursuing M.A. degrees as opposed to undergraduate degrees or teacher certification, come from different backgrounds and require significant financial aid in order to study full-time.

The findings raise a number of questions that require further investigation:

- 1. Given the student profiles, what are the best strategies for recruitment?? What types of recruitment currently are most effective in attracting students?
- 2. What are those factors that deter people interested in graduate education training from entering Jewish education versus general education? Why is the field of Jewish education attracting relatively few graduates of day schools?

- 3. What are the most effective ways of preparing students with weak Iluthica backgrounds? What role if any should an experience in Israel play in their education?
- 4. Do training programs affect the religious development of students?
- 5. What career paths do graduates of programs choose? How do graduates evaluate their training experiences?
- 6. How do the profiles of Jewish professionals in training, eg,, rabibinical students and communal service students, compare to graduate students in Jewish education?

3. Faculty Profile

Historically there have never been more than a handful of full-time Jewish education faculty members appointed to Jewish institutions of higher learning in North America. Most of those who taught education courses and had direct responsibilities for the preparation of teachers had rabbinical degrees and/or advanced degrees in the humanities.

For a variety of reasons education was not viewed as a rigorous discipline by (. . .). Although many of our students in the post-war years wanted to teach, the stress of the institution was on content—Judaica, text study. One could pick up techniques and methods the first or second year of teaching. It didn't make much sense to appoint a fiull-time educator to the faculty.

A glance at Table 3 shows that there are currently eighteen full-time faculty serving in departments or schools of Jewish education. They are full-time by virtue of having full-time academic appointments. However, only six have full-time teaching responsibilities. The other twelve, teach a partial load and assume significant administrative responsibilities. There are another 22 faculty who teach on a part-time basis and an additional 44 brought in on an adjunct basis.

The parallels between the field and academia are fascinating. The best teachers in the field last a year or two and then are pushed into administrative roles where many succeed but where an equal number fall prey to the Peter Principle..... In our departments of Jewish education the best pedagogues, teacher trainers, those who know the field, are generally assigned inordinate amounts of administrative responsibility and they are a real loss to the program. I also find they lose touch with the field and have a difficulty relating to students.

Part-time and adjunct faculty are generally recruited from schools and nearby institutions of higher learning. Many of the administrators interviewed are pleased that their respective institutions are able to attract the most prominent and knowledgeable academics and practitioners to teach a course or seminar.

In part our training program is superb because we can bring in local talent. The teaching stars from day schools, the resource people from the BJE and people like (...) and (...) from (...) University come to teach courses in special education and administration.

Having to rely extensively on part-time people, when we only have two full-timers of our own contributes to the sense that we aren't taken seriously in this institution. When I sit at faculty meetings it's clear that we are the only department where the part-time personnel out number the full-time faculty.

Full-time faculty have had their academic training in various areas. Eleven hold doctorates in education or allied fields (e.g., psychology, counselling); the others hold

doctorates in Judaica or the Humanities. Seven of the eighteen are also ordained rabbis. All have had field experience in Jewish education prior to choosing an academic career path. This diverse group ranges in age from 40-60 with approximately 65% of the faculty under age 50. Salaries of faculty vary considerably from institution to institution. In the denominational and university setting, full-time instructional salaries range from \$26,000 to \$63,00 depending on rank and seniority. Among the independent community colleges salaries are appreciably lower, ranging from \$18,000-\$45,000 depending on rank and longevity. All administrators interviewed spoke of the need to increase faculty salaries to levels commensurate with comparable schools of higher learning. In some schools there are standing committees which keep abreast of university salary scales and inform administration and faculty of the relative standing of the institution.

Teaching loads vary considerably among the training institutions. In one institution full-time faculty members are expected to carry a load of six courses per term. At the other extreme, one institution requires full-time faculty to teach two courses per term. The average teaching load of faculty is 3.5 courses per semester.

Jewish educational faculty tend to publish articles but produce few books devoted to education. Unlike their colleagues in other departments, they engage in several forms of research having a direct bearing on Jewish education including curriculum development, working with schools, and special projects.

My colleagues in history and rabbinics have little understanding of educational research. Nor do they understand how Jewish education should relate to the institution as a wholk.... Because the type of research we do is qualitatively different, we should be judged by a different set of criteria for promotion and tenure.

Attitudes reflected in the interviews of faculty and administrators correspond to the long-standing tensions between graduate programs and schools or departments of education in general universities (Clifford & Guthrie, 1988) which suggest deep biases concerning the role of research, the criteria for promotion and the seriousness of education courses.

Those interviewed have a variety of interests and belong to several different professional organizations. There is no one professional organization or conference which all attend. When presented with these data, a faculty member noted, "we are an interesting group of academicians but our diversity works against us in terms of becoming a professional group."

There was particular concern among several faculty about the need for educational research and the lack of support it receives from the community, foundations, and schools of higher learning.

(...) sends a mixed message about research in Jewish education. Lip service is given to its importance, but no significant financial support has come forth for educational research. Instead curricular projects, service projects, and in-service training take priority. Consequently education faculty, in contrast to my colleagues in other departments, are not really encouraged to engage in serious educational research projects.

3.1 Summary

The number of faculty members holding full-time positions in Jewish education is astonishingly small. They come from diverse backgrounds and training experiences, but all have had a long association with Jewish education. The interviews point to the need to increase the number of faculty in Jewish education if the field is to grow.

- 1. What strategies might be considered in order to increase the number of faculty?
- 2. What steps should be taken to improve the support of Lewishe ducation foodty in the institutions of higher Jewish learning? What mechanisms or opportunities need to be developed to enable faculty to do more research? How can support and professional networks for faculty be built?
- 3. Two what extent are the issues and concerns of feaulities comparable tto those in general education and those in Jewish studies? What motivates faculty to pursue academic careers in Jewish education?

4. Summarry of Training Programs: Retrospect and Prospect

The patterns of training for Jewish education in North America reflect complex, diverse programs that cannot be easily reduced to a few categories or types. During the past two decades there has been a steady decline in the number of students choosing to major in Jewish education at the B.A. level, while there was a proliferation of M.A. level programs. Currently, there are 358 students enrolled in degree or teacher certification programs preparing for careers in Jewish education. Amother 109 students are enrolled in post M.A. programs (doctoral or principal).

Students entering Jewish education programs come from varied backgrounds, they tend to be predominantly female, weaker than previous generations with respect to Judaica knowledge, highly motivated, and interested in pursuing a number of different caneer paths in Jewish education. The education faculties are exceedingly small. They are expected to function in a number of different arenas within the schools and flew are able to devote sufficient time to research and training in Jewish education.

A number off specific questions and issues emerged from the analysis and discussion:

- In order to meet the diallengess of the next decade and charta accourse of action, most of the institutions examined have or are currently conducting long-range planning studies. Their findings should provide data for better understanding their relative strengths and weaknesses, needs and resources. How might this information best be used in mapping out options for the training of Jewish educators?
- 2. Institutions fiercely want to maintain their autonomy and unique identity. Each needs to be understood within the context of its community, constituencies, and respective ideology. These realities require further exploration in order to understand how colleges might work together.
- 3. Despite their needs for autonomy, Jewish institutions of higher leaning are interested in working together. What mechanisms can be developed to facilitate collaboration among institutions? Is the AIHLJE (The Association for Institutions of Higher Learning for Jewish Education) a mechanism that will facilitate denominational, university, and independent programs in Jewish education to collaborate?

- 4. The articulation and maintenance of standards in the field of Jewish education is essential to its professionalization. Is it feasible and/or desirable to set national standards for the preparation of Jewish educators?
- 5. In what ways can each institution best serve Jewish education on a local, regional, national, and international level?
- 6. The recruitment and support of students is viewed as a primary factor in the shortage of personnel for Jewish education. And trans-denominational recruitment efforts desirable and/or realistic? What new mechanisms or strategies for recruitment are the most appropriate for training institutions?
- 7. Financial resources are needed to support existing programs, develop new programs, hire additional faculty, attract students, and conduct research. What types of structures and strategies would enable all training institutions to share and distribute resources?
- 8. A profile of each institution detailing the way these factors affected their respective training programs would contribute to a better understanding of what supports and what hinders effective training of Jewish educators. Are these factors affected by the type and number of students and faculty? What role does the local Jewish community play in relation to these factors?
- 9. Given the complexity of the programs, which work best under what circumstances? What is the structure of good programs for training Jewish educators?

5. Alternattiwe Training Programss

5.1 Short-Term Training Programss

In response to the shortage of qualified supplementary schools teachers (Bank & Aron, 1986), several communities have initiated short-term training programs for adults who may not have any formal training in education or Judaica. The investigator identified six communities (Long Island, Chicago, Pittsburgh, Providence, and Oakland) where Bureaus of Jewish Education, denominational agencies or federations have developed such programs. Approximately 80 students (90% female) are participating in these programs. They range in age from 21 to 65 years old and include university students, lawyers, public school teachers, social workers, home makers, and retired persons.

The programs characteristically consist of four, twelve-session courses over a one to two year period. Courses focus on Jewish thought, history, classical text study, and Hebrew language, and are taught by university or bureau instructors. Parallel to or upon completion of course work, students participate in a field experience. Chicago and Providence have instituted a mentor program where experienced teachers guide and work with trainees both in and outside of the classroom. Other communities have a more traditional supervised field experience.

The budgets of these programs provide stipends to both trainees and mentors (approximately \$150 per semester) and honoraria to the instructors. With the exception of Long Island, the local federation covers the costs of these programs, which are administered by the bureaus. Additional federations are planning to initiate similar programs in 1990-91. Short-term training programs are specifically designed for persons who are committed to Jewish education, desire part-time work, have little or no formal Jewish education training, and are highly motivated. No systematic follow-up studies have been reported that assess the effectiveness of these programs, but they have generated a good deal of enthusiasm and controversy. The instructors, trainees, and mentors are exceedingly enthusiastic about the programs.

This program has been a very powerful experience for all concerned. The students are highly motivated and committed to Jewish education. It's refreshing to see bright, takented, energetic people become excited at the thought of teaching Hebrew school. For the mentors ... it's given them new meaning in their work. They find that working with new teachers is stimulating and enriching. At the end of the program we all went on a weekend retreat where I observed the close bonds which had developed among program participants—it gives me hope about the future of Jewish education.

On the other hand, administrators of training institutions have voiced their concern about the quality of the programs, the lack of standards, and the general "non-professional" tone of the programs.

Short-term training programs provide one strategy for dealing with the teacher shortage problem. However, follow-up studies are needed to determine their effectiveness. Are such programs effective for training teachers at all grade levels? Are there other training formats that might prove more effective, e.g., camp settings? How can established teacher training institutions contribute to these programs? What can be learned from alternative teacher training models in general education that may have application to short-term training programs for Jewish educators?

5.2 Senior Educator Programss

Responding to the need for senior personnel in Jewish education, training initiatives based in Israel have taken a leading role in the preparation of mid-career Jewish educators who desire advanced preparation. The Jerusalem Fellows Program, an elite program for the training of Jewish leadership for education in the Diaspora, was established in 1981 by Bank Leumi and the Jewish Agency for Israel, and supported by public and private funding. It enables 12-18 educators to study intensively in Israel for periods of one to three years, engage in research, and participate in an international network of Jewish educational leadership. To date, 60 Fellows have completed the program and have assumed leadership positions in the Diaspora and Israel.

The Senior Educators Program at the Samuel Mendel Melton Centre of the Hebrew University, sponsored by the Jewish Agency for Israel and funded by public and private sources, selects approximately 20 Jewish educators each year from the Diaspora for graduate education study at the Hebrew University for one year. Graduates of the program return to school settings to teach or engage in administration. Approximately 100 educators have completed the program.

Although it is premature to assess the impact of these programs on the profession of Jewish education, they are perceived as generating excitement and confidence in the field. Many of those interviewed noted the value of these programs as models for advanced training in a pluralistic setting but also stressed the need to establish counterparts in North America, possibly in affiliation with the existing training institutions.

5.3 In-Service Training Programss

Since the mid-1970s, in-service staff development programs have been implemented as a way of promoting professional growth and school improvement (Lieberman, 1982; Rand, 1979). Bureaus of Jewish Education, institutions of higher Jewish learning, and individual schools all conduct in-service activities, in which thousands of Jewish educators enroll each year. These programs vary with respect to their function, format and duration, content, participants, sponsors, and instructors.

Function: Most agencies and schools sponsor in-service activities as a way of providing professional growth for their staffs. Interviews with agency directors and principals suggest that the majority of educators employed in Jewish educational settings are required to participate in some form of in-service training on an annual basis. Administrators in particular view staff development as a way of promoting professionalism among staff.

A second function of in-service education is to train people in specific content or skill areas where personnel are needed. For instance, a number of bureaus have offered im-service programs to train individuals in special education, art education, values education, and family education. Most recently, some experimental work has been conducted in the area of retreats for Jewish educators. These in-service retreats are designed to promote personal and religious growth as they relate to one's role as an educator (Holtz & Rauch, 1987).

Formats and duration: The continuum of formats range from a single lecture to a year-long course. More intensive formats include three-week continuing education programs in Israel and multiple-day retreat programs. Although there have not been national surveys or studies of the quantity or quality of Jewish educational in-service programs, descriptions of programs (Pedagogic Reporter, JESNA) suggest that most im-service activities are short in duration and lack continuity. Many of those interwiewed by the immestigator were well aware of the shortcoming of their programs and the evaluation literature which cites the importance of duration and continuity for effectiveness (see Fullen, 1981; Lieberman, 1981).

Within ((...)), the only form of staff development we can provide consists of one-shot sessions. It's probably not very effective, in the long-term, even though the feedback is very good..... We just can't expect supplementary school trackless, who are partitioned to begin with, to give of their time to participate in intensive staff development programs. On the other hand, if they would be willing, we don't have the financial resources to sponsor intensive programs.

Once of the transecties in Jewish education is the use of the CAJE conference as the primary form of staff development in Jewish education. Unfortunately, I see more and more administrators and directors sending their staff members to CAJE and copping out on their responsibility to provide staff development programs. Don't misinterpret me, CAJE is great but it's being misused.

Content: The content for in-service education varies considerably as a function of the educational setting (e.g., informal education, day school) and practical considerations (e.g., budget, instructor availability). Perhaps more significant is the question of who determines the content of in-service education. Evaluation research findings point to the importance of the consumers, i.e., those receiving training, being invested and involved in determining the content and format of staff development programs (Lieberman, 1981). Within Jewish educational settings, as in general education, it is often the administrator or sponsoring agency who determines content without con-

sulting consumers. Consequently, there is often a feeling among Jewish educators that staff development programs are unresponsive to their needs, e.g., too theoretical, unrelated to what they are expected to do in the workplace (Davidson, 1982).

Participants: Most formal Jewish educational establishments mandate that all education staff participate in in-service activities on an annual basis. Bureau of agency directors view in-service days as opportunities to bring together personnel from all denominational backgrounds, educational settings, and age levels.

Sponsors and Instructors: Bureaus generally have personnel assigned to the coordination, planning, and execution of in-service education. All bureaus publish calendars or newsletters with schedules for in-service programs. A perusal of many such schedules suggests that, overall, programs are conducted by Jewish educators from within the system who have particular areas of expertise or by bureau personnel. Some of the larger bureaus also call upon experts from the university world.

In four communities, the bureaus have developed a special relationship with the independent colleges of Jewish studies. Teachers in Jewish educational settings affiliated with the bureau are encouraged to promote their own professional growth by taking courses at the Jewish institutions of higher learning. The teachers are given subventions by the the federation to pay for these courses. Approximately 250 treachers nation-wide receive subventions for enrollment in Jewish institutions of higher learning. In the majority of communities the institutions of higher learning do not work in a collaborative fashion with the bureaus and schools in providing in-serwice programs. One faculty member felt that the bureaus and schools tend to turn to secultar schools and universities for "experts" before they approach the Jewish colleges.

Training institutions have also established branches and off-campus courses in areas which are far from their main campus. Branch programs serve both Jewish educators (im-service) and adults interested in studying Judaica.

Interview data and references to annual CAJE Conference (Reimer, 1986) suggest that it is viewed as a major center for in-service Jewish education. The 2,000 conference participants enroll in workshops, modules, and mini-courses focusing on all areas of Jewish life and education.

For the past several years, university-based programs in Israel (e.g., Samuel M. Melton Centre for Jewish Education in the Diaspora, Hebrew University) have offered summer institutes for Jewish educators. These institutes are intensive three-week seminars, held in Jerusalem, which focus on specific content areas: values education, Hebrew language, and the teaching of Israel. Teachers from all denominations have participated in these programs.

The denominational movements are also beginning to use Israel as a base for in-service educational programming. For example, the United Synagogue of America, in collaboration with the Jewish Theological Seminary and the Department of Torah Education and Culture of the WZO, has sponsored annual intensive winter workshops in Jerusalem focusing on the teaching of text, ideology, and values.

Yet another form of in-service education is sponsored by professional educational organizations of the denominations (The Jewish Educators Assembly, Conservative; National Association of Temple Educators, Reform; and The National Council of Torah Educators, Orthodox). These organizations sponsor national and regional conferences where workshops, modules, and mini-courses are offered.

The preceding superficial overview of in-service staff development in Jewish education illustrates its expansiveness and complexity. It is viewed by many in the field of Jewish education as the most dominant form of training, however, their is virtually no research to back this claim.

The interviews and documentation suggest that there are literally hundreds of opportunities for in-service and short-term training in North America and Israel. Accurate data concerning the number of participants, the overlap between programs, and their effectiveness is not available. A systematic study of in-service Jewish educational programs is needed to assess its current and potential impact on the professionalization of the field. Specific questions to be addressed include:

- 1. What is the scope and content of inservice Ideash education in North America? What are the costs of providing in-service programs? What is the effect of in-service education in different educational settings, i.e. informal, supplementary school, day school? What are the most effective formats for staff development programs within specific communities? Does in-service education contribute to the preparation of senior educators?
- 2. What role can Dewish institutions of higher learning play in providing staffdevelopment programs? Do those who enroll in in-service courses at Jewish institutions of higher learning continue to study for degrees?
- 3. What unique bloomfitis do insservice programs in Issael provide to North American Jewish educators?

6. Training Informal Jewish Educators

Whereas the boundaries between formal and informal Jewish education were once determined by setting, that is no longer the case (Reimer, 1989). Informal Jewish educational programming now occurs within the context of: camping, youth groups, community centers, schools and synagogues, adult study groups, college campuses, and museums. A theoretical analysis of the distinctions and commonalties between Jewish formal and informal education within the context of contemporary Jewish life would be most informative.

More germane to this study is the training of educators for informal Jewish education. There are no education programs at the training institutions studied specifically designed for preparing informal educators. However, many of the students interviewed indicated that they were planning careers in non-school settings as educators. The positions mentioned included family educators, adult educators, and out-reach. Moreover, faculty and administrators viewed informal education as a new and exciting frontier for Jewish educators. Statistics about the job placements of their graduates do not indicate how many do indeed enter informal education.

Given the lack of training programs, how are positions in informal Jewish education filled? Among the denominations, graduates of their respective training institutions are generally appointed to be camp directors, youth leaders, and adult education directors. They have degrees as rabbis, educators, and communal social service workers. Within the Jewish Community Center world there are a growing number of full-time positions in Jewish education. These positions are filled by rabbis, Ph.D.s in Judaica and persons holding M.S.W.s. Youth organizations such as Young Judea, B'nai Brith, and Hillel-JACY also tend to select graduates of rabbinical schools and schools of social work for their leadership positions for Jewish education.

Overall there is little contact between institutions of higher learning preparing Jewish educators and non-denominational programs where informal Jewish education is conducted. The lack of contact is coupled with ignorance and stereotypes about what the respective institutions do. (Exceptions to this rule are Brandeis University and Baltimore Hebrew University, which do collaborate with informal Jewish education programs.) However, there is clearly the desire of all concerned to learn more about each other and possibly work together.

The JWB, in response to the growing concern that its affiliated Jewish Community Centers lacked Jewish content, commissioned several studies over the years (JWB, 1948; 1968; 1982; 1984; 1988) addressing this issue. Its Mandate for Action (JWB, 1986) proposed upgrading professional staff through Jewish education, which led to the

development of a Jewish education guide (Chazan & Poupko, 1989); the initiation of staff development programs based in Israel; and the appointment of Jewish educators in JCCs.

An emphasis on staff development, i.e. involving JCC personnel in intensive Jewish content programs, may be an effective mode of training for informal education personnel. Data were not available on the extent and nature of staff development programs for youth groups, family educators, etc.

In sum, the training of informal Jewish educators has not been systematically studied. It is not known how many personnel are involved, where they are trained, and who they are with respect to their Jewish and educational backgrounds. There is a good deal of interest on the part of Jewish institutions of higher learning to play a more active role in the preparation of informal Jewish educators. Similarly, service agencies such as community centers are interested in learning what these institutions can offer.

We haven't begun to explore the possibilities in informal education. We have some of the most sophisticated programs and systems in camping and adult education in both denominational and non-denominational settings. But the links between the formal and informal are non-existent.

We have young talented students who want to enter this area and there is a need for trained personnel. The appropriate structures may not be in place, but overall I'm very optimistic that we all can work together.

Notes

- 1 Throughout this paper the terms training and preparation will be used interchangeably when referring to the preparation of educators.
- Personnel working in informal lewish education seem to be prepared as formal Jewish educators, as Jewish communal workers, or in general areas of social service and education (Reisman, 1988). There are no training programs known to the investigator whose primary purpose is to prepare informal Jewish educators. For a fuller discussion, see section 6.
- 3 Depending on their availability, personnel associated with the Jewish Community Center, Bureau of Jewish Education and Jewish Federation were interviewed.
- According to Sherwin (1987, p. 97), Magnus and his colleagues viewed Jewish education as a means for achieving Jewish group survival in an American environment and religious training aimed at the transmission of Jewish morals. Magnus made a direct link between the role of Jewish education and good American citizenship.
- Teachers Institute, Jewish Theological Seminary of America, 1909
 Teachers Institute, Yeshiva University, 1917
 Baltimore Hebrew Teachers College, 1919
 Hebrew Teachers College of Boston, 1921
 Herzliah Hebrew Teachers Institute, 1923
 College of Jewish Studies, Chicago, 1926
 Hebrew Teachers Training School for Girls, Yeshiva University, 1928
 Teachers Institute of the University of Judaism, 1947
 Stern College for Women, Yeshiva University, 1954
 Cleveland Teachers College, 1952
- Because of the small numbers of institutions and training programs and the numerous differences among them, a typology for understanding their differences and commonalties is not feasible. In general teacher education, such typologies have been most helpful in developing a conceptual and practical understanding of teacher training programs (see Feinman-Nemser, 1989).

- Students senteening processervice programs in general teacher echacation institutions have usually never had a paid teaching experience. This is a basic premise of pre-service programs, i.e., those entering have not had teaching experience. In Jewish education training programs virtually all students have taught in some Jewish educational setting or are engaged as Jewish educators, while enrolled in a graduate education program. It follows that general and Jewish education training programs are based on different premises with respect to the "pre-service" aspect of the students' experience.
- The flexibity who hold doctorates in education, and the whole, have done their academic training in the philosophy of education. There are no faculty who have concentrated on curriculum development, and very few who have a background in the social sciences.
- 9 In 1989, 5665 larypoopte, staffand dadoninistratooss from 200 Jewish community centers participated in staff development seminars held in Israel.



Institutions of Higher Learning Granting Jewish Education Degrees and Certificates

Table 1

II.	Instituttion	B.A.	Teacher Cert.	M.A.	Principal Cert.	Doctorate
14.	Baltimore Hebrew University	Yes	Yes	Yes		
2.	Brandeis University Hornstein Program			Yes		4
3.	Cleveland College of Jewish Studies	Yes	Yes	Yes	NISH	
4.	George Washington University/B.J.E.	Ą	I C	Yes	V E 5	
5.	Gratz College	Yes	Yes	Yes		
6.	Hebrew Union College, L.A.			Yes	Yes	Yes
	Hebrew Union College, N.Y.			Yes		
7.	Hebrew College Boston	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	
8,	Jewish Theological Seminary	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
9.	Midrasha Toronto		Yes	2		
10,	McGill University		Yes	Yes		
11,	Spertus College		Yes	Yes		
12.	University of Judaism		Yes	Yes		
13,	Yeshiva University Stern College	Yes	Yes			
	Breuer College	Yes	Yes			
	Azrielli Institute			Yes	Yes	Yes
14.	York University	Yes	Yes	Yes		

Table 2

Enrolled and Graduating Jewish Education Students from Institutions of Higher Learning

Degrees or Certificates	Currently Emrolled Students	Number of 1/989 Graduates	Total Number of Students
B.A.	68	21	89
Teacher Certification	43	n.a.	n.a.
M.A.		62*	247
Full-time	76	47%	
Part-time	171		(358)**
Principal Certification	42	10	52
Doctorate	67	7	74

- * Data giving the number of part-time and full-time M.A. graduating students were not available. A total of 62 students received M.A. degrees.
- Total number of pre-doctoral students (M.A. students, B.A. students, Teacher certificate program students).

Table 3

Distribution of Jewish Education Faculty in Institutions of Higher Learning

Full-time Faculty	18
Part-time Faculty	22
Adjunct Faculty	44

Appendix A

Semi-structured Interview Schedule

Imtroduction

The purpose of the research; the purpose of the Commission.

Setting and Context

I've read and heard a good deal about your institution. Before we focus on education, I'd like to get a general sense of it. Within an historical context, what is its current direction and status? What lies ahead? Let's focus a bit on the current structure of the institution: relationship to other institutions, e.g., federation, universities, BIE....

Strudents

Who are the students attending the institution? Have there been recent changes in the profiles of your students? How are students recruited? What type of students would you like to attract in the future? What implications does this have for the curriculum, structure, etc.?

Facculty

Im examining your bulletin, I noticed that you list faculty for education schools or departments. Would you please tell me about the school's faculty, the department's faculty? What constitutes a full-time faculty load? Who are your full-time faculty? Who are the part-time and adjunct faculty? What challenges do you see, from your perspective, with respect to education faculty? Please describe the tenure process in your institution. What place does research have in the lives of faculty? Who are the faculty in education? What are their responsibilities?

Salaries

We're going to move on now to another area—salaries. How would you describe the salaries of your faculty? How do faculty salaries in your institution compare to those of other institutions (locally, nationally)? What fringe benefits do faculty receive?

Education Programs

As I indicated to you earlier in our discussion, I'm primarily interested in the education programs you offer. Before we speak specifically about teacher training, would you please describe any programs you feel fall under the rubric of education. What

programs does the institution offer that ostensively prepares or trains educators? How do you view the purpose of training Jewish educators? What are the needs of the education programs?

Visions and Dreams

If major funding became available in the near future specifically earmarked for education projects, what would be your wish list?

Appendix B

Accreditation and Institutions of Higher Jewish Learning

Historically, four types of accreditation were sought in order to certiffy the quality of the programs as meeting certain standards.

- 1. All of the training institutions have authority through their respective state's Departments of Education to grant degrees. The areas state officials examine include: faculty, library facilities, admissions standards, the adequacy of course hours, and appropriate curricula. Obtaining state certification involved submitting required documentation and a site visit by department officials.
- 2. Regional accrediting associations such as Middle State Association of Coblleges and Secondary Schools, the North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools and the Western College Association attempt to strengthen and increase the effectiveness of higher education. They do not grant permanent accreditation but review each institution once every ten years. As part of the review process institutions are required to conduct an extensive self-study.
- 3. The Iggud Batesy Midtash la Morina (Association of Hebrew Teachers Colleges) was founded in 1951 as the accrediting body for Hebrew Teachers Colleges. While requiring less elaborate procedures than state of regional accrediting associations, it aimed to assure the quality of Hebrew Teachers Colleges. The Iggud seased to be a functioning organization in the early 1980s.
- 4. The National Board of License for Teachers and Supervisory Personnellin American Jewish Schools (NBL) was established in the 1940s to examine the qualifications of Hebrew teachers. According to an agreement between the Iggud and NBL (1955), any graduate of an Iggud affiliated Hebrew Teachers College will be automatically eligible to receive a Hebrew teachers license upon application to the NBL:

In 1986 the Association for Jewish Institutions of Higher Learning for Jewish Education (AJIHLJE) was established as an umbrella organization for North American institutions preparing Jewish educators. The NBL is in the process of determining whether to automatically award a teaching lisense to graduates of AJIHLJE affiliated schools who apply:

Members of AJIHLJE are:

Baltimore Hebrew University, Brandeis University, Cleveland College of Jewish Studies, Hebrew Union College, Gratz College, Hebrew College, Jewish Theological Seminary, McGill University, Spertus College of Judaica, Yeshiva University, University of Judaism.



References

- Ackerman, W. (1967). "A profile of Hebrew Teachers Colleges." In O. Janowsky (Ed.), The Education of American Jewish Teachers, pp. 41-61. Boston, MA: Beacon Press.
- Aron, I. (1990). Toward the Professionalization of Jewish Teaching. Commission on Jewish Education in North America.
- Bank, A. & Aron, I. (1987). "Dealing with the shortage of teachers." In J. Reimer (Ed.), To Build a Profession: Careers in Jewish Education. Waltham, MA: The Hornstein Program in Jewish Communal Service, Brandeis University.
- CAJE (1989). "Professionalizing Jewish education," Jewish Education News. N.Y., NY: Coalition for the Advancement of Jewish Education.
- Carnegie Task Force on Teaching as a Profession (1986). A Nation Prepared: Teachers for the Twenty-First Century. N.Y., NY: Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy.
- Chazan, B. & Poupko, Y. (1989). Guide to Jewish Knowledge for the Center Professional. N.Y., NY: JWB.
- Chifford, C.J. & Guthrie, J.W. (1988). Ed School. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Cutter, W. (1974). Jewish Education, 3, 7-11.
- Davidson, A. (1982). Collaboration for School Improvement: Charles E. Smith Jewish Day School Stafff Development Program (Evaluation Report). N.Y., NY: Jewish Theological Seminary of America.
- Ettenberg, S.C. & Rosenfield, G. (Eds.) (1989). The Ramah Experience: Community and Commitment. N.Y., NY: Jewish Theological Seminary & National Ramah Commission.
- Feinman-Nemser, S. (1980). Teacher Preparation: Structural and Conceptual Alluematives (Issue Paper 89-5). East Lansing, MI: The National Center for Research on Teachers Education, Michigan State University.
- Feistritzer, E. (1984). The Making of a Teacher: A Report on Teacher Education and Certification. Washington, D.C.; National Center for Education Information.
- Feistritzer, E. (1986). Profile of Teachers in the U.S. Washington, D.C.: National Center for Education Information.
- Fullan, M. (1982). The Meaning of Educational Change. N.Y., NY: Teachers College Press.
- Hochstein, A. (1986). Senior Personnel for Jewish Education: Progress Report. Jerusalem, Israel: The Jewish Education Committee of the Jewish Agency.

- Holmes Group (1986). Tomorrow's Teachers: A Report of the Holmes Group. East Lansing, MI.
- Holtz, B. & Rauch, E. (1986). "Education for change: toward a model of Jewish teacher education." In J. Aviad (Ed.), Studies in Jewish Education, Vol. 3. Jerusalem, Israel: Magnes Press.
- Honor, L. (1935). "Comparative study of Hebrew teacher training schools in the United Strates," Jewish Education, 2, pp. 71-90.
- Hurwich, L. (1949). "Survey of Hebrew Teacher Colleges in the United States," Jewiish Education, 1-2, pp. 73-96.
- Janowsky, O. (1967). "The education of American Jewish teachers: pattern and prospect. In O. Janowsky (Ed.), *The Education of American Jewish Teachers*, pp. 317-347. N.Y., NY: Beacon Press.
- JWB (1984). Maximizing Jewish Educational Effectiveness of Jewish Community Centers. N.Y., NY: JWB.
- JWB (1986). Mandate for Action—Final Report to the JWB Board of Directors of the Committee on Implementation. N.Y., NY; JWB.
- Kaplan, M. & Crossman (1949). "The Kaplan-Crossman Report," Jewish Education, 3, pp. 113-116.
- Lieberman, A. & Miller, L. (Eds.) (1978). Staff Development: New Demands, New Realities, New Perspectives. N.Y., NY: Teachers College Press.
- Lukinsky, J. (1974). "The education program at the Jewish Theological Seminary—basic distinctive assumptions," Jewish Education, 3, pp. 11-14.
- Mirsky, D. (1981). Report on Hebrew Teacher-Preparation Programs in Member Institutions. N.Y., NY: Council on Hebrew Teacher Colleges in America.
- Margolis, I. (1964). Jewish Teacher Training Schools in the United States. N.Y., NY: National Council for Torah Education of Mizrachi-Hapoel Hamizrachi.
- National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (1989). Toward High and Rigorous Standards for the Teaching Profession. Washington, D.C.: National Board for Professional Teaching Standards.
- Rand Corporation (1978). P. Berman & M. Melaughlin, "A model for educational change," Federal Programs Supporting Educational Change, Vol. 4. Santa Monica, CA: Rand Corporation.
- Reimer, J. (1989). "Changing educational strategies in Ramah." In S. Ettenberg & G. Rosenfield (Eds.), The Ramah Experience, pp. 57-63. N.Y., NY: Jewish Theological Seminary & the National Ramah Commission.
- Reisman, B. (1988). Social Change and Response—Assessing the Efforts to Maximize Jewish Educational Effectiveness in Jewish Community Centers in North America. N.Y., NY: JWB.

- Schiff, A. (1967). "The students of the Hebrew teachers colleges." In O. Janowsky (Ed.), The Education of American Jewish Teachers, pp. 83-111. N.Y., NY: Beacon Press.
- Schiff, A. (1974). "Overview of programs for the preparation of Jewish educational personnel," Jewish Education, 3, pp. 5-7.
- Sherwin, B. (1987). Contexts and Content: Higher Jewish Education in the United States. Chicago, IL: Spertus College of Jewish Studies.
- Shevitz, S. (1988). Field Work Guide for the Jewish Education Concentration. Wall-tham, MA: Benjamin B. Hornstein Program in Jewish Communal Service, Brandeis University.
- Wachs, S. (1974). "The Phillip W. Lown Graduate Center for Contemporary Jewish Studies," Jewish Education, 3, pp. 14-21.
- Woolfolk, A. (1988). "Graduate preparation of teachers: The debate and beyond." In A. Woolfolk (Ed.), Research Perspectives on Graduate Preparation of Teachers, pp. 111-47. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Zeichmer, K. (1988). Understanding the Character and Quality of the Academic and Professional Components of Teacher Education (Research Report 88-1). East Lansing, MI: The National Center for Research on Teacher Education, Michigan State University.



Ł

August 4, 1992

The Best Practices Project Progress Report and Plans for 1992-93 Barry W. Holtz

Introduction

In describing its "blueprint for the future," <u>A Time to Act</u>, the report of the Commission on Jewish Education in North America, called for the creation of "an inventory of best educational practices in North America" (p. 69).

The primary purpose of this inventory is to aid the future work of the CIJE, particularly as it helps to develop the group of Lead Communities which will be selected this summer. As the Lead Communities devise their educational plans and put these plans into actiom, the Best Practices inventory will offer a guide to Jewish educational success that can be adapted for use in particular Lead Communities.

In addition, the Best Practices Project hopes to make an important contribution to the knowledge base about North American Jewish education by documenting outstanding educational work that is currently taking place.

The Bestt Bractices Project as of today

This past year has been spent in designing a methodology for conducting a project that has never really been done in Jewish education before in such a wide-scale fashion. How do we locate examples of best practice in Jewish education? As the year has proceeded both an approach to the work and a set of issues to explore has evolved. We began by identifying the specific programmatic "areas" in Jewish education on which to focus. These were primarily the venues in which Jewish education is conducted such as supplementary schools, JCCs, day schools etc. A best practices team is being developed for each of these areas. These teams are supervised by Dr. Shulamith Elster and me.

We have come to refer to each of the different areas as a "division," in the business sense of the word. (Thus the Best Practices Project has a supplementary school division, an early childhood division, etc.) Each division's work has two phases. Phase 1 is a meeting of experts to talk about best practice in the area and to help develop the criteria for assessing "success"; Phase 2 is the site visit and report writing done by members of the team.

This year four different divisions were launched. We began with the supplementary school primarily because we knew that a) there was a general feeling in the community, particularly in the lay community, that the supplementary school had not succeeded; b) because the majority of Jewish children get their education in the supplementary school

and because of that perception of failure, the Lead Communities would certainly want to address the "problem" of the supplementary school; c) as the director of the project, it was the area in which I that the most experience and best sense of whom I could turn to for assistance and counsel.

As I reported earlier this year, a group of experts was gathered together to discuss the issue of best practice in the supplementary school. Based on that meeting I then wrote a Best Practices in the Supplementary School guide (see Appendix). A team of report writers was assembled and assignments were given to the team to locate both good schools and good elements or programs within schools (such as parent education programs).

We currently have a team of seven people looking and writing reports (see Appendix). By the end of the summer we should have the reports on ten schools as written up by the group members. The first results indicate that, indeed, there <u>are</u> successful supplementary schools and we are finding representative places that are worth hearing about and seeing. In the spirit of Professor Lee Shulman's talk at this year's GA, we have discovered real examples that "prove the existence" of successful supplementary schools. These are sites that people in the Lead Communities can look at, visit and learn from.

In May Dr. Elster and I launched our second division, early childhood Jewish education. We met with a group of experts (see Appendix) in this field and following up that meeting I wrote a Guide to Best Practice in Jewish Early Childhood Education. Many of the members of the group have already agreed to join our team of report writers. The writing will take place in September and October.

A third division, education in the JCC world, is in the early stages of development. Dr. Elster and I met with a team of staff people at the JCCA. Mr. Lenny Rubin of the JCCA is putting together a group of JCCA staff and in-the-field practitioners to develop the Phase 1 "guidelines" for this area. We will work with them in writing up the document. After this is completed (in the fall) a team of report writers (from that group and others) will be assembled to do the actual write-ups.

Finally, a fourth area- best practices in the Israel Experience- has been launched thanks to the work of the CRB Foundation. The Foundation has funded a report on success in Israel Experience programming which was written by Dr. Steven M. Cohen and Ms. Susan Wall. The CIJE Best Practices Project will be able to use this excellent report as the basis of further explorations in this area, as needed by the Lead Communities.

ţ.

Next Steps: The 1992-1993 Year

New Areas

As mentioned above, we should have reports of the Early Childhood division completed in the early fall. The JCC division should be operationalized in the fall. During the 1992-3 year we also plan to launch the following areas; day schools, adult education, etc. Each presents its own interesting challenges. Of these we have already begun to plan in a preliminary way for the day schools division. Here the goal is to gather together experts from the academic world of Jewish education (like our supplementary school group) as well as actual practitioners from the field. The current plan is to have each school that is written up be analyzed for one particular area of excellence and not for its over all "goodness." Thus we would have X school written up for its ability to teach modern Hebrew speaking; another for its text teaching; another for its parent education programs; another for its in-service education, etc.

Documentation

Another task that needs to be considered is finding more examples of best practices within those areas that we have already looked at, or to look at the examples we currently have in even greater depth. This applies particularly to supplementary schools because we will have only explored ten schools and programs and there is such a wide range of supplementary schools across America that we ought to have some more breadth in this area. A similar case could be made for early childhood programs.

At the time of our first exploration of supplementary schools, we sent a letter to all the members of the Senior Policy Advisers asking for their suggestions. In addition, we worked with Dr. Eliot Spack, Executive Director of CAJE, to send a similar letter to "friends within CAJE." Because of these initiatives we now have a list of 20 to 30 Hebrew schools that we might want to investigate.

Dr. Jonathan Woocher, Executive Director of JESNA, has asked the following question: "for the purposes of the project, how many examples of best practice do you really need in any one given area?" Do we need to have ten reports of supplementary schools or twenty or sixty? Another question might be raised about the "depth" of the current reports. Many of the report writers have said that they would like the chance to look at their best practice examples in more detail than the short reports have allowed. I have called this the difference between writing a "report" and writing a "portrait" or study of an institution.

The research component of the Best Practices Project would certainly welcome either greater breadth or greater depth, but at the present moment we believe that the first priority is to answer another question: What do the Lead Communities need? After

meeting with the representatives of the Lead Communities that are chosen, we will have a better sense of the next stages of the Lead Community Project—what the planning and implementation needs will be. At that point we will be able to decide the best direction the documentation should move in.

Lead Communities: Implementation=* and How to do it

Aside from launching the other divisions mentioned above the other main initiative of the Best Practices Project for the coming year will be thinking through the issue of best practices and Lead Communities. Professor Seymour Fox has often spoken about the Best Practices Project as creating the "curriculum" for change in the Lead Communities. The challenge this year 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: site visits by Lead Community planners to observe best practice3 in action; visits by best practices practitioners to the Tead Champuninities; 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 Leadi Communities and with other members of the CIJE staff.

From Best Practice to New Practice

On other occasions we have spoken about the need to go beyond best practices in order to develop new ideas in Jewish education. At times we have referred to this as the "department of dreams." We believe that two different but related matters are involved here: first, all the <u>new</u> ideas in Jewish education that the energy of the CIJE and the Leadi Community Project might be able to generate and second, the interesting ideas in Jewish education that people <u>have</u> talked about, perhaps even written about, but never have had the chance to try out. It is likely that developing these new ideas will come under the rubric of the Best Practices Project and it is our belief that the excitement inherent in the Lead Community Project will give us the opportunity to move forward with imagining innovative new plans and projects for Jewish educational change.

APPENDIX

Team Members: Best Practice in the Supplementary School

Report Writers:

- Ms. Kathy Green (Reconstructionist Rabbinical College, Philadelphia)
- Ms. Carol Ingall (Melton Research Center and BJE, Providence, RI)
- Dr. Samuel Joseph (HUC-Cincinnati)
- Ms. Vicky Kelman (Melton Research Center and Berkeley, CA)
- Dr. Joseph Reimer (Brandeis University)
- Dr. Stuart Schoenfeld (York University, Toronto)
- Dr. Michael Zeldin (HUC-LA)

Additional Consultants:

- Dr. Isa Aron (HUC-Los Angeles)
- Ms. Gail Dorph (University Of Judaism, Los Angeles)
- Dr. Samuel Heilman (Queens College, NY)

Team Members: Early Childhood Jewish Education

Report Writers

- Ms. Miriam Feinberg (Washington, DC);
- Dr. Ruth Pinkenson Feldman (Philadelphia);
- Ms. Jane Perman (JCC Association);
- Ms. Esther Friedman (Houston);
- Ms. Esther Elfenbaum (Los Angeles);
- Ms. Ina Regosin (Milwaukee);
- Ms. Charlotte Muchnick (Haverford, PA);
- Ms. Rena Rotenberg (Baltimore);
- Ms. Shulamit Gittelson (North Miami Beach);
- Ms. Lucy Cohen (Montreal);
- Ms. Roanna Shorofsky (New York);
- Ms. Marvell Ginsburg (Chicago).



EAD COMMUNITIES

A PROJECT OF THE COUNCIL FOR INITIATIVES IN JEWISH EDUCATION

BEST PRACTICES PROJECT:
THE SUPPLEMENHARY SCHOOL



A Message from Chairman

The Council for Initiatives in Jewish Education was established as an outgrowth of the Commission on Jewish Education in North America in November, 1990.

CIJE brings together distinguished educators, professionals, lay leaders and philanthropists of the continental Jewish community to energize Jewish education in North America. Visions of what should and can be achieved in the 21st century need to be repeatedly placed before our communities" leadership, and the wherewithal to do so obtained. The CIJE can provide a unique blend of individual and institutional advocacy in North America.

The Lead Communities Project is intended to demonstrate that local communities can significantly improve the effectiveness of Jewish education through careful organizing for the task, with a coalition of community institutions, supplemented with continental institutions and resources.

This first report of the Best Practices in Jewish Education project has been prepared to assist the Lead Communities in their work.

Morton L. Mandel

Worth A Mandel

Chair

COUNCIL FOR INITIATIVES IN JEWISH EDUCATION

Best Practices Project

The Supplementary School

Version 1

Barry W. Holtz Project Director

Council for Initiatives in Jewish Education Best Practices Project Best Practice in the Supplementary School

INTRODUCTION Barry W. Holtz

What is the Best Practices Project?

In describing its "blueprint for the future," A Time to Act, the report of the Commission on Jewish Education in North America, called for the creation of "an inventory of best educational practices in North America" (p. 69).

The primary purpose of this inventory is to aid the Council for Initiatives in Jewish Education (CIJE), particularly as it works with the three "Lead Communities" chosen in the fall of 1992: Atlanta, Baltimore and Milwaukee. As these Lead Communities-- "local laboratories for Jewish education," in the words of A Time to Act—devise their educational plans and put these plans into action, the Best Practices inventory will offer a guide to Jewish educational success that can be adapted for use in particular Lead Communities.

In addition, the Best Practices Project can be seen as a research project which hopes to make an important contribution to the knowledge base about North American Jewish education by documenting outstanding educational work that is currently taking place.

What do we mean by "best practice"? The contemporary literature in general education points out that seeking perfection when we examine educational endeavors will offer us little assistance as we try to improve actual practice. In an enterprise as complex and multifacetted as education, these writers argue, we should be looking to discover "good" not ideal practice. As Joseph Reimer describes this in his paper for Commission, these are educational projects which have weaknesses and do not succeed in all their goals, but which have the strength to recognize the weaknesses and the will to keep working at getting better. "Good" educational practice, then, is what we seek to identify for Jewish education, models of excellence. Another way of saying it is that we are looking to document the "success stories" of comtemporary Jewish education.

In having such an index the Council would be able to offer both encouragement and programmatic assistance to the particular Lead Community asking for advice. The encouragement would come through the knowledge that good practice does exist out in the field in many aspects of Jewish education. By viewing the Best Practice of "X" in one location, the Lead Community could receive actual programmatic assistance by seeing a living example of the way that "X" might be implemented in its local setting.

We should be clear, however, that the effective practical use of the best practices project is a complex matter. Knowing that a best practice exists in one place and even seeing that program in action does not guarantee that the Lead Communities will be able to succeed in

implementing it in their localities, no matter how good their intentions. What makes a curriculum work in Denver or Cleveland is connected to a whole collection of factors that may not be in place when we try to introduce that curriculum in Atlanta, Baltimore or Milwaukee. The issue of translation from the Best Practice site to the Lead Community site is one which will require considerable imagination. I will try to indicate some ways that such translation may occur at the end of this introductory essay.

Of course there is no such thing as "Best Practice" in the abstract, there is only Best Practice of "X" particularity: the supplementary school, JCC, curriculum for teaching Israel, etc. The first problem that the Best Practices Project had to face was defining the areas which the inventory would want to have as its particular categories. Thus we could have cut into the problem in a number of different ways. We might, for example, have looked at some of the "sites" in which Jewish education takes place such as:

- --Supplementary schools
- -Day Schools
- -Trips to Israel
- -- Early childhood programs
- -JCCs
- -- Adult Education programs

Or we could have focused on some of the subject areas which are taught in such sites:

- -Bible
- ---Hebrew
- ---Israel

Or we could have looked at the specific populations served:

- ---adults
- ---children
- -- retired people

There were numerous other possibilities as well.

Our answer to the question of cutting into the problem of best practices in Jewish education was to focus on the venues in which Jewish education is conducted. Eight different areas were identified: supplementary schools, early childhood programs (which take place in many different places) JCCs, day schools, the Israel experience, college campus programming, camping/youth programs, and adult education. Obviously there are other areas that could have been included and there were other ways of organizing the project. We chose, for example to include Family Education within the relevant areas above—i.e. family education programs connected to synagogue schools, day schools, JCCs. etc. We could have identified it as a separate area. We later chose to add a ninth area called "community-wide initiatives." These were programs usually based in a BJE or Federation which aimed in a communal way to have

a large scale impact on Jewish education -- such as a plan to relate teacher's salaries to inservice education credits.

Best Practice in the Supplementary School: The Process

The first area that the Best Practices Project chose to work on was the supplementary school primarily because we knew that a) there was a general feeling in the community, particularly in the lay community, that the supplementary school had not succeeded; b) because the majority of Jewish children get their education in the supplementary school and because of the perception of failure, the Lead Communities would almost certainly want to address the "problem" of the supplementary school.

A group of experts was gathered together to discuss the issue of best practice in the supplementary school. (The list of names appears in Appendix II of this introduction.) Based on that meeting and other consultations we developed a Guide to Best Practice in the Supplementary School. The Guide represented the wisdom of experts concerning success in the supplementary school. We did not expect to find schools that "scored high" in every measure in the Guide, but the Guide was to be used as a kind of outline or checklist for writing the report.

A team of report writers was assembled and the following assignment was given to the team: using the Guide to Best Practice in the Supplementary School, locate good schools or good elements or programs within schools that might be able to "stand alone" (such as a parent education program or prayer curriculum) even if the school as a whole would not fit our definition of a best practice site.

We believed that working in this fashion we would be likely to get reliable results in a reasonable amount of time. We also knew from the outset that the Best Practices Project was created to fulfill a need. We did not have the luxury or the inclination to create a research project that would have to wait many years before its results could be made available. The model that we have employed is based on the informed opinion of expert observers. The reports that our researchers wrote were, with one exception, based on a relatively short amount of time spent in the particular schools—although all of the researchers had had some previous knowledge (sometimes quite extensive) about the school or synagogue being studied. Im general we tried to use researchers who began the process with a "running start": They had some familiarity with the school they were looking at to begin with and could use that prior knowledge to move the process along quickly.

The "one exception" was Professor Joseph Reimer whose report was based on a long-term research project that he in conducting into two successful synagogue schools.

The Reports: An Overview

The best practice reports represent a range of synagogues, schools and geographical locations. In general the focus is on the school as a whole, rather than "stand alone" programs. Our sense was that the key to success in the supplementary school tended to be a wholistic approach, especially because of the part-time nature of the enterprise.

The congregations vary in size and wealth. Some of the schools are located within large congregations which simultaneously run a whole host of programs, including early child-hood programs and day schools. The ability of the supplementary school in these congregations to "compete" with other institutions, especially the day school, is particularly noteworthy.

We believe that these reports can offer serious assistance to the Lead Communities, and others seeking to improve the quality of Jewish education in North America, but we also know that more work can and should be done. We view the reports included in the present volume as the first "iteration," in the language of social science researchers—the first step im a process that needs to evolve over time. How might that research develop? We can see two ways: first, the research can broaden. We have only included a handful of schools in this report. The simple fact is we have no idea how many successful supplementary schools are currently operating in North America. We have certainly heard our share of bad news about the Hebrew school over the past twenty-five years, but we have heard very little about the success stories. It is likely that the number is small, nonetheless, it is clear that this "first edition" of the Supplementary School volume has touched only a few examples.

In an effort to plan for widening the net of possible sites, at the time of our first exploration of supplementary schools, we sent a letter to all the members of the CHE Senior Advisers committee asking for their suggestions. In addition, we sent a similar letter to contacts within CAJE. Because of these initiatives we now have a list of 20 to 30 supplementary school that we might want to investigate in the next stage of Best Practice in the Supplementary School. We should note, however, that such an investigation would likely be more time-consuming than the first round. Here we will not have the advantage—at least in most cases—of the prior knowledge of the sites that our current researchers brought with them to the task.

A second way of expanding the research in the supplementary school area would be in the "depth" of the current reports. Many of the report writers have said that they would like the chance to look at their best practice examples in more detail than the short reports have allowed. I have called this the difference between writing a "report" and writing a "portmait" or study of an institution. * As further iterations of the Supplementary School volume develop, we would like to see more in-depth portraits of schools and programs.

[†]The most well-known example of the "portrait" approach is Sara Lawrence Lightfoot's book The Good High School (Basic Books, 1983.)

Please note: In order to preserve the privacy of the best practice schools for a public document such as this one, all of the synagogue names (and personnel directly associated with those synagogues) have been changed.

Improving Supplementary Schools: Some Practical Suggestions

It is obvious from these first explorations that there are numerous ways in which supplementary schools could be improved using the Best Practices Project. The following suggestions are by no means exhaustive, but they represent ways individual schools or groups of schools within a community could begin to work for change.

1. Use the Guide

A good place to start is with the "The Guide for Looking at Best Practice in the Supplementary School" (see Appendix I). Even though it was designed for use by a group of experts with considerable experience as school observers and it was not intended to be an exhaustive "evaluation tool," nonetheless the Guide offers the opportunity for "insiders" at a institution—both professionals and laypeople—to begin a conversation about the strengths and weaknesses of their school. Obviously, insiders will have the disadvantage of less "objectivity" than outside observers, but on the positive side they also have much more information and deeper sense of the real workings of the school. Using the Guide is a good was to start thinking about the directions supplementary school education should and could be taking.

2. Improve the School at the Systemic Level

One characteristic common to all the best practice schools was the system-wide orientation of the supplementary school. By "system-wide" we mean a number of different, but interrelated matters. First is the relationship between the school and the synagogue. At this time in the history of North American Jewish education, virtually all supplementary schools are synagogue-based institutions. One thing that characterizes a best practice school is the way that the school fits into the overall orientation of the congregation. The school reflects the values of synagogue and the synagogue gives a significant role to the school—in its publicity, in the status of the school committee or board within the synagogue structure, in all the many subtle messages that the synagogue sends. A school that is valued and viewed as central to the concerns and mission of the synagogue has a much greater chance for success. One need only look at the reports on "Temple Isaiah" and "Congregation Beth Tzedek" for two very different examples of the same effect. Adding to the impact of this idea is the fact that both of these congregations also house day schools. Yet despite the generally held perception that the sup-

plementary school will have a much lower status than the day school when both are housed within the same synagogue, in these two examples we see supplementary schools which are successful and profoundly appreciated by their congregations.

How does the supplementary school become a valued institution? It is obvious from the best practice reports that the key player in bringing this about is the rabbi of the congregation. Virtually every best practice report talks about the investment of time, prestige and interest of the synagogue's rabbi. If we are to begin to improve the quality of the supplementary school, we must engage the rabbis in an effort to raise the stature and importance of the congregation's school.

Lay leadership also has an important role to play here, as the best practice reports point out quite clearly, and that leads us to the second element of working on the system: the stakeholders in the synagogue must be involved in an ongoing conversation about the goals and mission of the school. When the report writers talk about schools which are "driwen" by their goals (see, for just one example among many, the report on "Temple Bnai Zion"), which have a clear sense of their "vision" (see, for example, "Congregation Reyim," a school with a very different vision from Bnai Zion, and which succeeds with a similar impact.) The best practice reports indicate that schools which work are places that continually try to find ways to involve the key participants in ongoing reflection upon and discussion about the goals of the school.

Finally, best practice schools are places that view their schools as one part of a much larger context. These are places that see the synagogue as a whole as an educating community. In such places we are more likely to see the integration of the formal program (the "school") with a variety of informal programs—such as eamps, shabbatonim, family retreats, trips to Israel, holiday programs, tzedakah programs, arts programs, etc.

Implications and Possible Recommendations

If we want to have an impact on the supplementary school we need to begin with the rabbis. It seems that a program of consciousness-raising and practical skills development for rabbis in the Lead Community would make a great deal of sense. Such a program could be developed through the national rabbinic organizations (RCA, RA, CCAR, RRA) or independent of them. It might include visits to the best practice sites and meetings with the rabbis in those synagogues.

A similar program for lay leaders could also be launched. Here the ideas learned from the best practice reports could be studied and explored, so that lay leaders could come to understand the educational principles that make for success in the area of the supplementary school.

3. The Leader is Efficial

If there is one thing shared by all the best practice schools, it is the key role of leadership in creating quality. In most cases the leader is the educational director; in one small synagogue ("Ohavei Shalom Congregation"), it was the rabbi in particular. These leaders provide continuity, build morale, work with the rabbi and lay leadership on issues of status and vision and many other things as well. In addition such a leader can help turn around a school that needs to change ("Emeth Temple"). It is the principal who helps define the institution as oriented toward problem-solving and not defeatism and, it appears, the principal also seems to be an important factor in maintaining a school without significant "discipline" problems.

The people described here can all be characterized as <u>educational</u> leaders. They see their role not primarily as administrative or organizational, but as <u>educational</u> in a variety of ways. For some it takes the path of supervision and in-service education; for others it is by being inspirational or spiritual models; for others it is in pedagogic creativity, programming or curricular improvements. There is no one single way to be an educational leader, but it is hard to imagine a successful school, based on these reports, which would not have that kind of professional leadership.

Implications and Possible Recommendations

Of course, saying that a supplementary school needs an educational leader is a good deal easier than finding such a person. But knowing the importance of leadership can lead to a number of important practical suggestions: a) when hiring an educational director, seek out a person who can provide leadership appropriate to an educational institution, not just someone who is a good administrator. Such a consideration should influence the kinds of questions that are asked in an interview or solicited from recommendations, b) Investing in leadership means finding ways for educational directors to attend serious, ongoing training programs that can help them grow as leaders, c) Consultants who know about educational leadership development can help schools improve by working with . d) Places might want to develop peer groups or paired tutorials for education directors. Having a serious opportunity to grow as a professsional can be enhanced by peer groups which are well-designed to focus on important educational issues or by having pairings of principals who could meet on a regular basis. Such groups could be organized denominationally or on the basis of the size and type of institution. Professional consultation and training could come from a mixture of national service institutions (UAHC, United Synagogue, etc.), institutions for higher Jewish learning (YU, JTS, HUC, etc.) and institutions from the world of general education such as universities, training organizations, or professional societies.

4. Invest in Teachers

Despite the importance of systems and the centrality of leadership, in the end schools succeed or fail because of what happens in the individual classroom. The best practice schools are all characterized by an emphasis on the teacher's key role. In different ways each of the best practice schools try to deal with the three fundamental dimensions of staffing a school: recruitment, retention, and professional growth.

For some of the best practice schools recruitment is not a major problem. A place like "Temple Bnai Zion" has a staff of veterans and experiences a very small amount of turnover. In general, good schools tend to perpetuate themselves because their reputations are well known in the community of educators and when openings appear, teachers will want to come to work in such an institution. Here in a slightly different way, the educational leader makes a difference. Who would not want to work for the revered principal of "Congregation Beth Tzedek"?

Still, recruiting good teachers is not always easy, even for outstanding synagogues and some of the best practice schools have tried inventive solutions to deal with the problem. Certainly the most radical has been the teacher-parents used by "Congregation Reyim." This synagogue has developed a unique approach that deserves serious consideration. The pluses and minuses are spelled out in the report. The most important point of the Reyim model, however, is that the school works at training the parents for their jobs as teachers. Without that training and in-service the program could not succeed.

Other schools (such as "Congregation Beth Tzedek" and "Emeth Temple") have used teenaged teacher aides or tutors in the Hebrew school. This has the dual effect of helping out the professional teachers and finding useful involvement for the teenagers in the educational life of the congregation.

Finding ways to retain outstanding teachers is a crucial component of success. It is not easy to determine what is cause and what is effect here, but it is clear that stability of staff is one of the marks of the best practice schools. Success in retaining teachers involves a number of interrelated actions: fair pay is one thing, but this matter came up quite infrequently in the best practice investigations. More to the point was a sense of being appreciated by the educational director, the rabbi and the community as a whole. There are a number of suggestions that the reports present about teacher esteem. The key point is that this matter is directly related to the systemic issue of the congregational attitude about the role and importance of education. Where education is valued, teacher esteem will tend to be high.

An ethos of professional growth and teacher education characterizes all the best practice schools, even—one might say <u>especially</u>—in places that use "nonprofessional" teachers. Professional growth opportunities have the advantage of both advancing the quality of teachers and their sense of being valued.

We have seen many forms of such professional growth, but they tend to center around three areas of focus: a) efforts to increase the subject knowledge of teachers with sessions on Bible, Hebrew or Jewish holidays as examples. These sessions are particularly important for teachers in supplementary schools who may be professional general educators (such as public school teachers who sometimes teach in supplementary schools) who have pedagogic skills but lack Jewish knowledge. b) efforts to increase the skills of classroom teaching such as discussion leading, curricular implementation or classroom management. c) efforts to build a sense of personal Jewish commitment in teachers.

The best practice schools use local central agencies, denominational organizations and at times commercial Jewish textbook publishers for teacher education sessions. Teachers are

also sent to conferences, most notably the national CAJE conference, local mini-CAJE conferences where they exist, conferences connected to the various denominational educational organizations and experiences in Israel.

Most of the best practice schools engage in professional supervision of teachers, almost always by the principal. It is also noteworthy that a number of the reports mention that the educational directors find that they do not do as much supervision of teachers as they would like.

Implications and Possible Recommendations

The area of professional growth is one that should be able to make significant impact on Jewish education quality in the supplementary school. We know from the research im general education that in-service education needs to be sustained and systematic and there are a number of ways that such programs could be implemented, aside from the worthy policy of sending teachers to the national and local CAJE conferences. The CAJE conferences play a very important role in contemporary Jewish education—especially in lifting the morale of teachers—but they can not be considered a sufficient answer to the question of teacher education and professional growth.

What form should professional growth take? It is clear that many different options are used. These include the three possible focal points mentioned above: Jewish subject matter knowledge, pedagogic skills, issues of Jewish commitment. The means used include: inservice programs run by national organizations, extension courses at local universities, adult education programs geared for teachers, local BJE personnel coming into the school, sessions run by the local BJE, retreats for teachers, programs in Israel geared for teachers. Generally schools must find the financing the help teachers attend these conferences and sometimes money must be found to pay for substitutes while teachers attend workshops. Some schools pay the teachers to attend such sessions or relate their salaries to specific hours of inservice training.

The best practice schools do various things to work on retaining teachers. In general the focus is on raising the status of the school, and hence teaching in the school, within the congregation as a whole. Singling out the accomplishments of teachers through the synagogue bulletin and rabbinic support is coupled with treating teachers in a professional manner, giving them the appropriate workplace and supporting teachers' trips to conferences and other inservice sessions. Different localities deal with recruitment in different ways. The efforts described in the reports of some congregations to use teenagers and parents in the school as teachers or adjunct teachers may be appropriate for adaptation by schools who have difficulty finding teachers.

5. Involve the family

"Family education" has become a catchword in contemporary Jewish education, but it is obvious from the best practice reports that the term is used in many different ways in dif-

ferent settings. The overall goal of family involvement is clearly an important one for many reasons. Family involvement helps support the goals of the school (and probably the quality of discipline in the school), reinforces what children learn in school in the home, helps give children a sense that Judaism is not "just for Hebrew school," and "empowers" parents by assisting them in doing the home-based informal educating that has been typical of Jewish life for generations. The best practice reports show that family involvement may take many forms—adult learning, family retreats, actual teaching by parents in the school or an entire curriculum focused on family education, and others as well. There is little doubt that an increased and serious investigation of more family involvement in the synagogue school can have a powerful impact on its success.

Lead Communities and Best Practice: Implementation

In what way can the Best Practices Project directly assist the Lead Communities? We see three immediate uses of the project: knowledge, study, adaptation. First, the Best Practices Project offers "existence proofs" for the successful supplementary school, knowledge that such places actually exist. It is possible to answer "Yes" to the question, "is there a Hebrew school that works?"

Beyond merely knowing that such schools exist, we can use the best practice reports as models that can be studied. These schools "work" and they work in a variety of ways. Professor Seymour Fox has often spoken about the Best Practices Project as creating the "curriculum" for change in the Lead Communities. This should include: Exploration of the particular schools through study of the reports, meetings with the researchers who wrote them up and the educators who run those schools along with visits to the best practice sites.

Finally, it is crucial to think hard about adapting the best practice sites to the specific characteristics of the Lead Communities. It is unlikely that a program that exists in one place can simply be "injected" into a Lead Community. What must happen is a process of analysis, adaptation, revision, and evaluation. What the Best Practices Project does is give us the framework to begin the discussion, explore new possibilities and strive for excellence.

From Best Practice to New Practice

Best practice is only one element in the improvement of Jewish education. Even those programs which "work" can be improved. Other ideas as yet untried need to implemented and experimented with as well. The Lead Community idea allows us a chance to go beyond best practices in order to develop new ideas in Jewish education. At times we have referred to this as the "department of dreams." We believe that two different but related matters are involved here: first, all the new ideas in Jewish education that the energy of the CIJE and the Lead Community Project might be able to generate and second, the interesting ideas in Jewish education that people have talked about, perhaps even written about, but never have had the chance to try out. It is likely that developing these new ideas will come under the rubric of the

Best Practices Project and it is our belief that the excitement inherent in the Lead Community Project will give us the opportunity to move forward with imagining innovative new plans and projects for Jewish educational change.

APPENDIX I

Council for Initiatives in Jewish Education Best Practices Project

Barry W. Holtz

Guide for Looking at Best Practice in the Supplementary School

A "best practice" supplementary school should be a place...:

I. Systemic Issues

a. --with well articulated educational and "Jewish" goals

[What are those goals and by what means are they articulated? Meetings? Publications? Sermons?]

[What are the outcomes that the school seeks to achieve and how does the school measure success?]

- b. —where stakeholders (such as parents, teachers, laypeople) are involved in the articulation or at least the validation, of these goals in an ongoing way [What is the process by which this articulation and involvement happens?]]
- c. —with shared communication and an ongoing vision [How do we see this in the day to day life of the school?]
- d. --where one feels good to be there and students enjoy learning
 [In what way do you see this? What is the atmosphere in classes? The nature of student behavior and "discipline"?]
- e. —where students continue their Jewish education after Bar/Bat Mitzwah [Does the school have actual data about this?]

II. Curriculum and Instruction Issues

a. --which takes curriculum seriously and has a serious, well-defined curriculum

[Is it a written curriculum? Do they use materials published by the denominational movements? By commercial publishers?]

b. --and in which, therefore, students are learning real "content"

[Do you have a sense of what the students learn? About Jewish religious life and practice? Moral principles? History? Hebrew language? Israel, etc. In what way, if any, does the school monitor student progresss?]

c. -in which one sees interesting and "strong" teaching

[Is there a particular style of teaching that you see in the school? (Discussions?! Lectures? Group work? etc.)

Who are the teachers? What is their Jewish educational background and preparation? What is their relationship to the students?

What is the stability of the staff over time? What does the school do to help new teachers enter the school?]

d. -in which one sees attention given to "affective" experiences for children

[Is there occasion for "practice" in Jewish living or values? For example, is there a tzedakah project, an Israel project, a mitzvah project in the school? Is there a Junior congregation or other opportunity for experiencing prayer? Are there programs in the arts—music, dance, etc? Is there a retreat or shabbatom program for children?]

d. --with family or parent education programs

[What does the school do in this area? Do they use any specific materials or programs? (which ones?) How often does this happen? Is there a retreat or shabbaton program for families? Are parents required to engage in some kind of adult learning? In what way?]

III Supervision Issues

a. --which engages in regular serious inservice education and/or supervision of teachers

[Who does the supervision? What is it like? How regular is it? Does the school use outside consultants for inservice? Are teachers sent to inservice sessions? Where and in what way does this take place? Is there a retreat or shabbaton program for teachers?]

b. —with an effective principal who serves as a true educational leader. [In what way does the principal demonstrate this leadership? How do the teachers...the parents....the rabbi perceive him/her?]

APPENDIX II

Team Members: Best Practice in the Supplementary School

Report Writers:

- Ms. Kathy Green (Reconstructionist Rabbinical College, Philadelphia)
- Ms. Carol Ingall (Melton Research Center and BJE, Providence, RI)
- Dr. Samuel Joseph (Hebrew Union College-Cincimnati)
- Ms. Vicky Kelman (Melton Research Center and Berkeley, CA)
- Dr. Joseph Reimer (Brandeis University)
- Dr. Stuart Schoenfeld (York University, Toronto)
- Dr. Michael Zeldin (Hebrew Union College-LA)

Additional Consultants:

- Dr. Isa Aron (Hebrew Union College-Los Angeles)
- Dr. Sherry Blumberg (Hebrew Union College-New York)
- Ms. Gail Dorph (University Of Judaism, Los Angeles)
- Dr. Samuel Heilman (Queens College, NY)

Cover Sheet

Best Practice in the Supplementary School (For Individual Schools)

REPORT BY: Kathy Green

Date June. 1992

Name of the School "Temple Isaiah"

Denominational Affiliation Conservative

Approximate Number of Students 388 (in middle school)

From ages 7 to 13

Number of Teachers: 17

Students attend 6 hours per week; (3 days per week)

Approximate annual budget (if available) \underline{NA}

What particular emphases of this school are worth noting:

School-congregation relationships

Professional leadership

Supplementary school-day school relations

Council for Initiatives in Jewish Education Best Practices Project

"Temple Isaiah"

Overview

In this report Kathy Green describes "Temple Isaiah," a Conservative congregation of between 1,200 to 1,300 member families, located in the suburbs of a large Eastern city. Isaiah houses four separate, semi-automous schools, each with its own programs and staffs.

Isaiah includes both a supplementary school and a day school. The congregation is careful to find ways to integrate both the congregational school students and the day school students and can serve as a model for that kind of programming.

Isaiah is characterized by its well-trained, stable staff of teachers and the enthusiastic (and full time) leadership of the school's principal. The principal is involved very closely with the educational (not just the administrative) side of the program and observers believe that his leadership is partially responsible for the success of the school. The synagogue itself places a good deal of emphasis on the school (despite supporting a day school as well) and the rabbi as well as the lay leadership is highly supportive of its activities. The fact that the principal has a full time position is viewed within the community as one indication of that congregational support.

The principal pays close attention to the educational content of the school and has been developing a graded curriculum for the school using the resources currently available on the market. School-wide affective educational experiences are also emphasized. Isaiah is an example of the way that a large and well-funded institution can make outstanding use of its resources in developing and nurturing its synagogue school, along with a host of other educational activities.

Council for Initiatives in Jewish Education Best Practices Project

"Temple Isaiah"

Kathy Green

INTRODUCTION

"Temple Isaiah" does many things very well. It is both numerically and physically a large institution, a Conservative synagogue of between 1,200 to 1,300 member families, housed in a sprawling building at an expressway exit in the suburbs of a large Eastern city. My primary contact person and informant at Isaiah was Rabbi S., a graduate of the Jewish Theological Seminary, and for the last four years the director of the synagogue's religious school.

Rabbi S. characterized Isaiah as an umbrella which reaches over four separate, albeit not autonomous schools, each with its own programs and staffs.

SCHOOLS WITHIN A SCHOOL

First, let us briefly look at the four schools, their programs, and staffs. Dr. P. serves as educational director, placing him in a supervisory position above Rabbi S.; Dr. P. is also principal of Isaiah's Solomon Schechter Day School (SSDS). This day school for children from K through 8 began ten years ago with 17 children and currently has an enrollment of 342, of whom 40-45% are children of Isaiah members. Rabbi J., the senior rabbi of the synagogue, explained that he worked for the establishment of the school as a strategy to infuse what he perceived as an aging and faltering congregation with young people and new activity.

While Dr. P. believes that 20-25% of the SSDS students come from other congregations and perhaps 30-35% are not affiliated, the school is subsidized by Isaiah. Tuition is under

\$5,000 per year, and a spring trip for graduating 8th graders to Israel was financed in such a manner as to insure that no child was deprived of the opportunity to go for financial reasons. The Solomon Schechter Day School's PTA is represented on a PTA Council along with representatives of other Isaiah schools. Dr. P. runs a "Middle School Minyan" which meets twice a month in the synagogue and is only for children. Rabbi S. and Rabbi J. each teach courses in the SSDS. Thus the human and administrative integration of the school within the larger Isaiah structure is apparent. Professionals (such as Rabbis S. and J.) are visible within the school and can be effected by their own experiences of contact with students, faculty, staff and parents.

THE RELIGIOUS SCHOOL

Teachers employed by SSDS also teach in the religious school, which maintains classes for grades K through 7. While the total religious school enrollment is 388, class meeting times vary in duration and schedule slots. Kindergarteners and first graders only attend classes on Sundays. Second through seventh graders attend school three days a week for a total of six hours per week.

Now meeting for its third year and with double enrollment over its first year, 26 religious school students in grades 5, 6, and 7 have elected to attend school for two additional hours each Sunday. Students follow the regular curriculum of the six hour program but are the beneficiaries of special programming in the additional two hours. Classes in Torah cantillation and Zionism have been offered, and the question of possibly using the additional time to develop an enhanced Hebrew language tract has been raised.

Ms. R., who directs this voluntary "enrichment program" is very proud at having received a grant for next year to fund a life history unit. In this unit a geriatric social worker will train students in interviewing techniques; children will collect information from residents of an institution for the elderly; a professional writer will help children translate their interview data into a play; and finally the children will perform their play for their elderly informants. The children will also study traditional Jewish texts related to issues of growing older.

For the last four years Rabbi R., Isaiah's assistant rabbi, has directed a Hebrew high school program, where alumni of the religious school and SSDS can meet. A typical activity which draws about 100 teenagers is a monthly, social dinner meeting. Until the end of this school year (1992) more serious religious school graduates were encouraged to attend a three session a week BJE program and come to a Havurah study session at Isaiah on Tuesday nights. SSDS alumni were encouraged to participate in a similar BJE structure. By enrolling in any Tuesday evening youth program at Isaiah a student automatically

becomes a member of USY. A special student/faculty committee called "Lift" is responsible for social programming. A structural problem or challenge for Isaiah is that eighth graders who are already graduates of the religious school may seek out youth groups separate from the eighth graders who are still students in the Solomon Schechter School.

The following structure and system for accommodating differing interests on the part of students has been designed for next year. Students who chose may attend a weekly, one evening (Tuesday) high school program. Within this program there are two tracks. They may opt for the "bet midrash," which is text oriented; led by Isaiah rabbis; has homework, grades, and required attendance. Or they may decide to attend the "Havurah!" which is centered around discussion. Alumni of Solomon Schechter Day School or serious graduates of the religious school may elect to attend the community's Judaic Academy for two evenings a week and the "bet midrash" at Isaiah on Tuesdays. The religious school and SSDS graduates will be placed in different classes at the Judaic Academy, because of the variation in their levels of Hebrew language skill. All participates of Tuesday evening programs will also be invited to the monthly social dinner. So far, because of the age of the Solomon Schechter Day School, there have only been two graduating classes. To date very few graduates have gone on to day schools, thus sending member children back into the pool of Isaiah young people.

PRE-SCHOOL

Another "school within a school" is the pre-school, which is directed by Ms. L. Approximately 250 children attend the pre-school. The pre-school accepts children as young as two years of age and goes through pre-k. The pre-school functions as a feeder school for SSDS; in fact, the pre-k class evolved out of need for a class for children not quite ready to enter Schechter's kindergarten. Interestingly, parents of pre-school graduates who do not intend to send their children to SSDS tend to resist sending their children to Isaiah's kindergarten, choosing to enroll them in the religious school for first grade. Their reasoning seems to be to allow their children more time for transition to "regular" school kindergarten, feeling also that the children have received a lot during their pre-school years.

FAMILY EDUCATION

Ms. M., a graduate of Brandeis University's Homstein program and a teacher within the religious school, directs three family education coordinators who began working with kindergarten and first graders and their families but hope to expand their work upward through the grades. The curriculum for sessions with parents is designed to support what

is happening in children's classes. The rich resources of Isaiah are reflected in some of the materials designed for a recent family education event. Children were learning about their Hebrew names. One of Isaiah's three on-staff art teachers designed and calligraphed special birth certificates. Parents were supplied with xeroxes of perpetual calendars to look up their children's Hebrew birth dates and fill in the birth certificates. Later parents received mailings of suggested strategies for celebrating Jewish birthdays in educationally enriching ways.

Ms. J. explained the benefits of such programs: a way of informing parents what is happening in class; educating parents themselves; public relations for the school within the entire synagogue.

There are a number of frameworks within which children from the Religious School and from Solomon Schechter can interact. Graduates of either school can earn \$5 an hour working as tutors, helping the cantor in the "Hazan's Program." To qualify for this particular program students must demonstrate cantorial proficiency. Religious school aides are also paid \$5 and are required to keep journals describing their work with younger children. According to Jane Rachel, a ninth grader who works as a religious school aide and attended SSDS, the \$5 an hour pay represents an important incentive, giving the program a firmer foundation than if she and her friends served as volunteers. Next year ten young people have committed themselves to attending a two hour a month education course as well as combined study in the Judaic Academy and Isaiah and journal keeping to work as religious school aides or aides to the Havurah and younger children's youth groups.

YOUTH GROUPS

There are three youth groups for elementary school students (3rd and 4th graders; 5th and 6th graders; and 7th and 8th graders). Shabbat morning could find the following groups functioning outside of the main sanctuary service: Torah for Tots; Junior Congregation (led by Rabbi S. and comprised of young families; 2/3s of the children who lead the services are from SSDS, 1/3 from the religious school); Middle School Minyan meets two times a month and is only for kids, lead by Dr. P. and attended by SSDS students). Once a month there is a free Shabbat lunch attended by any and all kids' and their parents at this lunch birthdays are announced.

STAFFING

While the staff of the religious school is well trained (out of 17 teachers, there are 1 MS.W., 7 MS.Ed's, 1 close to finishing MS.Ed., 1 PH.D.), what is probably special or unusual about the faculty, according to faculty members interviewed, is the enthusiastic and full time leadership of Rabbi S. Rabbi S. explained that teachers are recruited through the BJE placement service, and their salaries follow the BJE scale. Only two teachers who were members of the faculty four years ago when Rabbi S. began his tenure remain today on the faculty.

What does Rabbi S. look for when hiring a new teacher? Knowledge of subject matter to be taught; ability to present the subject to students; sense of vocation or mission; love of kids; comfortableness in teaching in a Conservative synagogue. According to Ms. J., four out of ten teachers with whom she works directly in the school would not drive on Shabbat.) Rabbi S. expressed willingness to change curriculum to capitalize on the individual talents of teachers. While he neither requires teachers to submit lesson plans nor schedules formal observations of teaching, he expects teachers to attend monthly administrative staff meetings over dinner and team meetings of teachers working in the same grade level. He frequently enters classrooms and joins in the children's activities. He will draw and color with children and tells teachers to call on him to answer a question, if he raises his hand. He believes that he has earned the respect of teachers by putting himself "on the line" by teaching at SSDS. Significantly, he is a full time principal of the religious school.

CURRICULUM

What is the religious school's curriculum, and how did it evolve? Clearly the BJE's Synagogue Council, which grants an annual subsidy of \$12,000 to Isaiah, as an arena for developing curricular teaching materials, has influence. Rabbi S. maintains that the school's current curriculum grew out of dialogue between the principal and his staff and that he worked with two guiding principles: 1) You can't teach everything; and 2) Each year should be different. Further, he built on what existed when he came to the school and made changes slowly. Some changes he made include: phasing out conversational Hebrew; requiring teachers to design and share with students a "seder shel yom"; encouraging teachers to develop classroom goals which enable him to oudine a curricular overview of the school.

It is Rabbi S.'s dream that each classroom teacher begin the year with an itemized document of goals for each student. Next to each goal is a space for the teacher's signature when the goal has been achieved. Currently these documents are in use through the "heh"

level and are in the works for higher grades. Curricular content is listed below by grade level.

Aleph: Letter identification leading by the end of the year to oral reading. Throughout the grade levels, understanding of Hebrew words is taught. On tests in higher grades students are expected to write Hebrew words, names, etc., in response to questions {i.e. Avraham (in Hebrew) left Haran (in Hebrew)}. We learn this in Sefer Bereshit (in Hebrew)]] - Melton holiday materials - Family education programs orchestrated by Marietta (for example, the moon & the calendar; Jewish birthdays & names)

Bett: The year of <u>havdalah</u>: family education program; learning first part of <u>shahamit</u>: Israel; holiday vocabulary; <u>Our Living Past</u> (Behrman House).

Gimmel: Kabalat shabbat: home rituals; Ron Wolfson's seder shell shabbat materials; Melton work books for Bereshit and kashrut. Through their work on kashrut students have become enthusiastic callers with questions to the local Halacha Hotline. Near the end of the year the Rabbi who runs the hotline visited the class and enabled children to meet the person behind the voice on the telephone.

<u>Paled</u>: Torah reading, Passover Haggadah; the Book of Exodus

Heh: Hallel; the Book of Numbers; Rashi (through Melton curriculum)

<u>Vav: Tikun Olam</u> with reading of <u>Jonah</u> (self); <u>Esther</u> (responsibility); <u>Ruth</u> (extra acts of loving kindness); Amidah.

At the completion of the vav year an examination of Jewish knowledge is given. In order to graduate from religious school students must pass this examination. Occasionally students fail and are given an opportunity to re-take the exam. Children failing the examination have been assigned an alternative: reading five books and writing reports. It has happened that a child did not pass the examination, chose not to fulfill an alternative assignment and was not allowed to graduate.

At the end of the school year summer homework and/or reading lists are handed out.

AFFECTIVE EXPERIENCES

Rabbi S. identifies as one of his strengths the ability to create affective and effective school wide events and credits his years of experience working in Ramah camps as the source of this knowledge. What follows below are two of this observer's favourite examples.

- Il) For Yom ha Shoah (Holocaust Remembrance Day) an enormous collage-type poster was created by teachers and artists in the school. The poster consisted of a map of Europe with photographs illustrating Jewish creativity and life which was native to particular cities and regions. Children were asked to look at the poster very carefully and speculate about the people who lived before the Second World War in locations depicted on the poster. Next as the story of the Shoah was told, the poster was cut up into many fragments. Children were given only a very small percentage of the remnant of the poster and tolld that they could try to create another collage working with poster paper on which were identified cities that had received refugees after the war: Tel Aviv, Haifa, Jerusalem, Montreal, New York, etc. The children became so engrossed in their attempt at reconstruction that the school day ended and they did not want to leave their project. Thus they participated in a graphic illustration of destruction and resurrection.
- 2) "Rabbis and Romans" is a game played in celebration of Lag b'Omer on the wide lawns and playing field of Isaiah. Areas are marked as caves and tunnels, which are safe spaces. Children are divided into two teams: Rabbis and Romans. Midway through the game, a whistle is blown and children switch. (Rabbis become Romans, and Romans become rabbis.) Each teaching of Pirke Avot is cut out on a separate slip of paper. Rabbis cam only learn Pirke Avot in a safe place, but a whistle is blown to limit time available in any given cave or tunnel. The winner of the game is the team of rabbis who has learned the most Pirke Avot. A rabbi captured by a Roman can no longer learn Pirke Avot. Perhaps the nicest aspect of the game is that the rules were worked out by Jacob, a young teaching aide in the school.

MEASURING SUCCESS

By what yardstick can success of Isaiah's schools be measured? If enrollment is a standard, then clearly the programs are successful; witness the religious school's teacher roster which shows an increment of numbers of classes in each grade level with the largest number of increases paralleling Rabbi S.'s presence within the school. According to teachers, SSDS and religious school students are meeting positively within the walls of Isaiah, acknowledging differences in their educations (especially in Hebrew language) but also finding commonality in Jewish commitment. While this positive vision could only be

wallidated through extensive interviewing of students and parents, Rabbi S. in part accounts for the successful integration in the following way: By hiring him as a full time professional devoted to the religious school, the synagogue's leadership made an important statement about their valuing of and commitment to the legitimacy of the supplementary school and its programs. (Other strategies for positive integration have been noted above.))

The apparent success of Isaiah in terms of increasing enrollment and expressed enthusiasm on the part of faculty, administration and students is contradictory to both current demographic studies and patterns observed within the United Synagogue. When asked about the apparent contradiction, Rabbi S. joked, "Welcome to Toronto." By this he meant that the city itself represents a more traditional Jewish community than many other U.S. cities.

In terms of implicit goals of nurturing positive Jewish identity and commitment, Rabbi S. and teachers eagerly cite examples of children and teenagers who devote extra time and effort to programs within the synagogue and to such positive affect and enthusiasm in classrooms as manifested by Ms. C.'s fourth grader skit writers or Dr. M.'s video interviewers.

It should be pointed out that from those interviewed, two themes explaining success were most frequently articulated. Rabbi S., himself, was praised enthusiastically, and Rabbi J. was credited with significant administrative acumen in creating the organizational structure within the synagogue's educational programs. It should be noted that one of Rabbi S.'s first tasks, assigned by Rabbi J., as he entered Isaiah's employ was to write an administrative manual for the religious school. Finally it should be appreciated that the synagogue both had the money and leadership which enabled it to seek a skillful and talented professional staff.

June 11992

Cover Sheet

Best Practice in the Supplementary School (For Individual Schools)

REPORT BY: Kathy Green

Date May, 1992

Name of the School "Ohavei Shalom Congregation"

Denominational Affiliation Reconstructionist

Approximate Number of Students 85

From ages 3 to 12

Number of Teachers: 10

Students attend 5 hours per week; (2-3 days per week)

Approximate annual budget (if available) NA (see report re grant)

What particular emphases of this school are worth noting: Family education

"Ohavei Shalom Congregation" Overview

In this report Kathy Green describes "Ohavei Shalom Congregation," a thirteem year old Reconstructionist congregation of 125 family unit members, located in a small city in New Jersey. Her report focuses primarily on the success of the family education program at Ohavei Shalom. This is an example of how a small congregation with limitations on its funding can effectively use family education as a means of both teaching children and having a powerful impact on the synagogue as a whole.

Along with the regular curriculum of the school, year-long themes have been chosen for the five years of schooling. The goal of the program is to help people find themselves Jewishly by refracting their lives through the thematic concepts of the program. The synagogue hopes to influence the culture of the family by bringing a new vocabulary and symbols into the home.

There are four components for presenting material related to a theme in any given year: First, one hour of student class time on Sunday morning is devoted to the topic; second, children and their parents are required to do projects at home together based on materials that are sent home. The third component consists of adult education sessions on Sunday mornings for parents.

According to the synagogue leadership, parental reactions have been positive and enthusiastic. Because of this program the synagogue has a positive image of educational outreach to families. The synagogue is young, with many young families and a youthful rabbi. The number of young families means that it is not unreasonable to anticipate that as the initial five year program is completed roughly half the members of the congregation will have participated in the family education program.

Ohavei Shalom Congregation

Kathy Green

INTRODUCTION

Ohavei Shalom is a thirteen year old Reconstructionist congregation of 125 family unit members. It is a tenant of a Baptist church and meets in a section of the church building in a small city in New Jersey. When D. E., Ohavei Shalom's rabbi for the last four years and a graduate of the Reconstructionist Rabbinical College, came to the congregation, he perceived a need for family education, a vehicle for reaching out to adults and children. He began, in consultation with members of the Education Committee and the Hebrew school principal, to design a proposal for a family education program.

Further consultation with representatives of the JEA lead him to craft a grant proposal which met with positive response on the part of the Jewish Community Foundation of MetroWest, a New Jersey Jewish Federation group. Rabbi E. proposed and received a grant of \$14,100 to fund half of a five year, family education program. At this point in time (June 1992) curricula for three years of the program have been written, and two years of the program have been implemented. The synagogue has matched MetroWest's funding, absorbing the program's cost within the larger synagogue budget. Frugality has allowed Rabbi E. and his staff to spend grant money at a slower rate than initially anticipated, thus extending the amount of time that the money is lasting.

Early on Rabbi E. enlisted the aide of Rabbi Jeffrey Schein, who directs educational services for the Federation of Reconstructionist Congregations and Havurot. Rabbi Schein, collaborating with Rabbi E., became the curriculum writer for the program. Rabbi E. saw himself as "implementor" who would test curricular ideas and supply "feedback" to adapt and modify the curriculum as it evolved. Shortly before the program actually began, Rabbi Schein paid a visit to Ohavei Shalom and offered a teacher training in-service session to help acquaint faculty with the curriculum.

What no one, including Rabbi E., could have anticipated as the program was being imitiated was the profound, ripple effect it would have on the nature of Ohavei Shalom as a whole. This report will first focus on the family education program, its structure, goals and evaluation, and will later turn to considering some of the larger effects of the program on the congregation.

HEBREW SCHOOL

The family education program exists within the context of the synagogue's school, which now has an enrollment of 85 children. The pattern of attendance in the school is as follows: three and four year olds come to the school one Sunday a month; five to seven year olds attend every Sunday for two hours; and eight through twelve year olds attend Sunday mornings for three hours and late afternoons on Wednesday, totalling five hours per week. There is also a pattern of required attendance of Shabbat services; the pattern and its increments per year are as follows: three year olds - two services; four year olds - three services; five year olds - five; six year olds - eight; and seven year olds and above twenty-eight. Older children, approaching bar/bat mitzvah' join Rabbi E. on the bimah and help lead services. The general curriculum of the Hebrew school includes the Bethrman House series as a tool for teaching reading of siddur. Growth in numbers of students in the Hebrew school parallels Rabbi E.'s tenure in the synagogue with numbers increasing incrementally from the lower grades up. Currently ten teachers work in the school; it is hard to make statements about stability of teacher tenure; Rabbi E. reports that some of the teachers have been at Ohavei Shalom for several years while others represent rapid turnover.

STAFF

In contrast to the common expectation of finding women teaching in Hebrew schools, at the end of this school year all those working with the family education program were men. The staff consists of the synagogue's rabbi, the Hebrew school principal, and two teachers. What the two teachers most significantly share in common is extensive time living in Israel. T. G., now a student at HUC/IIR, previously worked for five years as a teacher on kibbutz and also comes to Ohavei Shalom with a number of years experience as a HaBonim camp counselor. Joe F. lived in Israel on a HaShomer HaZair kibbutz from 1968 until 1980. He somes to Ohavei Shalom with previous experience teaching in Hebrew schools but is employed as the vice president for production of a northern New Jersey manufacturing company and sees his teaching as a "labor of love." Harvey R., the school principal, is regularly employed as a public school psychologist; he also is a veteran of elementary age yeshiva education. Mr. R. came to Ohavei Shalom a year

At QLJ r*

before Rabbi E. Rabbi E. explained what he looks for in hiring a teacher: We are seeking teaching skill and Jewish knowledge. When we are lucky, we get both!

FAMILY EDUCATION STRUCTURE

Within a context of expected attendance, family education is structured in the following ways. Year long themes have been chosen for five years of schooling. In the first year of the program, when students are eight years old and in the aleph year of Hebrew school, the theme is <u>Hiddur Mitzvah</u>. The next year's theme for bet class students and their families is <u>Menschlichkeit</u>; the following year is devoted to Zionism. Themes for the fourth and fifth years are <u>Kedusha</u> and <u>Tikkun Olam/ Hokhma</u>. respectively. (Translations of these theme names are provided at the beginning of the school year but are rapidly dropped with the intent that the terminology enter the participants' vernacular.)

On what basis were these topics chosen? They seem to have emerged from dialogue between Rabbi Schein and Rabbi E. and reflect articulated values found within the Reconstructionist movement in general and in particular in <u>Creative Jewish Education</u> edited by Jacob Staub and Jeffrey Schein (Reconstructionist Rabbinical College and Rossel Books, 1985).

There are four components for presenting material related to a theme in any given year. One hour of student class time on Sunday morning is devoted to the topic. Mr. F., who taught Bet students in the Menschlichkeit program this year, spoke enthusiastically about student responses. He would read scenarios from Earl Schwartz's Moral Development: A Practical Guide for Jewish Teachers (Alternatives in Religious Education, Inc., 1983) and encourage nine year olds to debate their responses. He found that students quickly became involved in arguing and defending their positions. He also used Molly Cone's Who Knows Ten as a trigger for discussion and contrasted positive levels of attentiveness with their involvement when he taught materials not in the family education program.

Another component of the program is requiring that children and their parents do projects at home together. This is accomplished by sending materials home for parents and children to work on together, for example, families in the <u>Hiddur Mitzvah</u> year were asked to search their houses or apartments for objects which made their homes identifiably Jewish. On another occasion they were asked to chose a quotation from <u>Pirke Avot</u> which they found most meaningful and create an art project illustrating the quote for display in their homes.

Still amother aspect of the program is adult education sessions on Sunday mornings for parents. Topics for such sessions might include the origin of the menorah as a symbol at Hanukkah time; or a psychologist leading a session on menschlich ways of interacting with children and strategies for encouraging Menschlich behavior in children. During the Menschlichkeit year adults attended a session devoted to ethical wills. At the end of the class they were not asked to write ethical wills but rather were asked to list values and ideals which they hope to hand down to their children. They were them told that their children's class would compile a list of values and ideals which they believed their parents wanted to inculcate, and the lists would be compared. These adult sessions which occur three times a year for each year's theme are generally lead by Rabbi E. and occasionally by a paid, expert, guest speaker. The sessions are separate from adult education courses taught in the synagogue.

Adults and children join together for three sessions on Sunday mornings. A classic parent-child session was a trip to a Jewish museum when <u>Hiddur Mitzvah</u> was being studied. In the <u>Menschlichkeit</u> program parents and children chose to hand out leaflets about recycling and environmental concerns at a local shopping mall.

UPON REFLECTION

What Rabbi E. perceives as unique about Ohavei Shalom's family education program is the combination of thematic approach with varying matrixes of interaction (teacher/children; parents/children at home; teacher/adults; parents/children in trips or special events). This year there were twelve children in the <u>Hiddur Mitzvah</u> theme year; they came, as Rabbi E. quips, from ten and a half families (two twins and two step-siblings were part of the program). Sixteen children in the <u>Menschlichkeit program</u> this year represented fifteen families, accounted for by the presence of one set of twins.

Attendance is expected, and either Rabbi E. or Mr. R., the Hebrew school's principal, try to follow up absence with a telephone call. Unanticipated when the program was being planned was the situation of a family with more than one child in close age proximity. In such a circumstance Rabbi E. suggested to a mother that she give priority to any program which included her children and "cut" adult education classes in which material being presented seemed similar to what was addressed the previous year. This is an example of idiosyncratic details that could not be planned for in advance.

According to Mr. R. and Rabbi E., parental reactions have been positive and enthusiastic. Rabbi E. could think of a family with young children that joined the synagogue in part because of the positive image of educational outreach to families. He also notes that the synagogue, although numerically small, fills its calendar with as many events as much

larger and better staffed institutions. That means that demands are made upon congregants which, combined with expectation of participation in on-going family education programs, has led a few families to leave the congregation.

GOALS

What goals did Rabbi E. formulate as he talked about the family education program? He began by discussing the importance of Jews learning about such concepts as hiddur mitzvah or menschlichkeit. "In a non-Halachic age, how are people going to find themselves Jewishly? Perhaps they can be helped by refracting their lives through such comcepts as menschlichkeit or hiddur mitzvah. We can influence the culture of the family. We can bring new vocabulary and symbols into the home." Rabbi E. sees the program as being good for children to see their parents in Hebrew school and good for parents to see what efforts their children are exerting in school. He believes that the program is enhancing parents' Jewish educations and allowing parents who perceive themselves as Jewishlly ignorant to function in modest, teaching roles with their children. A fringe benefit of the program is that by gathering parents of young children together and molding them into a group, they become a support group for one another as their children approach bar and bat mitzvah. Furthermore, the rabbi and school staff have had an opportunity to influence positively families' values and expectations as they prepare for bnai/bnot mitzvala. Another benefit of the program is that of families with Hebrew school age children about 20 per cent are inter-married. Thus the adult education aspect of the programs facilitates reaching out to non-Jewish spouses. Parents are required by the family education program to come into the school for six Sunday mornings during the year; over a five year period minimally they have attended thirty educational sessions.

RIPPLES

Perhaps most interesting is the ripple effect of the program on the demography of the synagogue. The synagogue is young, with many young families and a youthful rabbi. The number of young families means that it is not unreasonable to anticipate that as the initial five year program is completed roughly half the members of the congregation will have participated in the family education program. Because the program is continuous, it will take a family with one child six years to become an alumnus of the program; the more children, the longer the involvement. Rabbi E. hopes, in fact, in the future not only to publish the program as a model for use elsewhere but also to design a similar scheme for nursery school children. Thus as time passes, it does not seem unlikely that more and more of the synagogue's identity, public image, and activities will be associated with family education:

EVALUATION

When asked by what criteria the program could be evaluated, Rabbi E. and his staff all pointed to "positive feedback," enthusiastic comments, attendance, attentiveness and involvement on the part of students. The program has received positive reviews from the JEA, laudatory local newspaper publicity and an award from the Federation of Reconstructionist Congregations and Havurot. When asked what might be done to improve the program, the following ideas emerged: planning long in advance with guest speakers in place and on the synagogue calendar as much as a year in advance; clearer, more explicit statements of curricula for teachers; more staff meetings; either a loose leaf binder or its equivalent on computer which would serve as a schedule diary and tell the user "now is the time to send out reminder notices, etc."; greater consistency in follow up telephone calls to parents.

Rabbi E. explained that he was more intimately involved in the administration of the program during its first year (1990-91) and because of other responsibilities within the congregation pulled back a little this year and gave the school principal more responsibility. He believes that as the program continues to grow, more administrative time will be necessarily devoted to the enterprise. That will mean either upgrading the principal's job from half to three quarters or full time or hiring someone to act purely as family education administrator.

A problem within the synagogue which is not addressed by the family education program is what to do with post Hebrew school children who will be veterans of the family education project. At this point a few children go on to a regional Hebrew high school; a fledgling, faltering youth group is beginning. Rabbi E. is very proud that this year (in contrast to one student last year) eight or nine teenagers from the congregation are going to HaBonim's Camp Galil.

June 1992

Cover Sheet

Best Practice in the Supplementary School (For Individual Schools)

REPORT BY: Carol K Ingall

Date March, 1992

Name of the School "Temple Bnai Zion"

Denominational Affiliation Conservative

Approximate Number of Students 110

From ages 5 to 13

Number of Teachers: 17

Students attend 6 hours per week; (3 days per week)

Approximate annual budget (if available) \$77.000

What particular emphases of this school are worth noting:

Parent education programs

Teaching of Tefillah (prayer)

Active attention to problem solving

"Temple Bnai Zion"

Overview

In this report Carol K. Ingall describes "Temple Bnai Zion," a large Conservative congregation located in a mid-sized Northeastern city. Bnai Zion is a school with well-articulated goals which drive the day-to-day life of the school. The school is characterized by its special emphasis on prayer and includes in its regular program a mandatory Shabbat experience for students and their parents once a month.

The school has a good record of sending its graduates on to the community Midrasha of Jewish Studies, which meets in the school building. Temple Bnai Ziom school is a place where students and parents seem happy and there are few discipline problems. Teachers who teach in both the local Schechter day school and Temple Bnai Ziom sense little difference in the students' behavior in the two institutions.

Bnai Zion is also noteworthy because of its ability to deal with problems in the school without despair or pessimism and in a creative, responsive and effective manner.

"Temple Bnai Zion"

Carol K. Ingall

GOALS

The "Temple Bnai Zion" Religious School articulates its goals as follows:

"We want our children to:

- --demonstrate a knowledge of Hebrew language, synagogue skills, rituals and ceremonies;
- --observe <u>mitzvot</u> and demonstrate a commitment to ethical behavior and social justice;
- -- understand that personal Jewish growth and learning begins, not ends, with Bar/Bat Mitzvah;
- -develop a sense of <u>K'lal Yisrael</u> (a sense of commitment with and responsibility for all Jewish people);
- -develop a sense of <u>dor le'dor</u> (continuity and history of the Jewish people);
- --develop a lifelong identification with and commitment to Judaism, the Jewish people, and the land of Israel."

These goals are communicated through a parent handbook, the synagogue bulletin (Kol Bnai Zion). weekly newsletters to families, reports to the synagogue Board and other constituent groups which support school programs (e.g., the Men's Club which supports a school-wide Jewish Book Month program) and through regular programs which implement these goals.

The goals were developed first by the faculty, then brought to the school committee which consists largely of parents, and then shared with the parent body through their inclusion in the parents" handbook.

The goals drive the day-to-day life of the school. There is a core of Hebrew-speaking teachers on the faculty who address each other and the students in Hebrew. Hebrew is promoted as a vehicle for prayer. The school stresses Tefillah, including a weekly Minhah service, Havdallah on Sunday mornings, and a mandatory Shabbat experience for students and their parents once a month. The Shabbat experience consists of the school meeting once a month on Shabbat, instead of Sunday. Students attend one of their classes, adapted to meet the needs of halakhic Shabbat observance. While the youngsters study, their parents do so as well. Parents attend a learners' minyan. Both groups join for a service and family lunch which bring the experience to a close.

Mitzvot play an important role in the curriculum of the school. Students routinely visit the Jewish Home for the Aged; they are currently selling snacks to each other to save up for a gift of wheelchairs for the Home. The school has a good record of sending its graduates on to the community Midrasha of Jewish Studies, which meets in the school building. Generally 60% go on to Midrasha; this year's class is likely to send 80% to Midrasha in the fall. Students continue their informal Jewish studies as well. Ten or twelve attend Camp Ramah; many Bnai Zion alumni supplement their Midrasha educations with summer trips to Israel.

Israel features prominently in the school. Students perform in a Shirivah, a song festival to which the synagogue community is invited. They perform Israeli songs, led by their Hebrew-speaking music teacher. The sixth and seventh graders discuss current events in Israel, using nationally published news magazines for children.

Students and parents seem happy. There are few discipline problems. Teachers who teach in both the local Schechter day school and Temple Bnai Zion sense little difference in the students' behavior in the two institutions. (Some teachers indicate that students at the Schechter School are more serious about their studies, but agree that there is none of the fabled heder acting-out here.) There are a number of explanations for student decorum. The principal is considered "very strict." As the librarian commented, "They wouldn't dare." The staff is an experienced, veteran group of professionals. All are trained teachers with the exception of a college student. All but one have been teaching for five years or more. When asked about the absence of behavior problems, teachers pointed to the presence of three clergymen on the faculty. Several teachers commented that since the two rabbis and the cantor joined the faculty, student behavior has improved. Contrary to conventional wisdom, all the teachers agree that having a parent involved in synagogue life is

no guarantee of better behavior in a student. When I asked about the correlation, numerous teachers gave me examples of dedicated parents and trouble-making children.

Students attend junior congregation, reading <u>Torah</u>, and leading services. There are twelve or so regulars who are coming weekly and beginning to bring their parents and friends. Parents seem to be pleased with their children's accomplishments. This is particularly significant in a community which includes a thriving day school. Until recently, parents assumed that only day school children could be comfortable in a synagogue service. The success of the Shabbat morning monthly experience seems to be paying off.

CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION

The local Bureau of Jewish Education accredits each of the state's religious schools. As part of the accreditation process, the school must produce a curriculum. Bnai Zion, having recently completed its accreditation review, has produced a curriculum including behavioral objectives, learning activities, textbooks and materials and methods of evaluation. The school uses some commercially available curricula, such as the Melton Bible, Holidays and Rashi material and the Behrman House Hebrew and Heritage Siddur track. Most of the curriculum offerings are teacher-designed. The teachers and school committee were involved in the curricular process.

The school presents itself as a serious institution. Report cards are issued twice yearly. There is an Open House for parents in which teachers discuss student progress. Interim progress reports are available for students whose work is flagging. Students seem to be learning real content, from real Jewish texts like the <u>Humash</u> and <u>Siddur</u>.

Evaluation is done through oral questioning and the use of commercial workbooks which accompany the texts used in the school. If the publishers make tests available, the teachers use them. Several of the more creative teachers are using projects and rudimentary exhibit-based methods of assessing student progress. A Bible teacher uses a checklist provided by the principal to measure student learning. In the absence of national standardized tests, evaluation at this school, as in other supplementary schools, varies from teacher to teacher.

The staff is a strong one. They are veterans with a range of five to fifty years of teaching experience. They are knowledgeable, including in their ranks two rabbis, a cantor, three European-trained, nationally licensed Hebrew teachers, two Israelis who are professional

educators, seven secular educators, a professionally trained music teacher and a professionally trained librarian, and the youngest member of the staff, an enthusiastic, "artsy" college student (the daughter of a rabbi.) There is no one "Bnai Zion style;" the approach toward instruction is an eclectic one.

The stafff is a very stable one. In a faculty of seventeen, two are new to the school this year. The principal meets with new teachers individually to orient them to the life of the school. Only the college student was truly new to the school. The other new faculty member was in fact a parent. Relationships between faculty and students are cemented through long-standing family connections. Many of the children's parents were taught by the "old-timers" on the faculty. Most of the faculty belongs to the synagogue. Approximately half of them attend synagogue services regularly, where they may run into their students.

I have discussed affective experiences earlier in this paper. I want to note that the Shabbat and prayer experiences were first suggested by the parents. The principal reflects that she is in the fortunate situation of keeping up with the parents. She notes that there is a core of activists who wanted more for their children. "They drive me", she said. They wanted her to send information home on Thursdays for Shabbat evening table talk. They are a committed group who, although not opting to send their children to day school, want a program with integrity. They are searching for spirituality for themselves and their children. They seem to have made this year an exciting one for the principal and faculty.

In addition to the programs mentioned earlier, the school is planning a family retreat for November 1992. The goal is to capitalize on the parents' interest and train them as enablers in a "see one, do one, teach one" mode. Before they attend the Shabbat retreat, they will participate in a series of preparatory workshops. Upon their return, they must commit to inviting other families to a Shabbat experience. Other family programs include the consecration service in which parents participate as Torah readers and prepare family heirlooms like wimpels and scrapbooks, and a "Roll Out the Torah" program which features the making of flags for family parshivot.

SUPERVISION

The principal supervises the faculty formally twice yearly. The process includes a preobservation and post-observation conference. The school has been involved in the United Synagogue's U-STEP program as a part of its regular commitment to professional development. Faculty members are regulars at conferences sponsored by the Bureau of Jewish Education. The school's proximity to the Bureau's Resource Center means that Bnai Zion faculty are "regular customers."

The principal also avails herself of the Bureau's new teacher induction programs. Her new faculty members are also members of the Bureau's Morium, program, a teacher-training course for secular teachers new to Jewish education.

The principal herself is a certified teacher who received a master's degree in Jewish education from the Jewish Theological Seminary. She is seen in the synagogue community as a strong advocate for her school. The involvement of both rabbis and the hazzam in the life of the school has made them much more sensitive to the role of the school in the synagogue and much more likely to care about it.

The parent-involvement programs in the school are worthy of including in our Best Practices Index. The consecration service, the family Shabbat morning experience, and the Shabbaton (after it takes place) are well worth sharing with other communities. One finds in Bnai Zion, more than anything else, an ability to deal with problems as they arrive. The principal is able to engage the various stakeholders in a serious, creative effort to relate to difficulties and to come up with solutions in a confident and responsive manner.

Cover Sheet

Best Practice in the Supplementary School (For Individual Schools)

REPORT BY: Carol K Ingall

Date March. 1992

Name of the School "Midrasha Aleph"

Denominational Affiliation Transdenominational

Approximate Number of Students 110

From ages 13 to 18

Number of Teachers: 20

Students attend 5 hours per week; (2 days per week)

Approximate annual budget (if available) \$77,000

What particular emphases of this school are worth noting:

Affective education through informal activities

3.81.1

"Midrasha Aleph"

Overview

In this report Carol K. Ingall describes "Midrasha Aleph," a five hour per week, community supplementary school for post b'nai mitzvah-age students. It draws from both afternoon schools and day schools, its students representing all positions on the denominational spectrum, although the large majority come from Conservative congregationss. Aleph has done an excellent job of providing students study of serious subjects in an inviting fashion while providing affective education through its informal activities.

Classes in the Midrasha are wide-ranging in subject matter and are characterized by a pedagogic style oriented toward discussion. The Midrasha has a stable faculty and the teachers often are known to students from other arenas. Students are learning from texts and are learning serious subject matter. The school monitors progress carefully and graduates no one who does not meet the school's minimum standards for graduation.

The Midrasha is particularly oriented toward promoting Jewish values through its informal programs.

Midrasha Aleph

Bureau of Jewish Education of X City

Carol K. Ingall

SYSTEMIC ISSUES

A. Background

Midrasha Aleph is a community supplementary school for post b'nai mitzvah-age students. It draws from both afternoon schools and day schools, its students representing all positions on the denominational spectrum, although the large majority come from Conservative congregations. All matriculated students must sign up for five hours a week. Certain courses, two of which are offered for college credit (an arrangement made with a local college) and one which trains students to become teacher aides, are open to the community. Of the 103 students enrolled, only four are non-matriculated. When the school was first constituted, there were those who proposed a two-hour a week school and those who advocated a five-hour a week school. The maximalist faction won. The issue of hours resurfaces periodically, but by and large, the battle has been won.

The Midrasha Aleph is nine years old. The result of a merger between the high school of one synagogue on the East Side of the City and the High School of Jewish Studies of the Bureau of Jewish Education, the Midrasha was born amidst compromises. The issue of hours was non-negotiable; the issue of location was not. To satisfy the East Side parents and those of the Bureau students in the southern suburbs, the board which created the school effected a compromise. The school meets for three hours on Sunday at the synagogue and two hours on Wednesday at a synagogue in one of the suburban towns. There is busing for southern area students on Sunday mornings and for the City students Wednesday nights.

The school is responsible to a governing body, which is a standing committee of the Bureau. This Midrasha committee consists of representatives of the Bureau, the three large Conservative congregations whose graduates attend the school, community representatives and a student representative. This group raises funds supervises curriculum, develops and monitors the budget of the school, suggests informal activities and sets tuition and fees. A unique feature of the school is that the three cooperating synagogues pay a sum determined by the committee to help defray the costs of the school. This year the sum is \$75.00 per student for each of their congregation's children enrolled in the Midrasha. Each congregation also donates an hour of rabbinical teaching time or its financial equivalent. Tuition is \$375.00 per annum, including busing. Scholarships are available to those who show financial need. The Bureau, through its Federation allocation, makes up the rest of the school school school is deficit.

B. Goals

The goals of the school are as follows:

- 1. To raise the level of Jewish knowledge of students and their parents
- 2. To create informal settings for community youth to socialize
- 3. To foster commitment to Judaism and the state of Israel
- 4. To promote spiritual sensitivity, love of family and the synagogue
- 5. To instill Jewish values and ideals, turning them into life-long habits
- 6. To encourage a love of k'lal Yisrael

C. Articulation and Communication of the Goals

The goals are disseminated through a Student/Parent Handbook, in the course catalog, and through weekly articles in the local Anglo-Jewish press and monthly articles in the Federation newspaper. The principal pays visits to the feeder schools where she speaks to parents and students about the goals of the school. Because these congregational schools have a part in the governance of the school, because their rabbis teach in it and they pay a capitation fee for their graduates who go on to the Midrasha, the rabbis include articles about the Midrasha in their bulletins, and "push" the Midrasha to their b'nai mitzvah when they address them from the pulpit. The school has created a brochure for potential students and their families, as well as an effective slide-tape presentation. There is an annual Open House to entice new students and parents. Each of these occasions is an opportunity to promulgate the vision of the school as it is articulated in the goals delineated above. Probably the most effective method for the dissemination of the goals is through students and parents discussing them with their peers.

D. Stakeholders

The Midrasha Aleph committee worked on the goals together with the faculty of the school. The goals were also reviewed by the board of the Bureau of Jewish Education. Because the committee is so broad-based, it represents the input of the principal stakeholders.

E. Implementation of the Goals

- 11. The cognitive goals are implemented in the course offerings of the school. The curriculum is driven by its goals. There are course requirements for graduation, including courses in Israel, Bible, Jewish values and Jewish history.
- 2. Parent education is addressed in two parent-child courses, one open to ninth and tenth grade students and their parents, and parent participation in many of the informal programs of the school. The jury is still out on whether this produces love of family, one of the stated school goals.
- 3. Informal activities are wide-ranging, including participation in <u>Panim el Panim</u> a carnival for residents of a home for the retarded, and informal <u>hugim</u> (interest groups) based on social action themes. For examples, students studied rabbinic texts on the saving of human life and then learned how to administer CPR.
- 4. Israel is an important component in the life of the school. Eighth graders study a mandatory course in Israel, and there are numerous opportunities to expand on that foundation. Midrasha Aleph promotes summer study programs in Israel as well as routinely sending its students to the Alexander Muss High School in Israel. Since the Bureau staffs an Israel Desk, and Midrasha students receive substantial stipends from a Bureau administered Federation Endowment Fund, Midrasha students are often the staffer's best customers. This summer sixteen Midrasha students will be studying in Israel.
- 5. The school tries to address the spiritual needs of the students. Sunday mornings begin within a voluntary prayer and breakfast session. Nearly all school-wide meetings include a tefillah component. Students receive modest course credit for leading services in their respective synagogues. Whether this achieves the goal of loving one's synagogue is unclear. Like the goal of promoting love for family, it is not as easily quantified as com-

nectedness to the state of Israel or provision of opportunities for Jewish teenagers to socialize.

- 6. The school promotes Jewish values through its informal program. Students demonstrated their solidarity with the newly arrived Russian teenagers by making them welcome bags, including in them Midrasha calendars and coupons redeemable at teen hangouts. Every Hanukkah they stage a Midrasha talent show at the Jewish Home for the Aged. Selling candy before and after school gives the students a tzedakah kitty which they divide among local, national and international agencies. They worked at Amos House, a City shelter, and Trevor's Place in Philadelphia.
- 7. The school promotes its goal of awareness of k'lal Yisrael by involving the students in Federation's Super Sunday and other community events. Students traveled to Washington for the big Soviet Jewry rally in 1987. The school practices a commitment to k'lal Yisrael in its day-to-day activities. There are several students with moderate to severe learning disabilities enrolled in the school. This is done without fanfare, creating modified programs or selecting courses that the student can master.
- 8. The school does well in keeping attrition to a modest percentage. These students are in school voluntarily. Their parents want them to meet other Jewish teenagers, something that doesn't come easily in a state with 17,000 Jews in a population of 1,000,000. Perhaps ten to fifteen percent of the eighth graders drop out by tenth grade.

The number of drop-outs used to be higher four or five years ago. Recognizing the high correlation of students who completed ninth grade with students who graduated in the twelfth, the principal embarked on an active program to hold onto eighth and ninth graders. She introduced a Shabbaton geared to younger students, created a special forum for newcomers to the school to meet periodically with her, and devised a Big Brother, Big Sister pairing. Attrition has been substantially lessened. The principal and committee note that there is a strong correlation between a synagogue's sense of ownership of the school and student attrition. The synagogue which is most lukewarm in its support of the school has the greatest percentage of dropouts.

The principal is just beginning to collect data on what Midrasha students do in college. The vast majority continue to take Judaic studies courses as undergraduates, perhaps 60-70%. Several Midrasha graduates have gone on to major in Judaic studies. The analysis of the principal's data should be most informative.

The social aspects of the school cannot be minimized as a factor in its success in keeping its students. The busing, first considered only as a political <u>quid pro quo</u>, has become a potent force in creating friendships. The Wednesday bus leaves the local Jewish Community Center at 6:00 P.M. Students start congregating at 5:30, knowing this is an opportunity to meet and socialize. Even when students receive their driver's licenses, they still take the bus. Only in their senior year, when their lives seem so pressured and saving fifteen minutes by driving seems a major savings, do some students then take the family car to Midrasha.

CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION ISSUES

A. Formal curriculum

The school has a lengthy curriculum framed in terms of behavioral objectives, learning activities, texts, and means of evaluation. The curriculum was mandated by the accreditation process of the Bureau of Jewish Education. Most of the curriculum is teacher created, allthough commercially available material for adults and young adults are used in the school. Because the school claims to be a community, not a denominational school (allthough most of the students come from Conservative congregations), the principal is careful to include materials which come from the UAHC or in the case of the few Orthodox faculty members, material with which they are comfortable.

B. Content

Students are learning from texts and are learning serious subject matter. The school monitors progress by calling up students who are absent several days in succession, by graduating no one who does not meet the school's minimum standards for graduation and by issuing report cards twice yearly. Interim progress reports are sent to parents whose children are not performing satisfactorily. In the eighth grade students may grumble about attending, but by their senior year, particularly after a trip to Israel, students know why they are there. The principal reports that older Midrasha students and graduates repeatedly tell her, "Now my Midrasha education makes sense."

C. Instruction

If there is any one Midrasha style of instruction it is discussion. Several classes are limited in numbers to promote a seminar-like atmosphere. There is a healthy respect between students and teachers. Students know their teachers from other aremas. Six are rabbits; five have congregations of which the students are members. Fourteen are Jewish professionals, educators in communal institutions which may have once trained these students. Three are secular educators with strong teaching skills. Four are knowledgeable Jewish lay persons, involved in the lives of their congregations.

A number of teachers are devotes of cooperative learning and incorporate it into their teaching. No one relies on lecturing as his or her primary method of instruction. The flavor of Midrasha Aleph is child-centered and problem-oriented, in the best of the Progressive education tradition.

The staff is quite stable. This year fewer than 15% had to be replaced. The principal reports that this is about average. The school has a reputation for paying its faculty well. Since the Bureau promulgates a teacher code, with a salary component, it behooves the Bureau's high school to be in compliance. The principal meets with new staff members to orient them individually, in addition to requiring them to attend the annual opening faculty meeting.

D. Affective Experiences

The "practice" in Jewish living as exemplified by the informal tzedakah programs of the school are noteworthy. The earnival for residents of the Ladd School, the overnight programs at Camp Ramah in Nyaek or in Vermont to work on ecological concerns are outstanding. Prayer, as I have indicated earlier, is a regular part of the life of the school. Although the principal rues the fact that tallitot and tefilling are not second nature to all the students and the large majority of parents, graduation eeremonies begin with communal prayer. Arts programs may not be represented as well as they should be. There are occasional classes in Jewish art and several times students worked on art projects in the course of hugim. This year a source is being offered in the image of the Jew in American film.

E. Parent or Family Education

In 1991-2 Midrasha Aleph offers two opportunities for parents to study with their children: a semester course for parents of juniors and seniors to study American Jewish literature with their children, and an eight-week course for the parents of ninth and tenth graders to study Jewish heroes with their children. Here I am not a disinterested

bystander: I am teaching the latter course, I am amazed at how seriously the families have been taking their commitment. Today two parents attended without their children who are on private school break, visiting grandparents in Florida. (Two students who attended without their parents noted that it is they who should be commended. Their parents would never have known if they hadn't come.)

SUPERVISION ISSUES

A. Regular Supervision

The principal formally supervises her teachers twice yearly. Each observation is preceded by a review of a pre-observation form and followed by a review of a post-observation form. The principal also visits classes informally on a regular basis.

Consultants are regularly used. The special education coordinator of the Bureau helps with placement of special needs students. The principal has brought in faculty from the Hebrew College of Boston as well as local Jewish educators for her faculty meetings. Teachers are told that they must attend three to four in-service programs annually. The Midrasha has a modest professional development line in its budget for this purpose. Faculty members are also encouraged to apply for teacher training stipends from the Bureau. These stipends help offset the cost of CAJE conferences and other workshops.

B. Perceptions of the principal

The principal is considered a serious Jewish professional. She is one of the most well-trained principals in the community, having received a Master's degree from the Jewish Theological Seminary and receiving Bureau certification as a principal.

Cover Sheet

Best Practice in the Supplementary School (For Individual Schools)

REPORT BY: Samuel Joseph

Date May, 1992

Name of the School "Emeth Temple"

Denominational Affiliation Reform

Approximate Number of Students 365

From ages 4 to 15

Number of Teachers: 31 (plus 23 Madrichim)

Students attend 2.5 to 5 hours per week; (1.5 days per week)

Approximate annual budget (if available) \$175,000 (some programs have separate budgets in addition to this

What particular emphases of this school are worth noting:

Many areas as noted in report, but note particularly the way that the school participates in the life of the congregation

"Emeth Temple"

Overview

In this report Samuel Joseph describes the synagogue school of "Emeth Temple," a large Reform congregation in a mid-sized Midwestern city. Emeth Temple is an example of a school that has undergone a great deal of change and improvement in the last few years. The growth of this school can serve as a model for progress and development in other synagogue settings.

The success of the school has been growing during the past few years. In many areas of involvement there is a marked increase in participation by students from the school. The numbers of students attending UAHC summer camping programs greatly increased, participating in Israel experiences, UAHC and other programs, rises each year. Most impressive is that there are virtually NO drop outs after Bar/Bat Mitzvah until at least through 10th grade. This year's 12th grade class will graduate with two-thirds of the original religious school class.

One of the strongest aspect of this school is how it participates in the life of the congregation. Emeth Temple as a congregation has a core value of responding to the social issues facing the city and beyond. The school is a full partner in any response.

"Emeth Temple"
Samuel Joseph

GOALS

There is learning going on in the Emeth Temple Religious School. There is excitement in the classrooms and the hallways. The school is a vital presence in the congregation and the community. This school can be counted as one of the "best practice" schools.

The goals of the Emeth Temple Religious School are taken directly from the national goals articulated by the Union of American Hebrew Congregation's Joint Commission on Jewish Education. Several years ago the Education Committee of the Temple adopted these goals as part of a curriculum review. The goals were then ratified by the Board of Trustees of the congregation. Though only part of the curriculum of the school comes from the UAHC, the entire program is founded on these goals.

Each year the school publishes a Parent Handbook that is distributed to each family. Prominent in the Handbook are the goals of the school. It should be added that the Parent Handbook also includes statements by the Rabbis and Educator about the importance of the goals and how these goals are not just for the children in the school, but form a life long learning agenda for all congregants.

The school seeks to create Jews who actively and knowledgeably participate in the life of the synagogue and the Jewish community. Since this is not achieved in one's youth, but as an adult, it is difficult to measure. It may even be too early to measure if we are to look solely at the children. But some things clearly can be seen.

In many areas of involvement there is a marked increase in participation by students from the school if one looks at the data over a period of several years. During the past few years the numbers of students attending UAHC summer camping programs greatly increased. The number of students participating in Israel experiences, UAHC and other programs, rises each year. The B'nai Mitzvah Program, a very extensive community action curriculum, gets stronger and stronger. The Temple Youth Group is very large and active and because of demand a Junior Youth Group is vigorous. Most impressive is that there are virtually NO drop outs after Bar/Bat Mitzvah until at least through 10th grade. This year's 12th grade class will graduate with two-thirds of the original religious school class. (The school keeps very accurate records concerning who registers and who does not each year.)

In a goal area where it may be more difficult to "see" the increase in involvement, the school attempts to model that behavior during school time. Tefilot are an example. The school now has Tefilah every week in school so the students can practice Jewish life behaviors.

Since the issue of retaining children after the bar-bat mitzvah is frequently raised in discussions of supplementary school Jewish education, I tried to discover why so many students remain at Emeth Temple?

Essentially there are a constellation of reasons for this phenomenon. I spoke with the Educator, Rabbis, parents, teachers, b'nai mitzvah tutors, and students. All confirmed that the reason for the high retention rate is complex and multi-faceted. I will attempt to explain what I learned.

Clearly there is a tradition in this congregation for post b'nai mitzvah schooling. It may be a historical reason, since the early Reform congregations frowned on bar mitzvah and tried to replace it with Confirmation in 9th grade. This congregation, founded by the "father" of Reform in the U.S., to this day has large Confirmation classes in 10th grade. My thought is there is a strong expectation by the Temple and parents that students remain through Confirmation.

Add to the expectation of "at least 10th grade" the fact of the community's Reform Jewish High School. This program, ten years old, is run joinedy by five congregations. It meets for three hours per week on Sunday evenings. All 9th-12th-graders of those are eligible to attend, and over 200 do! The High School is the meeting place for a large segment of Jewish teens in this city. A report on the High School needs to be written some day, but suffice it to say for now that its presence is a strong motivator for students to remain post bar-bat mitzvah.

Emeth Temple has a strong youth program. The Junior Youth Group and the Senior Youth Group are also a factor in the retention discussion. These groups have a cone value of Jewish knowledge, involvement, practice, and action. There too is the expectation of further Jewish education.

I also found that the Reform Movement's camping program was a factor. More and more of the students are attending the summer camp. Again, the value of a continuing Jewish education is held high.

Finally, when a bar-bat mitzvah and his/her family meet with the Senior Rabbi, approximately a year before the "event", they must sign a pledge promising that the will commit to continuing in the religious education of the Temple. The Rabbi believes that this factor is a very powerful one in keeping students in school post b'nai mitzwah.

I must report that the b'nai mitzvah program itself is probably a factor. The students spend a year working with a private tutor on their Torah and Haftorah reading. At the same time they meet twice a week in class studying what it means to be an active member of the Jewish community. The students like the program.

THE SCHOOL AND THE CONGREGATION

One of the strongest aspect of this school is how it participates in the life of the congregation. Emeth Temple as a congregation has a core value of responding to the social issues facing the city and beyond. The school is a full partner in any response. For example, the congregation is part of a coalition called the Interfaith Hospitality Network. Every few months, homeless people are sheltered and fed at the Temple for several days. The students in the school are cooks and bakers for these people. The students decorate with well-come posters the classrooms where the cots are placed. The children made curtains for the rooms. They make cards of welcome to put on each cot. They even made shlach manot during Purim for these people needing shelter.

The students collect all kinds of supplies, from tooth brushes and paste to mops and brooms, as part of the Temple's work with another project called Hope for the Homeless. Every grade in the school is involved in yet a third project which matches congregants with over 33 social service needs projects in the community. Last year over 600 congregants participated along with children from the school.

It is easy to see how the vision of the school, and the congregation, is communicated everywhere one looks. There is a weekly Faculty Bulletin containing articles from the world of Jewish education, secular education, Judaica and Hebraica. Teacher growth is a major goal here. The Temple Bulletin has monthly articles about the school. The parents have their own newsletter called Emeth Parents. Even the hallways are covered with letters thanking the students for tzedakah projects they performed.

THE LIFE OF THE SCHOOL

There is a wonderful feeling in the school. Yes, there are discipline problems at times. Usually in the upper grades. But the "trouble makers" tend to cause problems in only small ways. Talking too much when it is quiet time, for example. Not listening to the teacher is another. Yet the school has a policy of rewarding positive behavior. Each semester teachers select students in their class who exhibit "correct" behavior. There is a specific list of criteria for the teachers to follow. Students receiving this reward are called a Class Act. They have their names published and they receive ice cream certificates, or movie passes, and a certificate of recognition.

Overall, the discipline philosophy and policies of the school are admirable. Parents are sent a full description of the behavior philosophy, discipline policies, and the Class Act Program at the beginning of the year. Post cards are sent home after each class session if needed. These cards range from the "We missed you hope you are okay" to " You should know that your son/daughter was wonderful in class today". The school also keeps exact records regarding referrals of students to the office and contacts with parents when required.

After analyzing the systemic issues in the school one is a bit overwhelmed by Emeth Temple Religious School's efforts to be a "good" school. They are committed also to improvement and growth. And they are aware that a status quo really does not exist.

TEACHERS

The teaching staff at Emeth Temple Religious School most certainly is the heart of the program. There are thirty-one paid teachers and 23 madrikhim. It should be noted here that the school includes grades prek through 8 with grades 9 to 12 as part of the community sponsored Reform Jewish High School. The Educators and the Rabbis are centrally involved in the high school program.

Approximately 40% of the teachers at Emeth are congregants, 30% rabbinic students from Hebrew Union College, 10% are students at a local university of Cincinnati, and 20% are from the general Jewish community. More than half of the staff are veterans of the school, working there for more than five years. In fact, the only real turnover is caused by the graduation and ordination of the teachers who are also full time students.

The rabbinic students bring a great knowledge of Judaica/Hebraica to the school. The other members of the staff are less able in this area. At the same time the teachers clearly express a desire to know more so they do participate willingly in learning opportunities offered by the school, Temple, and the BJE/Community. Faculty meetings are regularly dedicated to enhancing the Jewish knowledge of the staff and their teaching skills.

The teaching styles of the veteran teachers are very rooted in informal educational methods. All the classes have a strong discussion component, there is a little or no lecturing. Projects are key in every grade. Two grades should be singled out here. First, the Open Room for prekindergarten and Kindergarten. This Open Room has been going for 16 years! There are 5 teachers, 3 madrikhim, and a music specialist. There are about 62 children in the Room. The staff is expert at managing and teaching such a program. The other area is Cooperative Learning. The 6th grade teacher is an expert in this methodiology and uses it successfully with her class. She is now training other members of the staff to use it also.

During the summer months the Educator meets several times with any new teachers coming into the school. She uses those times to help them prepare for the school year, whether they require curriculum support, administrative assistance, or the like. It is also a chance to begin to ease the newcomer into the culture of the school.

The Temple itself has a fine resource that must be noted for its importance to the school—its library. The library has over 16,000 volumes! It must be one of the largest synagogue libraries in the country. There is a very knowledgeable librarian who is on site almost full time and assists teachers, and students, with their research needs.

CURRICULUM

As stated earlier, the curriculum of the school begins with the national curriculum of the UAHC. This is followed through grade 4 and then the curriculum is a straight subject matter curriculum. The course work is enriched with special areas such as music and art. Parents and teachers receive a fully written out copy of the curriculum so they can see the course of study as a whole.

Every grade level has one major project each year that relates to their area of study. This project usually culminates with a large program, frequently including parents. For example, the 8th grade tzedakah unit culminated in a project called "Life Savers". The students developed a set of criteria for judging a person as performing "life saving" acts. Using the Temple bulletin and mailings to homes, they called on congregants to nominate members of the congregation who perform(ed) such acts and the class voted to whom the awards should go. Another grade studied Shabbat and culminated with a Family Day on Shabbat.

Each class participates in family shabbat dinners at the Temple followed by services. Several classes have a Grandparents Day on a particular Sunday. The class studying life-cycle has a big Wedding, parents attend and participate. Tu b'Shvat was also a partent involvement day.

More work needs to be done in this area, but there is a strong desire in that direction. Next year will see even more of these types of events.

Materials used in the school, both print and non-print, come from about every source possible. All the major denominational and non-denominational publishers are represented. The Educator is committed to providing the teachers and the students with the best resource for a particular class regardless of who publishes it.

Evaluating what the students are learning is somewhat difficult in this school. The Hebrew program is an exception probably because it is skill related. Each Hebrew class has testing all through the year and a final assessment before they move to the next level. The other classes are not tested in a traditional manner. Yet looking at the projects of each of the grade levels, looking at the programs in which they participate, and taking into account the overall level of participation in Temple life, it does seem that learning is going on.

The school does send home report cards twice per year. Called Progress Reports, the teachers relate the student's achievements in class directly to the objectives of that

particular class in three areas.—academic, Hebrew, and citizenship. Most importantly, the teachers have to write a narrative comment about the student so the parents have a context for the "grades". Each Progress Report is signed by the teacher, reviewed by the Educator, and signed by the Educator.

SUPERVISION

In-service training for the staff is a core value of the school. The teachers are paid to go to an all city in-service day run by the BJE. The school itself uses outside paid comsultants several times a year to work with the staff. In fact this past year the teachers attended three workshops at the Temple, one on cooperative learning, one on children and death, and another on legal issues and teaching.

The Educator uses a monitoring approach to classroom supervision. She is frustrated that she does not have the staff to use a clinical style. It is a priority to add supervisory staff to the school.

One thing that does prove useful is that teachers are required to turn in lesson plans at least a week in advance of the lesson. The Educator reads each plan, writes comments, suggestions, and hints, then returns them to the teachers.

Overall the Educator is a fine model, an educational leader, for the teachers. She is especially effective in the area of planning and accomplishing goals. Teachers do look to her as their leader.

The Educator is perceived by the Temple community as the professional educator. She is always consulted, no staff member or congregant would plan an educational event without her input.

Even more, she is viewed as a Jewish professional leader. This is apparent when she is asked by the Rabbi to deliver a sermon from the pulpit.

The Educator is involved in the city wide Principal's Council and she helped in the formation of the Tri-state Area Reform Temple Educators group. She is very professional, very competent, very confident.

At one time the religious education program at Emeth Temple was extremely weak. People connected with the school had a low self image, as did the entire school "system". Since that time the school is on a meteoric rise with no limits in sight. There are areas to work on, to improve. But people are saying "how do we get there", "when do we get there", not "we're satisfied; it's not important".

June 4, 1992

Cover Sheet

Best Practice in the Supplementary School (For Individual Schools)

REPORT BY: Stuart Schoenfeld

Date July, 1992

Name of the School "Congregation Revim"

Denominational Affiliation Reform

Approximate Number of Students 250

From ages 3 to 16

Number of Teachers: 20 (plus 20 co-teachers)

Students attend 5 hours per week; (2 days per week)

Approximate annual budget (if available) \$30,000

What particular emphases of this school are worth noting:
School almost completely staffed by members of congregation

"Congregation Reyim" Overview

In this report Stuart Schoenfeld describes the school at "Congregation Reyim," a Reform synagogue of 250 families located in the outlying suburbs of a large Canadian city.

Congregation Reyim school runs a successful and innovative program that is characterized by an enormous amount of parental involvement, particularly as teachers, tutors and aides in the classrooms. "Teaching our own" is the slogan of Congregation Reyim and this approach is seen clearly in both the parental involvement and the rabbi's connection to the life of the synagogue school.

By systematically training parents and graduates to become school staff, Congregation Reyim addresses two perennial issues in North American Jewish education - first, teacher recruitment; second, the gap between home and school.

The synagogue, through its rabbi, educational director and lay leadership, places a large emphasis on the role of education. The education committee is reported to be the most prestigious of the eighteen or nineteen committees in the congregation. It has ten members; new families are brought on each year. It sets school policies, assists in all activities, discusses curriculum and deals with exceptional cases.

This involvement with the school creates community and also presents important role models for the students. Students see continuing involvement with Judaism lived out before them in school among adolescents as well as parents. Older students stay after Bar Mitzvah and Bat Mitzvah, become teachers' aides, Bar-Bat Mitzvah tutors or teachers and are active in the youth group.

"Congregation Reyim"

By Stuart Schoenfeld

THE SCHOOL AND ITS SETTING

Congregation Reyim is located in a one of the newer suburbs of a large Canadian city. Reyim was founded in 1973 and is often thought of as out of the mainstream of the City's Jewish community. There are two other small congregations several miles to its north and south. There are no other Jewish institutions in the immediate vicinity. Members of these congregations are scattered among non-Jewish neighbors. Their children rarely have other Jewish children in the same class, sometimes not even in the same school.

A Reform congregation, Reyim is continuing to grow, with a current membership of about 800 (250 families) and a school enrollment of about 250. About 20% of the congregatiom's families are intermarriages and about an equal number are conversionary marriages. Professional leadership is provided by Rabbi Bill Miller (pseudonym) and Mrs. Susam Gross (pseudonym), director of education.

The synagogue does not have school classrooms. The School meets on Sunday morning and Tuesday evenings at a Catholic School which is about 7 blocks away from the synagogue. That school is a new, well equipped educational facility, reflecting the Province's policy of funding a public Catholic school system as well as a non-denominational school system.

WHAT THE SCHOOL IS KNOWN FOR

The back cover of Congregation Reyim's 1991-2 school booklet lists 60 school staff (35 female, 25 male) and 16 Bar-Bat Mitzvah tutors (10 female, 6 male). Forty of the school staff are teachers; the rest work in some other capacity—office work, volunteers, aids. Thirteen of the Bar-Bat Mitzvah tutors are also school staff. The overwhelming majority off the staff and tutors (all but two Hebrew teachers) are members of the congregation. This is a substantial percentage of a congregation with 250 families. By systematically training parents and graduates to become school staff, Congregation Reyim addresses two perennial issues in North American Jewish education - first, teacher recruitment; second, the gap between home and school.

The work put into teacher recruitment and training reflects a conscious strategy. As the school booklet states, "Our school is based on the commitment to 'teaching our own." Teachers and parents are role models. When students see parents teaching they learn that their parents value Jewish study and contributing to the community. While this is presented as an educational strategy, it is also understood as a strategy of community building. Many families join because they want to send their kids to religious school. The congregation's strategy accepts that this is motivation for many families. The congregation's educational strategy draws parents as well as children into the school.

It also defines the context for those families whose initial inclination is to have a minimal family involvement, one limited to sending the children to school. "It becomes our role," said the rabbi, "to see how subversive we can be—and I use that word advisedly—changing their behavior and seeing if we can encourage more Jewish activity in the family context. Our success is mixed, but the secret is to create expectations right off the bat and also to have a critical mass." Recruiting parents as teachers is important in its own right, but it is also an important way of building up the critical mass of parents and students who are role models to the less involved. The critical mass is further developed by having many activities in the congregation organized around the school, by including adult education in the responsibility of the education committee and by cultivating older students as teachers' aids, Bar-Bat Mitzvah tutors, youth group members and eventually teachers.

FORMAT OF THIS REPORT

For purposes of comparability with reports of other settings, the findings will be reported using the categories of Holtz's "Guide for Looking at Best Practices...." Am additional category, "Other comments," is added at the end of major sections.

SYSTEMIC ISSUES

1. GOALS

Organizational goals may be expressed at different levels of abstraction. At the most abstract level, organizational goals state the ultimate purpose of the collective action which takes place in organizational roles. As an outsider I would say that the ultimate goal of Congregation Reyim is to use the resources of Judaism to nurture and sustain decent human beings through study, community building and role modeling.

Neither the rabbi nor the educational director, nor any documents given to me used this kind of abstract rhetoric. However, this vision is implicit in what I was told and what I observed about the school's educational strategy. I would say that this strategy has three central elements. I. We teach our own. 2. We build a close link between congregation and school. 3. We learn in order to do. The school is organized around these proximate goals. This educational strategy integrates study, community building and role modeling.

It should be noted, of course, that as in any organization what people actually do is guided by the interaction between organizational goals and personal agendas. Comments relevant to personal agendas appear elsewhere in this report, but a fuller study would be required to speak confidently about the personal agendas of various members of the system. Any attempt to adapt the educational strategy of Congregation Reyim to other settings should take the personal agendas of the people in those settings very seriously.

2. STAKEHOLDERS AND THE SCHOOL'S EDUCATIONAL STRATEGY

The school's educational strategy grew along with the congregation. The congregation has always been led by Rabbi Miller, who came as a student to a group of seventeen families. When the congregation decided to hire their student rabbi they were also accepting his educational strategy. The congregation has had only two educational directors, both of whom have worked as a team with the rabbi and share the commitment to "teaching our own" The present educational director, Susan Gross, was previously a high school teacher and teacher of English as a second language; she became a religious school teacher when her children entered the school in the late 1970s and educational director when her predecessor left for another position. The education committee is reported to be the most prestigious of the eighteen or nineteen committees in the congregation. It has ten members; new families are brought on each year. It sets school policies, assists in all activities,

discusses curriculum and deals with exceptional cases. The educational committee has supported the school's educational strategy from the beginning and is guided by it in the decisions it makes.

The educational strategy is not so much a topic for debate, articulation or validation as it is a fundamental part of the culture of the school - something which has always been there and is now taken for granted. It's part of the package. What is not taken for granted is the implementation of the strategy. The continuing activities which implement the strategy and the monitoring of progress towards better implementation keep the strategy a liwing pant of the school.

The commitment to the educational strategy does not extend to all parents and children. There are families which are ambivalent and marginal about their Jewishness, and some classes where children from these families are the majority. The school and congregation have programs to draw these families in, and the school and congregation communicate clear expectations from the beginning. As noted above, "teaching our own!" contributes to building up the critical mass of involved families so that they, rather than the marginal ones, set the tone.

3. COMMUNICATIONS / VISION

The school's distinctive educational strategy is communicated in writing in the 1991/12 school booklet. The director of education writes in her welcoming letter

Our school is based on the commitment to 'teaching our own,' The involvement and participation of our parents is the model that guides and encourages our students. There are numerous ways in which parents both can and do join in the most important task of educating their children.

Parents are urged to become involved in our teacher-training programme, to help as administrative assistants, or as parent-aids, to work on the Education Committee, or to join the adult education programme or the adult Hebrew programme. Reyim's tradition has taught us that parental involvement enriches both the formal and informal Jewish experience of the entire family.

Similar sentiments are expressed in the letter of the chair of the school committee. The inclusion of adult education within the responsibilities of the education committee and in

the school booklet also communicates the vision of the school as a setting for adults as well as children.

Reyim's educational vision is also communicated each year when the education director and rabbi meet with new parents. The orientation session explains the philosophy of the school: education is not just something that takes place in the school but also in the congregation and the home. The ways in which those links may be made are presented. Participation in various school activities is described and parents are invited to become involved in the teacher training program. If individuals are unable to commit themselves to the program, they are encouraged to help as volunteers and to move into the teacher training program when they have the time.

As well, the education committee periodically publicizes the teacher training program and encourages particular individuals. Individuals with particular talents, for example in Israelii dancing or art, are personally called and asked to volunteer.

The vision of a community of teachers as well as learners is also communicated through the way that older students are incorporated into the educational strategy. Among the Bar-Bat Mitzvah tutors, teenagers outnumber parents. Students approaching Bar-Bat Mitzvah know that the school encourages them to use the skills they have learned as tutors in the school. Many students two or three years past Bar-Bat Mitzvah enter the teacher training program. The vision of older student becoming involved with the education of younger ones is dramatized through the "I'dor va dor" ritual. During the Shavuot service "Grade Nine students call the Junior Kindergarten students to the bimah to honor them and to formally welcome them to the study of Judaica and Hebrew." (school booklet).

4. EMOTIONAL TONE

Intensive research would be required to adequately understand how good it feels to be at Congregation Reyim and in what ways learning is enjoyed. The following anecdotal comments from my Sunday morning visit are suggestive: Coffee and cake were laid out in the large teachers' lounge before class. Teachers were sitting at tables talking. The director of education spoke with teachers as they came in. The atmosphere was active, but friendly and unhurried. The school day began with "O, Canada" and "Hatikvah" and announcements on the P.A.

The announcements included a mention that I was visiting and asked that I be welcomed. As I was walking through the halls, a shild came over and said, "Welcome to our school." I was told to go into whatever classes I liked and visited five of the eighteen classes and

- B. "Teaching our own" with paraprofessional parents is also connected to flexibility in teaching assignments. Particularly in grades 7-9, where the morning is normally divided, teachers may teach on a part time basis. This accommodates those parents who do not make a commitment to teach every week by allowing them to teach, for example, an eight week unit for one hour a week.
- C. The link between religious participation and school is very strong. The importance of prayer came up again and again in the discussion with the rabbi and educational director. There were certainly other things of importance to the congregation and the school, but in a fundamental way, the ability to share in common rituals is central to the system. The rituals of Jewish worship link the identity of the members to other Jews in time and space. Regular attendance at services is not required, but much is done to encourage it. Friday evening services are held for young families on an average of twice a month. About sixty people will come to a regular Friday night service. About thirty will come on those Saturday mornings on which there is no Bar-Bat Mitzvah. The school self-consciously promotes "service literacy," familiarity and comfort in services. Each class and youth group conducts a service during the year. The Hebrew program is oriented towards knowledge of prayers. Tefillah takes place in school. The rabbi works in the school, and the educational director goes to services and is often on the bimah.

The philosophy of "we teach our own" is connected to the importance of ritual in the congregation and the school. Parents who teach are not just role models of parents who know about Jewish things and talk about them. They are also role models of parents who know prayers and go to services.

CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTIONAL ISSUES

1. CURRICULIUM DEFINITION

The school booklet contains a curriculum outline for Judaic Studies from jumior kindergarten through Kallah, and Hebrew levels from primary through kitah vav. The educational director provided me with mimeographed curricula for each grade. These curriculum documents, however, do not define the curriculum; they are only one element of it. Moreover, as new curriculum materials become available and the educational committee reviews what happens in the school, the written curriculum is modified, either in writing or with the understanding that the modifications will be incorporated into written revisions.

The educational director and rabbi spoke of curriculum in a broad way.

First, they included the synagogue experiences as part of the curriculum. Neither the mid-morning tefillah described above nor the involvement of school classes in shabbat serwices are listed in the curriculum outline, yet both are spoken of as important parts of the sadhooll's instructional strategy. The educational director commented that the curriculum which the Reform movement has recently published is consistent with the importance given to learning Hebrew prayer in the school. Each year, each class and youth group leads a service. Six to eight weeks will be spent preparing for the service.

Second, the educational director and rabbi consider those Sunday morning activities which create a Jewish atmosphere and encourage socializing to have full status as parts of the curriculum. Rabbi Miller said.

We consider the social statements to be part of the curriculum. Kilds may come into the class announcing a youth group meeting coming up; someone may come in announcing a bake sale for tzedakah. That's fine, we consider that to be part of the curriculum. Number one because it influences values. Number two just getting Jewish kids together to shmooz with each other and enjoy each others' company is an important component of our school and who we are in the town.

The educational director further explained the interaction between different aspects of the school.

Our grade 7, 8 and 9 student teachers are not always needed the full morning. They may have the middle of the morning off and they'll have a youth group meeting. All of the sudden, the school becomes something that's central to their Jewish identity, it becomes a youth group morning, a fund-raiser, a sisterhood activity.... We create our Jewish world. The aura is very, very special; you can't walk into the building without feeling it.

Third, Bar-Bat Mitzvah preparation (20 = 25 per year) is a separate area of instruction, involving Bar-Bat Mitzvah tutors (who are members of the congregation, often teenagers), the educational director and the rabbi.

Fourth, the school booklet lists "additional educational programmer" discussion groups and adult Hebrew classes, preschool, teacher training, family education and a lending library.

2. LEARNING OF CONTENT

Content learning takes places partly in the classroom, following the printed curriculum. All the classes observed were focused on content of some kind. There is homework. One of the classes I observed consisted of reports of individual projects. There are report cards. Members of the Kallah class must pass a three page exam (Hebrew terms, fill in the blanks, short answers and an essay). Students also participate in voluntary learning activities which supplement what the school does = the Rikudiyah, Zimriyah (both sponsored by the City Board of Jewish Education), Bible contest (sponsored by the Canadian Zionist Federation) and Israel quiz (sponsored by the Reform movement). While the formal curriculum covers the standard elements of Jewish education, there is a "tilt" towards instruction in synagogue skills and knowledge of religious topics.

Because the curriculum is broadly conceived, formal lessons in the classroom are not the only way in which content is learned. Continuous involvement and participation in synagogue sponsored activities are given a high priority. The educational director commented,

Our classes run services. The kids come up on the bimah and chant from Torah on a regular basis. They are not strangers because it has become more than a subject; it's part of who they are. There are some things that suffer because of it. On the other hand, if it were only school, if Hebrew were only like French, we'd lose something because it wouldn't be important for them. The importance grows as they become involved in the process. We have a wonderful retention rate of kids who do not leave us after Bar-Bat Mitzvah and bat mitzvah.

3. TEACHING STYLES AND BACKGROUND

The staffing of Congregation Reyim by parents and older students is the school's distinctive characteristic. The eighteen classes of 20 to 22 students are well staffed. Most classes have more than one teacher. Student aides and volunteers are frequently present. The training and supervision of teachers will be covered below in the section on "supervision issues." Only the implications for classroom experience will be noted here. The observations recorded above on "emotional tone" are consistent with the rabbi and educational director's summary comment on teaching style - it is "relaxed." Teachers are encouraging,

but are self-conscious about not making the learning of content the exclusive, or even the most important, goal of their work.

I would also add that the teaching style is cooperative. There is usually a team in the classroom. In grades 7 through 9, the students have multiple teachers. The morning is divided into an hour of Hebrew and two one hour lessons; in each hour the class may have a different teacher.

Reyim teachers have all been trained by the rabbi and education director, who continue as their supervisors. The overlapping of statuses as parents, congregational members, members of a teaching team and graduates of a common teacher training program contributes towards a teaching style which reflects identification with an organizational culture rather than a technical

division of labor.

4. AFFECTIVE EDUCATION

The curriculum documents describe content, but the educational director and rabbi spoke much about the integration of feelings and behavior with knowledge. There is a self-consciousness about role modeling, creating the proper atmosphere, learning in order to do and to feel like doing. Linking the school to participation in the synagogue has an affective dimension. The children have their transitions in the school marked by synagogue events junior kindergarten and grade one students are welcomed in September, the grade nines and the junior kindergarten participate in the l'dor va dor service, the Kallah graduation is a creative service. Each class (from grade four up) and each youth group runs a service. The Friday night family services are not formally school sponsored, but are part of the congregation's "package."

Other affective programs—retreats, tzedakah, trips and zimriyah—are also present. The intentional use of the school setting to promote social activities falls into the category of affective education, as does the dinner that the rabbi hosts at his house for the Kallah class.

5. FAMILY/PARENT EDUCATION

PARENT EDUCATION. Two levels of adult Hebrew, with about fifteen students, are taught at the same time as the rest of the school meets. The teachers of these classes are also parents. Sunday morning discussion groups sponsored by the education committee are

periodically held. The director of education leads a Judaica study group on Wedmesday nights.

FAMILY EDUCATION. There are family services on Friday nights about twice a month. The rabbi leads prayers with his guitar, tells stories and invites kids to come up and act them out. Every grade is invited to a specific Shabbat morning service. From grade four up each grade runs the service. A few special programs are held in other grades. Grade 1 has shabbat afternoon and havdalah around Tu B'Shevat, with parents, run by the educational director. In grade 7 the first five weeks of school are a family Bar-Bat Mitzwah program, with students and parents attending together. Grade 8 contains a four week family program on parents' and children's views of what makes a Jewish home. In grade 10 parents are in the classroom for the session on mixed marriage.

SUPERVISION ISSUES

1. INSERVICE EDUCATION

In 1991/2, about half a dozen adults joined the teacher training program. Students in grades 9 and 10 are given the opportunity to be join the teacher training program and be teaching assistants. In 1991/2 about 10 students joined. Not everyone who begins the teaching training program completes it, but most do.

The teacher training program is held on Sunday mornings. Teacher training students meet together for an hour. The educational director, rabbi or sometimes a guest (usually a parent who is a teacher, principal or educational specialist) will present a topic. The outline of weekly topics is attached as Appendix A.

For the other two hours, each teacher in training goes into a grade, where they will spend either the full year or half a year (they may switch in the middle if they want). Trainces move from observing to teaching parts of lessons to teaching full segments of lessons under the guidance of the classroom teacher. Where possible, the educational director or rabbi will observe their teaching.

At the end of the year, those in the teacher training program are given a form which asks them their feelings about the program, what sessions have been best, which ones they would like to see changed. This feedback is used for planning of the next year's program.

They are asked which grade level they see themselves most comfortable with and which content they prefer to teach.

Their teaching assignment is discussed at a conference with the educational director. In most cases, the new teachers are placed as "associate" teachers rather than main teachers.

The morning on which I observed was near the end of the year. The teacher training class that morning was led by the rabbi. The class began with five students; three more arrived soon. It was composed of teenaged boys, teenaged girls, adult women and adult men - two off each. The class began with role playing: "It is June, you two are co-teachers planning your first day in class." After about six minutes, a discussion, led by the rabbi, of what to do when planning the first day. Then more role playing: "This is September, the first day of class. We are the class. Start the class." The rabbi role played a student who first thing asks to go to the bathroom. After this short role playing, the rabbi led a discussion by raising questions: "What do you do before you get into class? What do you do on the day of, before students arrive? When the students come in, what impression do you want them to have of you? How do you keep the administrivia of the beginning of the year firom getting in the way of teaching?"

The school also holds professional development sessions through the year and discusses teaching issues at staff meetings.

2. SUPERVISION

Since the financial rewards of teaching are minimal, the primary rewards are personal satisfaction and social approval. These rewards effect the supervisor / teacher relationship. The goal of supervision is to have everyone in a place where they can creatively use their talents. If someone is not working well as a teacher, personal satisfaction and positive feedback will be low. It is also significant that teachers are members of the congregation. This means, I was told, that they can't be fired. If a class is not working and the support provided doesn't help, the teacher will be encouraged to move. Sometimes the teacher will work better with a different age level or be encouraged to volunteer at the school in amother capacity. Sometimes the class is one which goes through several teachers or grades before they find a teacher that reaches them. Some classes and grades present more problems than others. Since most classes are team taught and volunteers and aids are part of the instructional strategy, a variety of interventions are possible.

3. DIRECTOR OF EDUCATION'S / RABBI'S ROLE

The educational director is responsible for hiring and assigning teachers. She is also responsible for general administration and implementation of educational policy. She gets to know particular classes as they move up through the grades and uses a variety of interventions with problematic classes. She described one class which had been challenging, which "gave our teachers a run for their money for about three years." Different parents were brought in, and finally, they got the right combination of teachers who helped them focus on a tzedakah project which bonded them together, making them feel very good about what they were doing in school.

The educational director and rabbi are both teachers of teachers. They share the teacher training program, observe classrooms, give seminars during staff meetings and "are there when the teachers need us." Both see accessibility and the presence of the rabbi as someone who knows the children and is involved in the school as important.

4. OTHER COMMENTS

Neither the director of education nor the rabbi have formal training in teacher training. Mrs. Gross has an M.Ed. in history and philosophy of education. She worked as a high school teacher and an English as second language teacher before becoming educational director. Rabbi Miller has only the courses that were part of his program at HUC and his camp experience.

SOME CONCLUDING COMMENTS

This concluding section situates the training of parents as teachers in the context of other aspects of the congregation and raises the question of the long term effects of Congregation Reyim as compared to other schools.

CONTEXT

While the use of parents as teachers is the most readily noticed aspect of this school, this aspect does not stand alone. It is one part of the way the school works, and makes sense only in relationship to the other parts. Although these other aspects of the school have been already discussed, this concluding section highlights them. It is important to recog-

nize them, as they effect the transferability of the teacher training program from this setting to others.

- Il) The relationship of the rabbi to the school. Rabbi Miller teaches, invites students to his house, makes school classes central to the yearly synagogue schedule, and gets personally involved in Bar-Bat Mitzvah. In his relationship to parents whom he would like to recruit as teachers, he sets an example.
- 2) The stability of the educational strategy. The school's educational strategy was introduced by the congregation's one and only rabbi almost twenty years ago. The present and past educational directors subscribe to this strategy. It is part of the culture of the school, a shared understanding taken simply as "the way we do things." Building this orientation towards Jewish education as a change introduced into other settings would raise challenges not faced at Reyim.
- 3) The size and isolation of the congregation. Reyim is still small enough so that it doesn't feel like a bureaucracy. A similar program might work in a larger congregation in a largely Jewish neighborhood, but it wouldn't feel quite the same as at Reyim. It would not necessarily be worse or better, but it would definitely be different.
- 4) The financial dimension. "Teaching our own" at paraprofessional pay makes it possible to have a team in the classroom and to still keep dues lower than they would otherwise be. Financial considerations may be different at other congregations depending on the level of affluence and family life-styles.

LONG TERM EFFECTS

Can an educational strategy like the one followed at Reyim have the long term effects that proponents of Jewish school reform hope for?

Despite their pride in what they have done, no one at Congregation Reyim expects their educational strategy to be Ae solution to the problem of Jewish continuity in North America. The identities shaped at Congregation Reyim are also shaped by public schools, peer groups and the mass media. Moreover, Reyim still has its share of marginal and ambivalent families who resist the commitments the congregation promotes. Some join the congregation and enroll their children in school only to please their own parents. The children in the school all have non-Jewish friends. Older students inter date. When they leave home for university, their ties to the congregational community will weaken. The

friends they make on campus, their adult value commitments, their romantic involvements, and their marital choices are all uncertain.

It is possible, though, that what is done at Reyim may shed some light om broader issues raised in the discussion of Jewish continuity. It is now becoming common for writers on Jewish continuity to note that neither the Holocaust nor Israel have the same emotional impact on commitment to Jewish identity that they did a generation ago. Yet identification with Jewish suffering and a reborn nation-state are still used to mobilize adolescents and young adults because (it is said) they don't know anything else about being Jewish. The students who go through Congregation Reyim may come out knowing something else. They will have seen their parents, or parents of classmates, take responsibility for making a synagogue school work. They may carry with them after they leave the knowledge of what it feels like to be part of a community that uses ritual and study to gain access to a rich intellectual and emotional tradition.

November 10, 1992

ANTERNATIVE AS

Resyim THEACHHER TIRAINNING COURSSE WHEEKILY TIOPRICSS, 19991/22

First Semester

Role of the Congregation Reyim Teacher

How to Teach About God

Teaching Strategies #1

Teaching Strategies #2

How to teach Torah

Lesson Planning #1

Lesson Planning #2

The Special Child

Midrash

Class Management #1

Class Management #2

Active Learning

Second Semester

Ancient Jewish History

Jewish Story Telling

Jewish Resources

Questioning Skills

Medieval Jewish History

Modem Jewish History

Overview of Curriculum

Crafts in the Classroom .

Learning Centres

Kohlberg and Moral Development

Peer and Parent Communication

Special Topic

The First Day

Last Session

Cover Sheet

Best Practice in the Supplementary School (For Individual Schools)

REPORT BY: Michael Zeldin

Date May. 1992

Name of the School "Congregation Beth Tzedek"

Denominational Affiliation Reform

Approximate Number of Students 400

From ages 5 to 17

Number of Teachers: 20 (plus 20 co-teachers)

Students attend 4-4.5 hours per week; (2 days per week)

Approximate annual budget (if available) \$230.000 (some programs have separate budgets in addition to this

What particular emphases of this school are worth noting:

Educational activities outside of school (e.g. The Show)

School-congregation relationships

Professional leadership

Madrichim (post Bar Mitzvah aides)

Hebrew Center (curriculum enrichment)

Council for Initiatives in Jewish Education Best Practices Project

"Congregation Beth Tzedek"

Overview

In this report Michael Zeldin describes "Congregation Beth Tzedek," a Reform congregation in a large West Coast city. Beth Tzedek is characterized by its ability to create a sense of community through a variety of imaginative educational experiences. The professional staff and lay leadership of Congregation Beth Tzedek have created a vibrant community despite the geographic challenges of suburban life in Southern California.

The goal of the religious school can be captured in one word: Continuity. The educational programs are all designed to instill within students and adults a commitment to the continuity of the Jewish people. Since the congregation is the most tangible representation of the abstract idea of "the Jewish people," commitment to the temple serves as a bridge to larger commitments. The loving atmosphere thus contributes to the educational enterprise: Students and their families become committed to the Jewish people by first becoming attached to the congregation.

Much of the success of the school is attributed to efforts of its longtime principal. The principal is a central focus for the school's activities and an advocate for the school and for education in general within the congregation. She has been particularly successfull in her efforts to link school life with congregational life. When the leaders of the synagogue talk, it is difficult to discern the boundaries between the congregation and the school, if, indeed, there are any.

Beth Tzedek is an example of how a synagogue committed to education working with a strong and energetic educational leader can build an involving and dynamic school with a host of programs designed to address the needs of contemporary Jews.

Council for Initiatives in Jewish Education Best Practices Project

"Congregation Beth Tzedek"

Michael Zeldin

INTRODUCTION

Seventeen-year-old Becky B. bounces out of her classroom door like a kid bursting into a candy store. She bubbles with enthusiasm as she descends the stairs and enters the courtyard of the school building. She is eager to talk about how much the temple means to her; she says that the temple is her second home. She is an alumna of many of its educational programs, and she now co-teaches a first grade class because "she wants these kids to have the same exciting experiences I did growing up."

Cindy and Wayne S. are co-chairs of the religious school committee. They sit quietly at a picnic table in the courtyard discussing how they became involved with the religious school. Like so many other adults, they remember their own religious school experience as something worth forgetting. Here, though, they find that parents don't force their children to come; "kids make the parents come." Now, they are happy to play a rolle in supporting the temple, its programs, and its staff because they believe that the religious school makes Judaism a joyous experience for everyone who is involved with it.

Debbie teaches at the temple almost every day of the week. This is her first year teaching after a 3-year hiatus while her family was living in New York. She was thrilled when she had the chance to move back to town so she could once again teach at the temple. It is such a warm, loving place, she explains, that she missed the family feeling she gets there and which, she hopes, she in turn gives to her students.

Becky, Wayne and Cindy, and Debbie are a few of the many people whose lives have been touched by the magic of Congregation Beth Tzedek in a large California community. The city is a sprawling metropolis with a Jewish population of 75,000. The temple is located downtown, on the same site on which it has been located for over 100 years. Most Jewish families no longer live nearby; they live scattered up the coast and inland through the newer suburban valleys that stretch out into the California desert. A Northern

suburban branch school offers easier access to the temple's school on weekday afternoons, but on Sundays, parents shlep their children downtown so they can be part of the Beth Tzedek experience.

MORE THAN A SYNAGOGUE, A COMMUNITY

The professional staff and lay leadership of Congregation Beth Tzedek have created a vibrant community despite the geographic challenges of suburban life in Southern California. Senior Rabbi M.S. has served the congregation for close to 20 years. Assistant Rabbi L.C. has family roots in the city that go back more than a generation and is raising her own young children in the congregation. Educational Director H.S. has been part of the Beth Tzedek community for more than a quarter-century. And Congregational President B. B. is a life-long member of Beth Tzedek; her children and grandchildren have grown up in its schools.

The stability and sense of family created by the congregation's leadership pervade the school: Every weekday afternoon and Sunday morning, Educational Director H.S. welcomes children as they get out of their cars. She greets parents as well and frequently asks about their families and, in particular, their older children. With a smile and a few kind words, she makes them feel part of a community. She also handles many potential problems casually so they don't become major issues.

For Cindy and Wayne, the school committee chairs, communication is what makes this "temple family" work so well. The temple staff is responsive to what parents have to say, they explain. As an example, they cite a recent meeting which addressed a problem many parents expressed: The temple had not offered programs for teenagers since the high school youth group became dormant several years ago. The meeting brought together the rabbis, the educational director, the school committee chairs, and a group of interested parents. Together, they developed a plan of action, which the staff then implemented. Cindy explains that this is typical of how the temple works: Parents have an idea, they approach the rabbis and educational director, and they respond. The result is an educational program with a diverse series of options.

For Debbie, the loving atmosphere that makes the temple so special starts with the rabbi and educational director. Their warmth sets the tone for the entire congregation. H.'s effusive personality, and the hugs and kisses which she freely dispenses, have earned her the appellation "Eema." She is always ready to hold a hand, put an arm around a shoulder, dry a tear, or share a triumph with a smile of encouragement and pride.

Teachers and students alike know that to be in H.'s presence—or in the presence of any of the staff members who have "eaught the love bug" from her—is to be safe and secure. Debbie smiles, laughs, hugs and kisses students in class and when they pass her in the courtyard. She wants her students to feel as comfortable and appreciated at temple as she does.

THE SCHOOL

Beth Tzedek is more than a place where children come to feel good about themselves; it is also a place where they come to learn about being Jewish. The goal of the religious school can be captured in one word: Continuity. The educational programs are all designed to instill within students and adults a commitment to the continuity of the Jewish people. Since the congregation is the most tangible representation of the abstract idea of "the Jewish people," commitment to the temple serves as a bridge to larger commitments. The loving atmosphere thus contributes to the educational enterprise: Students and their families become committed to the Jewish people by first becoming attached to the congregation.

The school's curriculum addresses the school's goals in many direct and indirect ways. A mural outlining the curriculum adorns one wall of the courtyard. It was painted several years ago by students as part of a school-wide project. The mural depicts the continuity of the Jewish people from the time of Abraham in Ur until today in the United States. Students who take the time to stop and admire the mural do not miss its message: It is their responsibility to insure the Jewish people's continuity into the future.

In addition to Jewish history, students learn about Jewish holidays and values, for these, too, are paths to Jewish commitment. In all these content areas, though, the school has made a choice: Amassing large amounts of knowledge is not as important a goal as developing a commitment to Judaism and a thirst for knowing more. The hope is that when students are older and more able to understand the deeper philosophical principles of Judaism, their experiences as children and the commitment they have developed will lead them to a desire to study more.

Outside the classroom, students learn about Judaism in more informal ways. They celebrate Shabbat at camp or at a Shabbat dinner at temple. They work several Sundays at a local shelter for the homeless as part of their Bar or Bat Mitzvah preparation. They learn tzedakah by bringing used clothing, toys, or children's books as the price of admission to temple activities.

Beth Tzedek'S OTHER CURRICULUM

Part of what makes Beth Tzedek such a special place for children and their families is its veritable alphabet soup of educational programs that take place <u>outside</u> of school. There is a program to meet every family's needs and interests. The temple has its own preschool and day school (which will not be described here), an infant and toddler program, a religious and Hebrew school, a performing troupe, a postBar and Bat Mitzvah Hebrew program, a young-adult volunteer program, and a summer day camp for 2- to 5-year-olds. In past years, the temple has also had its own summer sleep-away camp. Because of the family atmosphere and shared commitments of the temple, there are few conflicts between the various programs. Even the day school is an integral part of congregational life on a par with other programs, neither overshadowing them nor being overshadowed. Since the day school became financially self-sufficient, it no longer competes for resources with other programs, and day school children participate in the out-of-class educational programs alongside their religious school and Hebrew school counterparts.

The shining star among these programs is the annual Show. Each year, students from 8 to 16 volunteer to spend Sunday afternoons preparing a musical variety show based on a Jewish theme. C.F., a dynamic and gifted composer and director, writes each year's production under the guidance of the Educational Director. C. then teaches students the Jewish content on which the show is based, and lovingly guides them as they prepare to sing, dance and act. Recent shows have focused on immigration to America (featured in Shofar magazine and performed on stage throughout California, even at Disneyland), Jewish heroes (including a home-made rock video featuring more than 100 student performers), and the Book of Esther.

Last year's production, "The Role Model," was set in a drama class. As the show opens, students in the class are dividing into groups to prepare skits about Jewish heroes. One member of the class comes late and is not accepted into any of the groups. He watches as one group presents the life of Theodore Herzl and another the heroism of Hannah Senesh. As he is worrying about what hero he will select, he doses off and dreams of a magical history book which brings to life the prophets and sages, the warriors and poets of our people. When he awakes, he realizes that the people who work with the elderly, the disabled, and the homeless are the real heroes of the world. The show ends as he—and his fellow students—realize that "maybe someday I'll be one of these quiet heroes." The audience sat in stunned silence as the story unfolded. Adults in the audience realized how much children in the show had learned . . . not just about theater, but about Jewish history and Jewish values.

The Show is typical of the extra-curricular programming that makes Beth Tzedek so successful and so loved by children and parents. Children spend many extra hours at temple.

The atmosphere of the school is quite informal. Children engage in serious learning, using materials from national Jewish publishing houses, but the feeling one gets is that the classrooms are more like club houses than school rooms. Children are relaxed, but attentive; casual, but not blase. It is rare for students to be sent to the office for misbehaving; they are too involved in activities to have time to act out.

The Hebrew program, in particular, has a relaxed atmosphere. As part of their program, students often go to the Hebrew Center where a cornucopia of independent learning materials for enrichment, remediation and review awaits them. Materials in the Hebrew Center have been designed by its professional staff and by older students, under the guidance of Educational Director. Ten self-paced units form the core of the Hebrew center. Each unit focuses on a different theme and helps students learn vocabulary, grammar and reading skills based on that theme. Activities in each unit include reading, writting, listening, vocabulary development and enrichment. Students are free to select their own activities in each area. The Hebrew Center thus fosters a sense of independence and freedom that counteracts the feelings of boredom and resentment that students in other schools often feel.

The enrichment activities, in particular, add excitement to the process of learning. Students can choose to make a videotape, write a story, play vocabulary games, work on computer programs, or prepare a puppet show. As part of each unit, teachers also have access to videotapes, games and other media that make whole-class presentations as involving and motivating as the independent work. For example, one videotape is designed to reinforce reading skills related to final letters. Prepared by post-Bar/Bat Mitzvah students, the videotape includes segments in which Bert and Ernie of Sesame Street explain to one another how to read final letters, and a rock song, complete with electric guitar, which introduces and explains the various final letters in the Hebre alphabet. Children find all of these materials highly motivational because they "speak the language of children" and feature older students who serve as models of young people who know and care about Hebrew.

Parents are drawn into the learning process, too. The school often sends home Hebrew homework packets. As the School Committee Chair explains, the packets, "help parents learn while helping them help their children learn." Parents are also encouraged to help out with the many special projects and programs in the school, using their skills as cooks, seamstresses, earpenters of anything else. Even the many intermatried couples find themselves drawn into temple life, he explains, because their children are so involved in its educational programs.

They make close friends. They feel they are part of "something larger than themselves." They feel good about themselves and their accomplishments. And they learn about Judaism in the process.

The longest-running program is Madrichim, a program conceived by the educational director more than twenty years ago, and which she still teaches herself. Many years ago, before she became Educational Director, H. realized that the only way to keep teenagers involved in temple life was to make them feel important and to assign them to leadership roles. So she volunteered to begin a class for Hebrew school graduates, which she called "Madrichim." The teenagers were to be assigned specific responsibilities in the school: They were to make presentations to younger students, to teach them occasional Hebrew lessons, and, as a culmination to the year, to be "counselors" at "Hebrew Camp," a weekend conclave for students in the Hebrew school. In order for them to be effective as leaders, the teenagers were to practice oral Hebrew and learn leadership skills in biweekly classes. The goal set before them was to make Hebrew come alive for younger students. As a result, Hebrew came alive for them, too. After several years of success, H. expanded Madrichim, and now there are "Mad 1" and "Mad 2", programs that bridge the gap between Hebrew School graduation and Confirmation for a "select group" of students (any students that apply, and each year more than 75% of those eligible do).

Another highly successful program brings young families into the Beth Tzedek community by offering what their extended families no longer offer: on-going support and advice about childrearing. Most young Jewish families in San Diego are transplants from elsewhere; "Bubby" may live a two-hour-drive north in Los Angeles or a 3- to 5-hour flight to the east. She is no longer near enough to give the young parents advice. This becomes a "surrogate extended family" for young moms and dads as they assume their new roles as parents and heads of Jewish families. The ties that they forge with one another and with the temple remain strong as their children grow.

Many young people from the city go away to college, but then come back home to start their careers. Some of them become teachers in the religious or Hebrew school, but most cannot take time out of their careers to teach all year long. But many do come to Beth Tzedek a few Sundays each year as part of V.I.P.s (Volunteers in Programming). They help out by preparing and conducting occasional school-wide programs, and by playing the roles of characters from Jewish history in classes. Through V.I.P.s they remain connected to the Jewish community during the years when many of their peers stray from their Jewishness.

Another temple project, Camp Beth Tzedek, ran for several years in a rented facility outside the city. It provided day school and religious school students a chance to experience a Jewish environment filled with summertime fun. The camp utilized the best techniques of

Jewish educational camping (including twice-daily educational programs utilizing experiential learning), an atmosphere suffused with Jewish rhythms (including daily tefilah and full Shabbat experiences), and a Hebrew-language environment (particularly in the dining hall). Supervised by H.S. and led by local college students, Camp Beth Tzedek provided both education and inspiration to its staff and campers.

Becky B., the seventeen-year-old co-teacher, is an alumna of most of these programs. She went to pre-school, religious school, Hebrew school, and Confirmation. She participated in Madrichim and spent several summers at Camp Beth Tzedek. And she starred as Haman in a recent Show production. She talks about how the Jewish friends she made over the years growing up at Beth Tzedek are still among her closest friends. Her social group from temple has remained close even though they attend high schools far away from one another. Her fondest memories of growing up are memories of going to camp with her temple friends. She doesn't plan on staying in the city for college. But she is sure that when she goes away she will seek out Jewish activities and Jewish friends.

A Dynamic Educational Leader

When asked what made the experiences at Beth Tzedek so wonderful, Becky did not hesitate in crediting "Eema," H.S. H. has been part of the professional staff at Beth Tzedek since she and her husband moved to California. She was looking for a way to share some the excitement she felt growing up in a Conservative, Zionist family in Detroit, and she landed a job teaching Hebrew at the local Reform temple. She taught Hebrew for a few years under creative educational directors who encouraged her to use her talents to make her classrooms as lively and stimulating as possible. When the congregation was looking for a new educational director a few years later, its leaders turned to her. She agreed to become the educational director, and has been in that position ever since.

H. is a tireless leader, who recognizes and encourages the talent of others. She is comstantly on the lookout for people with a "special spark" to share with the temple and its children. Over the years she has encouraged many talented young people to become part of her "team." Some of them have gone on to other leadership positions in Jewish education, but many are still part of the Beth Tzedek family. H. has inspired her staff to care deeply about the school, the children and their activities. For example, when H. hired a new school secretary several years ago, she brought her to CAJE. She wanted her to be more than an office manager; she wanted her to feel part of the school and to understand the excitement of a dynamic Jewish program.

Much of H. 's success is due to her efforts to link school life with congregational life. In this she is joined by the Rabbis, synagogue President and School Board Chairs. When amy of these leaders talk, it is difficult to discern the boundaries between the congregation and the school, if, indeed, there are any. H. attends every meeting of the congregation's bound of directors and finance committee. She feels that she needs to stay involved in all of the congregation's programs and all of its deliberations. By knowing the "big picture" in the congregation, particularly its financial condition, she has become an able and credible advocate for Jewish education. When she presents a budget for the congregation's educational programs, lay leaders know that she understands and appreciates the other strains and stresses on the congregational "system."

EDUCATION: THE CENTERPIECE OF CONGREGATIONAL LIFE

In return, the congregation places education at the core of its program. The centerfold of the High Holy Day issue of the congregation's bulletin describes the year's educational programs. Monthly, the bulletin lists educational programs and financial contributions members have made to support those programs. Temple events are often held for the benefit of one or another of the educational programs. The current president of the congregation, attends all of the events connected with the school—from Show productions to the annual Children's Festival and concert. At every opportunity, she publicly praises the school and the parents and grandparents who bring their youngsters to events at the temple. At this years Children's Festival (a day filled with arts and crafts activities, an arts display of work done by religious school children, and a concert featuring children's composer and performer Craig Taubman) she greeted the concert audience saying, "It's so great to see so many kids who brought their parents and grandparents."

Each of these actions has great symbolic value. They remind congregants and visitors that Jewish education lies at the heart of congregational life. By reaffirming the centrality of Jewish education, the congregational leaders set the stage for congregational actions which translate symbolism into action. For several years, the school has been operating on two sites. In order to help students get to school on time, the temple provides transportation (including taxis) to pick students up at their public and private schools and ferry them to religious school.

No form of support is more concrete than the decision to erect a new school building. The temple has recently bought property for a future relocation. Its location will make it especially accessible to young families. In addition, it is in an area that is less congested on weekday afternoons than the current downtown site, which will make driving to Hebrew school easier for most families. The congregation has decided that when construction begins, the first building erected will be the school building. This is a most powerful reaffirmation of the importance of education in the life of the temple.

The symbiotic relationship between school and synagogue was expressed by an event held a few years ago: a confirmation reunion. Congregation Beth Tzedek is more than a century old, and living confirmands range in age from 15 to 85. The school located as many former confirmands as possible and brought them together for a weekend at the temple, including Shabbat services and a family picnic. A video made for the event sought to draw its viewers back to temple life and to Jewish life. In addition to messages from the rabbis and educational director, the highlights of the video were the reminiscences of confirmands from as far back as 1915. They all shared one common theme: how much growing up at Beth Tzedek and going to its schools meant to them . . . and how they still feel that Judaism is an important part of their lives.

Becky B., the first grade co-teacher, was not at the last confirmation reunion; she had still not been confirmed. But no doubt when the next reunion is held, she will come back to the city from wherever she is. She will come to see old friends, to renew her connection to Congregation Beth Tzedek, and to reaffirm her commitment to Judaism and the Jewish people. When she comes, she will be one of many people whose lives have been enriched by their years in Beth Tzedek's educational programs. What will she find then at Congregation Beth Tzedek? No one can say for sure. But given continued hard work and creativity by the temple's leadership, continued support from the congregation, and continued commitment to Jewish learning in a loving environment, she may find that the temple has built on its past successes. She may find new programs that no one today has even imagined. She may find children happily engaged in Jewish learning, and young parents coming to temple to find ways to maintain the Jewishness of their families. In short, she may find that Congregation Beth Tzedek has met its goal, helping to insure Jewish continuity.

Cover Sheet

Best Practice in the Supplementary School (For Individual Schools)

REPORT BY: Joseph Reimer

Date June. 1992

Name of the School "Temple Akiba"

Denominational Affiliation Reform

Approximate Number of Students 359

From ages: K to 7 (not counting 8-12 high school)

Number of Teachers: 21 (Sundays): 11 (Hebrew program) 4 overlap

Students attend 6 hours per week; (3 days per week)

(With options for less; See report for discussion)

Approximate annual budget (if available) \$245.000

What particular emphases of this school are worth noting:

Hebrew Curriculum

Council for Initiatives in Jewish Education Best Practices Project

"Temple Akiba"

Overview

In this report Joseph Reimer describes "Temple Akiba," a Reform congregation in the suburbs of a large East Coast city. Professor Reimer's report is based on a long-term research project studying two successful congregational schools and therefore is enriched by a considerable amount of detail and firsthand experience in the school.

This report describes the success that a supplementary school committed to serious learning of subject matter can have in introducing and maintaining a demanding curriculum, in this case in the area of classical Hebrew.

Although the report focuses on the Hebrew curriculum developed by the Melton Research Center, the issues raised by Professor Reimer here are applicable to any serious curriculum project in the supplementary school arena. Professor Reimer emphasizes that the success of the program depends on a number of factors, most of which would be relevant to other curricular areas as well.

Professor Reimer's report indicates that, given the proper support and dedication, there is a possibility for serious pedagogic endeavors in the supplementary school.

Council for Initiatives in Jewish Education Best Practices Project

"Temple Akiba"

By Joseph Reimer

INTRODUCTION

The literature on supplementary education in synagogue schools is replete with examples of what goes wrong in the process of Jewish education. But it is only recently that researchers have begun to focus their attention on examples of supplementary education that seem to work, that, in the words of the British psychoanalyst D.W. Winnicott, provide students with "a good enough" basis for future development as a Jew in American culture(1).

In this essay I draw from the ethnographic research I conducted during two school years (1989-90, 1990-91) at a large, urban Reform synagogue that I call Temple Akiba(2). I chose this synagogue and its school for study after consulting with well-informed Jewish professionals in its metropolitan area and learning that this school had the reputation for providing "an exceptionally good" educational program. I was curious to learn from close, weekly observation what "good" means in synagogue education and how this school is organized to provide that quality education.

While it is beyond the limits of this essay to tell the whole story of the Temple Akiba school, I will focus on one aspect of its educational program—the teaching of Hebrew—to illustrate how what might be called "best practice" operates in a synagogue school. I was drawn to the Hebrew curriculum for from previous reading about synagogue schools, I had come to believe that teaching Hebrew has become the weakest link in the curricular chain of synagogue education (3). Yet here was a Hebrew program that seemed to have genuine curricular coherence, a solid core of teachers, good administrative support and, most importantly, engaged students who over a period of 5 years showed a progression in learning how to read and comprehend Hebrew texts. This seemed a remarkable educational achievement for a contemporary synagogue school, and I wanted to determine from close observation how the daily realities of classroom life matched the very positive reputation of the program.

I did not set out to evaluate this program, but to describe the synagogue and school in which it is embedded. I offer my descriptive material as a possible example of "best

practice" in a synagogue school. But I do so with a cautionary caveat: if this be best practice, it is not a panacea for all the dilemmas that surround supplementary Jewish education. For as I will show, a close-up view of a "good enough" synagogue school reveals a complex picture in which some strong teaching and solid learning takes place within a context of a secularized or assimilated Jewish community that remains ambivalent in its Jewish commitments. Even while evincing support and enthusiasm for the quality of education that the school provides, many families chose not to take full advantage of the programs the school offers = including the Hebrew program I am about to describe.

In this essay I will provide: (1) a historical context for understanding the evolution of the Hebrew program within the life of this synagogue and its school, (2) a picture of the educational staff of the Hebrew program, (3) an in-depth look at teaching and learning in the Hebrew program, (4) a discussion of whether the Hebrew program meets its goals, and (5) why what may be considered as an example of "best practice" still has limited appeal.

MELTON HEBREW IN A REFORM CONGREGATION

Before coming to know Temple Akiba well, I would not have imagined that this historic Reform congregation, once famous for its classic and even radical Reform stance, would adopt a Hebrew curriculum that was developed by the Melton Research Center of the Jewish Theological Seminary. How, I came to wonder, did this shidduch come about?

Some historical background is helpful here. During the early decades of this century Temple Akiba prided itself in providing a quality Reform Jewish education for children im a professionally-run religious school. But until the 1940's its religious school met omly om Sundays and did not include Hebrew as a major part of the curriculum. As services for adults were conducted in English, and as classical Reform Judaism was non-Ziomist in orientation, there was little perceived need for teaching Hebrew to the children. Winth a change in rabbinic leadership in the 1940's came two significant changes in temple philosophy that affected the place of Hebrew in the curriculum. First, more traditional prayers and rituals (including bar mitzvah) were introduced into the liturgy. Second, the congregation became more supportive of Zionist efforts to establish a homeland im Palestine and to revive Hebrew as a spoken language. After World War II the temple for the first time opened a regular Hebrew program for students in the school.

This new Hebrew program, however, was neither mandatory nor fully-integrated into the religious school. Rather, religious school continued to meet on Sundays, and those students who wished to learn Hebrew came during the week to the voluntary Hebrew program. Over the years as more and more families became interested in their children becoming bar or bat mitzvah, the mid-week Hebrew program grew in popularity. For to become bar or bat mitzvah one had to know enough Hebrew to participate in the increasingly Hebraized Shabbat service. Yet participation remained voluntary, and

families who followed the classical Reform model tended not to send their children to mid-week Hebrew.

In the late 1970's the current senior rabbi came to Temple Akiba with a serious interest in making Jewish education even more central to the mission of the synagogue. He had doctoral training in classical Judaica and a passion for introducing textual study into the curriculum of both the religious school and adult education. He and the rabbi who serves as temple educator had as a first priority making the great texts of Judaism more accessible to their students - both young and old.

When they learned several years later of the availability of the Melton Hebrew Language Program, it seemed to fit their goals for the mid-week Hebrew program. This is not a program with a denominational slant, but one that places the learning of Biblical Hebrew at the forefront of the curricular agenda. The rabbis recognized that they could not expect their students in a part-time program to learn both modern spoken Hebrew and classical literary Hebrew. If a choice had to be made, they agreed with the authors of the Melton curriculum that synagogue schools should give priority to learning the skills of reading and comprehending classical Hebrew texts and leave for later grades learning modern spoken Hebrew(4).

In 1983 an experimental first year Melton Hebrew curriculum was introduced into the beginning level in the mid-week Hebrew program. In subsequent years the next levels were introduced until there were four years of the curriculum in place. In 1986 the decision was made to start the Hebrew program a year earlier at the third grade level, and by 1990 the students completed the four year Melton program by 6th grade and devoted the 7th grade to learning a Biblical text in Hebrew and beginning to learn modem spoken Hebrew.

ASSEMBLING A STAFF

To put in place a curriculum as extensive and demanding as the Melton Hebrew Language Program requires that the school invest in a faculty that can master the theory and practice of the curriculum in question. We know that ambitious curricular designs can easily falter on the shoals of underqualified or resistant teachers(5).

At Temple Akiba Rabbi Don Marcus, the temple educator, built over the course of several years a solid foundation for assembling his teaching staff. Here are the most significant steps that he initiated.

1. CoordGaacdinAeslizRegultzingschleichendrackportespentisteineWebregulgegwaseninstruction, Rabbi Marcus worked to support the creation of a new position, Coordinator for the Hebrew program. This is a master teacher whose job it is to oversee the implementation of the Hebrew curriculum. She is especially responsible for the training and supervision of teachers who are hired to teach in the program.

- 2. Salary Increases. Realizing that there are limited numbers of teachers who have the competence to teach in a Hebrew program of this kind, Rabbi Marcus lobbied hard to increase significantly the salary base for the faculty. He wanted to attract the most able teachers available and knew that paying more would make a difference in recruitment and retention.
- 3. A Wide Net. Though he is committed to both a Reform religious perspective and a core of professional teachers, Rabbi Marcus casts a wide net in his hiring practices and brings in teachers who are neither Reform Jews nor experienced teachers. He believes that as long as a new teacher knows Hebrew and Judaica well and is willing to respect both the ideology of this synagogague and the diversity of its student body, that person cam learn on the job to do a professional job in teaching in this program.
- 4. Training and Supervision. The school has arranged for a trainer from the Melton Center to come at the beginning of the year to offer initial training to teachers new to the Melton curriculum. But the great majority of training comes through the constant supervision provided by the Hebrew coordinator. She regularly observes classes and offers teachers ideas about and feedback on their work. No teacher is left alone to learn how to teach the curriculum; instead there is constant dialogue with the coordinator on their work.

THE TEACHERS

In 1990-91 there were ten teachers teaching in the five grades of the Hebrew program. All taught classes that met for one and a half hours on both Tuesday and Thursday afternoons. In addition some taught Hebrew on Sunday mornings.

Of the ten, three were veteran teachers. Vicky, the most veteran, had been teaching for over twenty years including serving for several years as the Hebrew coordinator. Barbara, the youngest of the veterans, had been teaching in this program for six years and was now also working as a principal in another synagogue school. Of the seven relatively new teachers, five were Americans, four of whom had taught here previously; one was new this year. The other two were Israeli teachers who were also new to this curriculum.

I observed in eight of the ten classes and found a vast range in teaching skill from the veterans who were each outstanding teachers to Richard, the newest teacher, who could barely manage his class and had to be let go mid-year. In the middle were the majority who, though not formerly trained as teachers, clearly knew how to manage their classes, organize a lesson and relate to their students. But they were still learning how to keep on top of the demands of this curriculum and were being visited regularly by the coordinator.

The teachers' backgrounds were equally various, ranging from Rachel who was a product of American Orthodoxy to Liat who was a secular Israeli who had come to study at a local graduate school. In between were the majority of young adults who grew up in either Conservative or Reform congregations, were active in youth movements, studied

Judaica in college and spent time in Israel mastering the Hebrew language. The veterans could be seen as professional Jewish educators, but the younger teachers were primarily teaching while pursuing other career paths.

MELTON HEBREW IN PRACTICE

To tell an educational program that <u>looks</u> good from one that actually works-- meets the goals that it sets for itself-- requires careful study and evaluation. While my research intent was not evaluative, but rather descriptive, I can offer glimpses of teaching and learning from observing in the classes in this Hebrew program that the reader can him or herself evaluate. To assist that evaluation I will add what the school has announced as the goals of this program.

We begin with short excerpts from Rachel's third grade and Liat's fifth grade classes. I observed both of these classes during late September and early October of the 1990-91 school year. I chose these as representative samples of the basic work of the Hebrew program - students' mastering the mechanics of Hebrew as a classical language.

It is in third grade that students first come during the week to study Hebrew. They receive initial exposures to the language during first and second grades in religious school, but learning to read and comprehend begins in earnest during third grade. This class comes during the seventh week of the school year when their learning is clearly in progress.

After spending the first half-hour of class working with the third-graders on recognizing and ordering Hebrew letters, Rachel places the word "yom" on the board and asks the class: "How do you say in Hebrew - day, today and Sunday?"

Hands go up and students eagerly supply "yom" and "hayom," but no one knows the Hebrew for Sunday. Rachel introduces "yom rishon" on the board, asking if anyone knows why "rishon" means first. Miryam suggests it is because of the "re" at the front of the word. Rachel says that is a clever thought, but not correct. She has them look at the word to see if any other Hebrew word is contained within. They spot "rosh" - still familiar from the recently celebrated Rosh Hashana. Why, Rachel asks, is that holiday called "Rosh Hashana." Ten hands fly in the air as clearly they remember the connection between head and first in the word "rosh."

Rachel then says in Hebrew "Hayom yom shlishi" ["Today is Tuesday"] and asks them to repeat that short sentence. Each of the 15 students says it aloud. Using hand motions, she asks "Ezeh yom hayom?" [What is today?] and each responds again "Hayom yom shlishi" ["Today is Tuesday"].

Rachel introduces the word "machar" [tomorrow] and asks if someone will write it in Hebrew on the board. Shlomo volunteers and writes the "mem," but then is stuck. Other students coach him as he is locating the letters on the Hebrew alphabet chart that is printed above the board. With their help he locates and writes the next two leters. But

what about the vowels under those letters? Shlomo shrugs; Rachel calls on Chana who eagerly supplies the vowels.

While this exercise is being completed there is plenty of restless behavior in the room. As she is talking to Shlomo, Rachel is walking around the class touching some children on their shoulders, closing some extraneous English books, putting away the pencils of the doodlers and handling requests to go to the bathroom. What impresses me is how she accomplishes a considerable amount of classroom management without ever interrupting the lesson or breaking from her pleasant demeanor.

With "machar" fully inscribed on the board, Rachel introduces the Hebrew song they know about the days of the week. At fifty minutes into the lesson the singing serves to review the Hebrew, focus everyone's attention on a shared task and allow these 8 year olds to expend their energy in the service of a focused goal.

Rachel is a middle-aged woman who, as an observant Jew, wears skirts and long-sleeved blouses to teach. In contrast, Liat is a tall, thin woman in her twenties who tends towards jeans, shirts and running shoes. Rachel smiles a lot and moves her class along at a moderate, but steady pace. Liat drives her fifth grade as an army on the move; yet, for all her Israeli toughness, Liat displays a distinctive sense of warmth and charm.

By fifth grade the students are involved in reading the stories in the Melton curriculum that are written in Biblical Hebrew but deal with non-Biblical themes. A regular part of their learning entails homework which they are regularly assigned and which the teacher checks at the beginning of each class. Liat begins this class with 20 minutes of homework review and then moves on to the first new lesson of the day. She has the class open the workbook from the Melton curriculum that goes along with the story they have been reading in Biblical Hebrew.

Liat: What is the verb for crying that appears on this page? How do you say crying? Sam: "Bacha."

Sam's answer is correct, but it is not the verb used here in the story. The class searches for another verb until Eric finds

"vatizaak." Liat asks for a translation and Laura correctly translates it as "cry out." Liat shouts "excellent," and calls for more work on breaking down this verb.

Liat: What is the 'vav' here?

Brian: 'And.'

Liat: What is the 'toff here?

Karen: For a woman.

Liat: What do you mean 'for a woman?'

Karen: "And she [cried out]."

Breaking down the verb is an essential part of the lesson. The students are expected to learn how verbs are constructed in Biblical Hebrew so they can accurately identify and separate the base of the verb from the letters that indicate gender and preposition. Liat is having them practice this skill.

Liat: What word appears here twice?

Nathan: "Haradah" and 'Vatecharad.."

Liat: What does it mean?

Nathan: Let's look it up in the dictionary.

Jeremy" "And she trembled.."

Liat: Which of the two words?

Jeremy: The second.

Liat: How do you know?

Nathan: It has the "toff in it.

Liat: Excellent!

Liat is pleased that they can recognize a single base in both a noun and verb form and can translate it with the use of a dictionary. More importantly, they know how the construction of the verb indicates the female gender.

Not all the students are equally involved. Liat spots Gabe with his head down on the desk and walks over to ask him if he is all right. She offers him a chance to go out of the room, but he chooses to stay. He begins to participate in the lesson, but on his first try misses the correct meaning of the next verb, "shma." Someone else gets it right, but Gabe stays tuned in even after his miss.

Liat asks that someone read from the Hebrew story. Six volunteer and she calls on Scott who begins to read slowly, but accurately. Then he misses a word. Liat stops and asks that he work on it, but he is having difficulty. She writes the word on the board and underlines the letter 'zaddik' which he is mispronouncing. Five other students are eager to pronounce it correctly, but she waves them off. "It's like 'pizza'," she says to Scott, and this time he gets the pronunciation right. She asks what the word means, but Scott does not know. Peter helps out with the correct translation.

Liat asks who can summarize this Hebrew paragraph. Jenny shouts her readiness and accurately summarizes in English. Liat looks pleased and eight hands go up with requests to read on

Liat's voice shoots up and dips down. Her pace is erisp and exciting. The students respond with alacrity, wanting to please, aiming to be correct. When there is a pause, she

shouts in her Israeli English, "Hey, you guys, wake up!" And they do. Of a class of 11 students, 8 students participated actively and the others were called on by Liat.

What these two excerpts highlight is the language drill that stands at the heart of teaching the Melton curriculum. One can see that the fifth graders are working on far more complex word constructions than the third graders and are reading whole mamatives in Hebrew rather than single words or sentences.

What struck me in observing broadly in this program was that a curriculum based so heavily on mastering language skills through repetition could hold the interest of these children. I observed no class other than Richard's in which there was a discipline problem beyond some restlessness and inattention. These teachers were adept at noticing when certain children were fading out and made the effort to draw them back into the lesson. They were also keenly aware of the need to vary the activities in class. Any one class would be made up of several 20-25 minute segments, and each segment would feature a different approach to learning the Hebrew.

One popular approach was the use of games. Especially at the close of the first hour (in an hour and a half class), teachers would tend to use a competive game to review the Hebrew. One such game was called "Around the world." The teacher would pair two students and hold up a flash card with a Hebrew word they had just learned in the lesson. The two would compete to see who could be first to read (and sometimes translate) the word correctly. The "winner" would then be paired with a next student and compete again. No prizes were given to winners and there was no tangible loss for the losers. But even those students who during the previous hour had seemed most out of the lesson would rouse themselves to energetically compete in "Around the world," trying greatly to read faster and more accurately than their neighbor.

The carefully-honed structuring of classroom time seemed to create a classroom environment in which students were engaged by a variety of activities and were seldom visibly bored for long stretches of time. They responded positively to the demands of the program and showed clear evidence of progressing from year to year in their mastery of Hebrew. Though there were variations in progress, one could go from one grade to the next and see that the level of mastery grew from third to fourth, fourth to fifth, etc.

HEBREW AND JUDAICA

In Temple Akiba the study of Hebrew does not represent a goal unto itself. In the Parent Handbook that is distributed to all the parents(6) the goal is stated more broadly.

Our Hebrew programs seek to integrate the study of Hebrew language, liturgy, mitzvot and Jewish thought in a graded five-year curriculum. It is our belief that familiarity with the Hebrew language enables students to attain a richer understanding of themselves as Jews....

Comfort with Jewish liturgy and texts, including a more powerful link to the Hebrew Bible, are some of the benefits off even a limited knowledge of Hebrew language.

Looking for evidence of the integration of Hebrew and Judaica, I could point to moments in Rachel and Liatfs classes that were not excerpted above. Liat began her class by writing on the board in Hebrew several key terms from the liturgy of Yom Kippur that had been celebrated that week. While she did not review the theology of the holiday, she reviewed the Hebrew terms that are central to understanding that theology.

In Rachell's class the students were learning Hebrew words that featured the letter "lamed." Among those words were "lulav" and "Elul." Rachel first asked the class, "What fruit do we use with the lulav?" Several answered "etrog." She then asked if they knew which "hodesh" was Elul? When Shaul answered "April," she praised him for knowing that "hodesh" meant month, but corrected his information by saying "It is the hodesh before Tishre." Nahum replied "It is the Jewish December." Thinking he meant it came during December, Rachel began correcting him when Nachum more fully explained his thought: as December is the last month before the Christian New Year, Elul is the last month before the Jewish New Year. Rachel heartily agreed and then explained about blowing the shofar during Elul. The introduction of Judaic material into the Hebrew lesson was a regular feature of the classes I observed. But the fullest integration takes place during the seventh grade when the students have completed the official Melton curriculum and move on to applying their acquired skills by starting to study in Hebrew the biblical Book of Jonah. As Jonah is a narrative that raises significant theological issues, its careful study is an opportunity for the students to both increase their mastery of Hebrew and wrestle with questions of faith central to traditional Judaism.

I observed Barabara, one of the veteran teachers, teaching the seventh graders the first chapter of <u>Jonah</u> and found the integration to be fully in evidence. To illustrate I excerpt from a class she taught during February, 1991.

STUDYING JONAH

Barbara, an artist by training, spent much of her adolescent years living in Israel and still speaks a beautiful Israeli Hebrew. Blessed with a rich Judaica background, she began teaching here as a way of supporting herself, and over the years has become more profesionally involved in Jewish education. Yet her training as a teacher has been on the job teaching this curriculum for the past six years.

When Vicky was the Hebrew coordinator, she designed this curriculum for studying Jonah that follows the principles of the Melton approach. Barbara noted in conversation that while in earlier years she had classes that were less able and more resistant to making this transition, the current class and its predecessor—who began the Melton curriculum in third grade—have been both more positive in attitude and more capable in skill level.

On this day of winter rains, the 5 of 7 students present are using looseleaf texts rather than Hebrew Bibles. The students are given large-print texts that can be written on rather than small-print sacred books. In these editions the students have the Hebrew text without the English translation, but with a dictionary of Hebrew terms to help with word comprehension.

Staci begins reading in Hebrew the first sentence of <u>Jonah</u>: "The Word of the Lord came to Jonah son of Amittai" (7). Barbara asks in modem Hebrew "Who spoke to Jonah?" and "Who is Jonah's father?" She is checking for simple comprehension; Debby and Andrew supply correct single word answers. Barbara reads the next half-sentence and without referring to her dictionary, Nancy translates: "Go at once to Nineveh, that great city, and proclaim judgment upon it."

Debby concludes the second verse by reading in Hebrew, "for their wickedness has come before Me," and starts down the road of a spontaneous translation. She first spots the word ra which she knows means "bad." Barbara asks, "What then is ra'atum?" Debby correctly identifies the suffix as meaning "their" and demonstrates the Melton approach of "breaking down the word" into its component parts. But she is stuck on the word alta (gone up or come before).

Barbara: You know the word aliya. What does it mean?

Staci: A Torah portion.

Barbara: Where do you go for the Torah portion?

Debby: On the bimah.

Barbara: How do you get there?

Debby: You go up.

Barbara: Yes, and that is <u>aliya</u>.

Staci: Couldn't you tell us that?

Barbara: I wanted you to figure it out.

More than helping the students with the meaning of this verb, Barbara is connecting the Hebrew of the Bible to the more familiar Hebrew of synagogue life. She wants them to see that the phrases commonly used in their bar mitzvah preparation have a meaning and history that extend back to the Biblical text.

The class continues with the Hebrew reading: "Jonah, however, started out to flee to Tarshis from the Lord's service." In the previous session the students had done research on the map of the ancient Mediterranean world to identify the geography of the Jonah story. They know that "Tarshis" is a port city located in what today is Sicily. Andrew identifies Nineveh as being in ancient Assyria, which today is Iraq (much in the news as this class takes place during the Gulf War). The students realize that Jonah is fleeing in the opposite direction of Nineveh and consider that Jonah may be hoping that God won't see him if heads in this other direction.

They take on the second half of the third verse: "He went down to Joppa and found a ship going to Tarshis. He paid the fare and went aboard to sail with the others to Tarshis, away from the service of the Lord." Debby remembers the Hebrew for "ship" and Nancy the word for "found." Andrew successfully works on the verb "went down" and identifies "Joppa" as the port city of Jaffa in Israel. Rebekka puzzles out word by word "to sail with the others to Tarshis, away from the service of the Lord." Her skill in translating without the use of a dictionary is impressive.

With the hard work of translating this complex verse completed, Debby comments: "I don't understand why Jonah did not want to do what God asked."

Barbara: What do you think?

Debby: He was afraid they [the people of Nineveh] would kill him.

Barbara: Why would he worry about that?

Andrew: They would capture and torture him. They weren't your 'Hi,

I'm your nice neighbor' type.

Barbara: Are you confusing Nineveh of then with Iraq of today?

Andrew: No! Even then there was conflict between Israel and

Assyria.

Barbara: I'm sorry. You are right. There always were armies,

debates and travel.

Barbara relishes the moments when students open up the discussion and is not about to close off possibilities by herself answering Debby's question. Debby imagines Jonah's fears about being killed by the people of Nineveh, a point that Andrew elaborates. Remembering that Andrew earlier identified Nineveh with the current Iraq, Barbara checks out on which historical plane he is operating. When it is clear Andrew has his history straight, she apologizes and reinforces his point.

Andrew then turns the discussion from Jonah to God.

Andrew: Why does God care about them? They [the people of

Nineveh] don't even believe in God.

Barbara: That's a great question!

Debby: He wanted to be the God of everyone.

Barbara: You mean that His laws are for everyone.

Andrew: It doesn't work that way.

Staci: That's why you have a prophet.

Barbara: You mean that from our perspective, as people who believe in God, we want His word to get to them, and how can it get there

without a prophet?

Staci: Yes.

Andrew: Why should he [Jonah] go? They won't believe him. They will probably torture him.

Debby: If he's scared they will capture him, he should realize God

wouldn't ask him if it was going to hurt him.

Barbara: He should have more faith. If it is not in his best

interest, it is in the best interest of humanity.

Andrew: A prophet of God wouldn't run unless he had a good

reason.

The students enter the Jonah story with the full force of their imaginations as they try to understand the actions of God and Jonah. Andrew is the pragmatist in the discussion. Why should God care about these people who do not even believe im Him? Why should Jonah undertake this mission to Nineveh if it is not likely to succeed and he will end up being tortured for delivering the unwelcome message? Debby and Staci see God as having an important mission to assemplish through the prophet Jonah. God is acting as the divine ruler of the larger world and surely will provide Jonah with the needed protection against the wrath of Nineveh. Andrew, though, cannot see why God is so invested in this mission and is less certain about divine protection.

Barbara limits her role to amplifying their comments and drawing out more explicitly the theological assumptions of the story as she understands them. I am struck by how these students intuit the main themes of Jonah and how willing Barbara is to engage

in theological discussion. In fact the discussion moves from this point more directly to God's role in people's lives.

I observed Barbara's teaching more than any other in the school to get a better sense of how the integration of Hebrew and Judaics works. Barbara, like Rachel in the third grade, is so comfortable with and knowledgeable about Judaism that she tends to include as much reference to Judaic content as the lesson will bear. Not all teachers have that level of comfort and knowledge, but all do at a minimum what Liat did: at holiday time make explicit connections between the learning of Hebrew and the celebrating of the holiday(8).

ARE THE GOALS REALIZED?

In describing the goals of the Melton Curriculum, Ruth Raphaeli writtes that the curriculum "deals with the central themes of traditional Jewish thought", "and im focusing on ideas "is ineluctably also text-oriented (9)." In explaining in an interview his devotion to this Hebrew program, Rabbi Marcus spelled out its goals as he sees it:

We are providing the foundation so that their mastery can be reactivated in later years. But our goal is not just language as language, but really it is critical reading skills. I am enamored of this approach which inculcates and reinforces the skills of critical reading skills which enables us - more in English than in Hebrew - to do text teaching.

In Barbara's class the students demonstrate that they can (1) read the Biblical text and translate it (some word by word and some phrase by phrase) with a degree of fluidity, (2) read with comprehension and ask meaningful questions of the text, and (3) with Barbara's encouragement, engage in a process of inquiry by which they read the text closely and add their own thoughts about what lies behind this narrative and makes it such a compelling story.

Were we to judge whether this Hebrew program achieves its goals on the basis of evidence from Barbara's class, I think the judgment would be overwhelmingly positive. These students excelled in the close reading of the Jonah text as they have displayed their initial mastery of Hebrew language skills. At age 13 they are on the threshold of becoming - as it were - the ideal type of Jew that this synagogue sponsors: one who has the knowledge and commitment to engage with the tradition in an on-going search for ways of leading one's life as a modem Jew in contemporary American society.

On the last day of school in May these seventh graders shared with their fellow students in the Hebrew program the evidence of what they were accomplishing. They staged in Hebrew a short production of Cinderella. Though Barbara wrote the script (using a mixture of biblical and modern Hebrew), the students committed it to memory, and with help of certain props and a generous usage of non-verbal communication, they thoroughly entertained their peers who seemed to easily follow the dramatic action. As Rabbi Marcus said at the conclusion of this assembly, the presentation dramatically illustrated that learning Hebrew is a lively goal in this school to which the younger grades could and should aspire.

THE HEBREW PROGRAM IN CONTEXT

But Barbara's class is not the whole story. They represent the seven best students in the seventh grade. In the room next to Barbara's class was Richard's class who did not enjoy the same quality of teaching or reach the same level of Hebrew achievement. When I asked the Hebrew coordinator to explain the discrepancy in levels of achievement, she pointed not to differences in the children's native capacities, but to the different histories that these classes had in the school. Barbara's students had continuously attended the five hours of mid-week Hebrew instruction while several of Richard's students returned to that track in sixth grade after choosing a less intensive Hebrew program in earlier grades. They had fallen behind and never quite caught up to Barbara's students who, because of their abilities, had received an accelerated Hebrew curriculum.

That Hebrew study came to Temple Akiba as a voluntary option has remained a significant factor to the present day. While the synagogue leadership has invested heavily in supporting the three day program (Sunday, Tuesday, and Thursday), a family whose child is entering the third grade of religious school can choose one of three options: the three days of schooling a week, Sunday in school with a once-a-week tutor in Hebrew at home, only Sunday. In 1990-91, of the total population of 236 students in grades 3 to 7, 126 attended for three days, 85 attended on Sunday and had a tutor during the week, 20 attended on Sunday only and 5 attended a mid-week class for students with special needs.

During this year the religious school committee, working closely with Rabbii Marcus, decided to change the school's policy and institute a new policy of "mandatorry Hebrew." That meant there would no longer be a third option of choosing Sunday only and all the children would have to attend some mid-week Hebrew. This proposal was greeted with protest from some vocal parents who thought it was wrong to institute a "mandatory Hebrew" policy that went against the temple's ideological grain of providing people with choices on how to be Jewish. Yet, the proposal was adopted by the board of trustees. Hebrew was now "mandatory," but the three day program was not. As Rabbii Marcus confided, the proposal would never have carried if it had eliminated the second option of Sunday plus the tutorial at home. Too many families were invested in keeping that option to call its legitimacy into question(10).

Yet Rabbi Marcus and the Hebrew coordinator are convinced—as we can see with Richard's class—that it makes a big difference to children's education if they come to regular classes for Hebrew or are tutored at home. One hour of tutoring cannot cover what is learned in two hours of classes, and in addition, there are the socialization benefits of regular school attendance that are attentuated when the study is at home. Rabbi Marcus contends that three day attendance is the best predictor for continued attendance in the temple high school, for the children who attend for all three days make the deeper connection to the school and want to continue the relationship into their high school years([1]).

BEST PRACTICE IN PERSPECTIVE

Thus a more complex picture emerges. The Temple Akiba school illustrates that a symagogue school can effectively put into place a demanding curriculum—such as the Melton Hebrew Language Program—if the synagogue invests in a well-paid teaching staff, a good system of supervision and a principal who is fully committed to realizing the articulated goals of the program. But even with the curriculum in place, it may not be the case that all the students make the commitment to learn the maximum that the program can teach. At Temple Akiba the best students do their teachers proud, but many of the students, while certainly learning, do not realize the full potential of learning that their school offers.

Perhaps, for some, seeing the larger picture at Temple Akiba will disqualify this Hebrew program from being considered an example of "best practice." If only 126 of 231 elligible students are taking the full program, it may by definition not be "best practice."

I see the matter differently. The clergy and educators at Temple Akiba have a clear picture of what they hope to achieve in their educational programs. They have selected the Melton Hebrew Language Program as a vehicle for arriving at some of those goals. They have not compromised in their efforts to put this program in place as effectively as they could. But they have compromised with the history and social realities of this temple. They have moved ahead with a program while leaving primarily in place a congregational legacy of Hebrew study as voluntary.

"Best practice" in my view refers to the quality of educational practice that is observable from careful observation. It is not the same as "effective education"— or the producing of the highest average level of achievement. If this program be "best practice," it is because the teaching and learning within it are judged to be of high quality, because the goals that it sets for itself are largely met. We may regret = as these rabbis do = that in Temple Akiba, given its history and population, universal attendance in the three day program is not currently an attainable goal; but that does not take away from the quality of the Hebrew program it offers.

"Best practice" programs are a joy to observe. Their presence helps restore our confidence in what it is possible to achieve in a synagogue context. But they are not panacea. Even when such programs exist, the work of convincing reluctant Jewish families to take

full advantage of what they offer is likely to continue. Even excellence cannot conquer ambivalence.

NOTES

- II. See D.W. Winnicott The Child. The Family and the Outside World (Middlesex, England: Penguin Books, 1964) for further elaboration on the concept of "good enough" that appears in Winnicott's dicsussion of mothering. See my The Synagogue as a Context for Jewish Education (Cleveland, Commission on Jewsih Education in North America, 1990) for discussion of both the critique of supplementary Jewish education and the research effort to search for "good" synagogue schools.
- 2. "Temple Akiba" is a pseudonym as are all the other names used to describe the staff and students of this synagogue.
- 3. See <u>Jewish Supplementary Schooling</u>: An <u>Educational System in Need of Change</u> (New York: The Board of Jewish Education of Greater New York, 1988) for effort to evaluate the level of Hebrew learning among students in 40 synagogue schools in the New York area. "Comversational Hebrew" ranked lowest among all ten subjects they surveyed in terms of levels of Jewish knowledge (p.84).
- 4. For a full statement on the goals of the Melton Hebrew Language Program, see Ruth Rahaeli, "The Melton Curriculum and the Melton Hebrew Language Program for Afternoon Hebrew Schools," in <u>Studies in Jewish Education</u>, Volume 4, (Jerusalem, Hebrew University, 1989).
- 5. For a classical treatment of an ambitious curricular project that failed in part due to lack of proper teacher involvement and training, see Seymour B. Sarason, The Culture of the School and the Problem of Change (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1974), chapter 4.
- 6. The Parent Handbook distributed to each set of parents is a 45

page document that provides not only information on the school, but also extended statements on curricular goals and school policy. It is a rare excercise in spelling out in writing what the principal and staff see as the rationale for the education they provide.

- 7. Rather than quote these biblical verses in the original Hebrew as they were read in class, I am supplying their translated versions that come from the <u>Tanakh</u> (Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1985).
- 8. Passover was the holiday for which I observed the greatest preparation in the Hebrew program. Regular Hebrew instruction was interrupted over a period of several days of instruction for teachers, with the coordinators help, to do a unit on Passover. Different grades took different angles on the holiday, but there was a regular emphasis on introducing Hebrew terms that were central to the holiday's celebration.
- 9. Raphaeli, p. 1122.
- 110. The rationale that Rabbi Marcus offered for why the school had to offer the tutoring option is that there are two types of students who legitimately cannot come to the regular mid-week Hebrew program. They are students who live in suburbs geographically distant from the synagogue and students who attend private schools that have mandatory sports programs on those afternoons. But besides these students, there are others who live closer and attend public schools, but choose this arrangement for its convenience. They choose it though the school discourages the option and charges the family \$940 per student per year to pay for the tutor whom the school hires and supervises. Tutors teach the same Melton curriculum that is offered in the school; this is not bar mitzvah tutoring. Tutors report back to the coordinator on the progress of each student. Some students, as in the case of Richard's class, return to the regular program after a year or two of tutoring.
- 11. Figures on continued attendance beyond 7th grade the year of bar and bat mitzvah are not broken down by the Hebrew program attended. Of the 43 seventh graders in 1989, 42 continued onto to 8th grade. Of those, 28 continued onto 9th grade. Clearly 8th grade attendance was not contingent on Hebrew program attended, and I do not know beyond the rabbi' statement how that factor influenced choice of remaining for 9th grade. These figures refer to continuing attendance at the temple's 1 day a week high school that runs from 8th to 12th grade.

June, 1992

COUNCIL FOR INITIATIVES IN JEWISH EDUCATION

Board of Directors

Morton L. Mandel, Chair Charles Goodman, Vice Chair Neil Greenbaum, Vice Chair Matthew Maryles, Vice Chair Lester Pollack, Vice Chair

Max Fisher, Honorary Chair

David Amow
Mandell Berman
Charles Bronfman
Gerald Cohen
John Colman
Maurice Corson
Susan Crown
Irwin Field
Alfred Gottschalk
Arthur Green
Thomas Hausdorff
David Hirschhom
Ludwig Jesselson

Henry Koschitzky
Mark Lainer
Norman Lamm
Seymour Martin Lipset
Florence Melton
Melvin Merians
Charles Ratner
Esther Leah Ritz
Richard Scheuer
Ismar Schorsch
Isadore Twersky
Bennett Yanowitz

Consultants. Advisors and Staff

Henry L. Zucker, Executive Director

Shulamith Elster Seymour Fox Adam Gamoran Ellen Goldring Annette Hochstein Roberta Goodman Stephen Hoffman Barry Holtz Martin Kraar Virginia Levi James Meier Arthur Naparstek Arthur Rotman Claire Rottenberg Julie Tammivaara Jacob Ukeles Jonathan Woocher

Holtz--2



To: CIJS Interested Parties

From: Barry W. Holtz Re: FHot Projects February 22,,1993

We have spent some time talking about the concept of the "Pilot Projects"* for the Lead Communities. In this memo I will put down some ideas that Shulamith Sister and I have been thinking about that may help our discussions about the Pilots.

A Pilot Project is an initiative undertaken by a Lead Community in its start-up phase, even before the planning process is completed. The purpose of the Pilots is to "jump start" the process for change / " the Lead Communities as well as to build local enthusiasm for the Communities Project. In addition Pilot Projects can help in the planning process or test on a small scale what may later be attempted in a larger context.

All Pilot Projects should be centered around the two main "directives" of the CIJE, as stated in A Time to Aut: a) builth community support for Jewish education; b) build the personnel of the professsion of Jewish education.

Shulsmith and I have conceptualized three different "cuts" into the Pilots ((which we call Pilot A, B and C), all or some of which can be launched in each Lead Community.

Pilot A

Pilot A is a series of consultations -- an ongoing educational seminar -- by the CUE and its guest consultants developed for the Lead Community Commission. Its purpose is to help the Lead Com-'Inities plan, envision and launch the implementation of educational These consultations would, in essence, form the beginnings of the "content" side of the planning process outlined in the Lead Communities Planning Guide ((see specifically pp. 31-33)).

The "curriculum" of these consultations would be based on the work of the Best Practices Project. Shulamith and I would lead ((or arrange for other consultants to lead)) a presentation and discussion about each of the areas in the project: supplementary schools, early childhood Jewish educatiom, the Israel Experience, JCCs, day schools, the college campus, adult educatiom, camping, and community-wide initiatives (those programs in training, recruitment, board development, etc. that have been done at the community level such as Federation or BJE). In addition, we will devote sessions to the process of implementing change in educational settings.

Holtz--3

Where the publications of the Best Practices Project are available (@.g. the supplementary school), we will use those volumes as the "text"; where they are not available, experts in the field who are working on the project will present to the group.

The seminar will also include presentations from educators in the Best Practices sites and visits by the Lead Communities Commission (or relevant task forces within it) to actual Best Practices sites.

Pilot B

Pilot A works at the level of community leadership; Pilot B aims at the <u>educational</u> leadership in the local Lead Community. It focuses on the introduction of new ideas into the the community. Here we could imagine a similar approach to Pilot A, but with a different audience: sessions with relevant educational leaders based around the Best Practices Project; visits to sites; visits from Best Practices practitioners.

Pilot C

Pilot C aims to be less oriented on planning and more focused on practical skills, for a number of different potential papulations:

#1: The Rabbis Seminar for supplementary schools. Based on Joseph Reimer's work for the Commission, this would be a mini-course for local rabbis on improving their supplementary school. It would include visits by rabbis the Best Practices Project supplementary schools. This could be organized by the denominations or transdenominationally.

#2: The Supervisor Level: a mini-course oriented toward the principals of schools or agency directors around some skills important for their work-- leadership in education, supervision, board relations, etc.

: The "front line soldier": a project oriented for the teachers in the field. This might include an inservice project for early child-hood teachers, an Israel oriented program etc. It is likely that these could come from national training and service organizations.

Examples:

The Melton Research Center/JTS has proposed an intensive program on teaching using the arts for the Baltimore BJE. This project could serve as a Pilot C, #3 project.

The Hebrew University's Melton Centre has proposed developing a numbox of Emptional for the Centre has proposed developing a numfrom each community to the Senior Educator program; b) using the

Hollitz--4

melton Mini-School in the Lead Communities to provide Jewish content knowledge for early childhood educators, etc. c) A Seminar in Israel could be arranged for principals of Lead Communities dayschools to prepare them for bringing their staff the next summer.

Yeshiva University could be approached to offer a program for Lead Comfamiltime day school teachers.

August 4, 1992

Monitoring, Evaluation, and Feedback in Lead Communities — Tentative Plan of Work for 1992-93

IL CONTENT

For lead communities, 1992-93 will be a planning year. The agenda for the evaluation project is to raise questions that will (a) stimulate and assist the planning process; (b) enumerate the goals that lead communities intend to address; and (c) identify current practice so that progress towards goals can be assessed in the future. Broadly, the field researchers will raise three questions:

- (1) 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? To what extent do these visions crystallize ower the course of the planning year (1992-1993)?
- (2) What is the extent of community mobilization for Jewish education? Who is involved, and who is not? How broad is the coalition supporting the CIJE's efforts? How deep is participation within the various agencies? For example, beyond a small core of lleaders, is there grass-roots involvement in the community? To what extent is the community mobilized financially as well as in manpower?
- (3) 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 faculties cohesive, or fragmented?? Do principals have offices? What are the physical conditions of classrooms? Is there administrative support for innovation among teachers?

Visions of reform. The issue of goals was not addressed in A Time to Act. The commission report never specified what changes should occur as a result of improving Jewish education, beyond the most general aim of Jewish continuity. Specifying goals is a challenging enterprise given the diversity within the Jewish community. Nonetheless, the lead communities project cannot advance—and it certainly cannot be evaluated—without a compilation of the desired outcomes.

For purposes of the evaluation project, we will take goals to mean outcomes that are desired within the lead communities. We anticipate uncovering multiple goals, and we expect persons in different segments of the community to hold different and sometimes conflicting preferences. Our aim is not to adjudicate among competing goals, but to uncover and spell out the visions for change that are held across the community. To some extent, goals that emerge in lead communities will be clearly stated by participants. Other goals, however, will be implicit in plans and projects, and the evaluation team will need to tease them out. The evaluation project will consider both short-term and long-term goals.

Another reason for focusing on visions is that a lack of clear goals has hindered the success of many previous reform efforts in general education. For example, the New Futures Initiative, an effort by the Casey Foundation to invigorate educational and community services in four inner-city communities, was frustrated by poor articulation between broad goals and specific programs. Although the communities were mobilized for reform, the connections between community leaders and front-line educators did not promote far-reaching programs for fundamental changes. New programs were generally supplemental, and they tended to produce superficial changes.

Questions related to visions include asking about anticipated obstacles, about overcoming barriers between segments of the Jewish community, and about how participants foresee moving from goals to implementation. By asking questions about visions, the evaluation project will not only document goals, but will help persons at all levels of the lead communities project—lay leaders, parents, educators, and other Jewish professionals—to think about their visions of the future. This process may lead to interactive thinking about goals, and may help the communities avoid purely top-down or bottom-up strategies.

It will be important to consider the concreteness of the visions in each community. Do the visions include a concept of implementation, or do ideas about goals remain abstract? Do participants recognize a link between their visions of change and the structure they have established to bring about change?

Community mobilization. According to A Time to Act, mobilizing community support for Jewish education is a "building block" of the lead communities project, a condition that is essential to the success of the endeavor. This involves recruiting lay leaders and educating them about the importance of education, as well as increasing the financial resources that are committed to education. The Report quotes one commissioner as saying, "The challenge is that by the year 2000, the vast majority of these community leaders should see education as a burning issue and the rest should at least think it is important. When this is achieved.... momey will be available to finance fully the massive program envisioned by the Commission (p. 64)."

Recent advances in educational theory also emphasize the importance of community-wide, "systemic" reform instead of innovations in isolated programs. Educational change is more likely to succeed, according to this view, when it occurs in a broad, supportive context, and when there is widespread consensus on the importance of the enterprise. Hence, an important issue for the evaluation of lead communities is the breadth and depth of participation in the project. What formal and informal linkages exist among the various agencies of the community? Which agencies participate in the visions of change that have been articulated?

As part of their applications lead communities are proposing planning processes for the first year of work. In studying mobilization in the communities, we need to observe how this planning process unfolds. Is the stated design followed? Are departures from initial plans helpful or harmful? Is there broad participation? Are the planners developing thoughtful materials? We will need to describe the decision-making process. Is it open or closed? Are decisions pragmatic or wishful?

The professional lives of Jewish educators. Enhancing the profession of Jewish education is the second critical building block specified in A Time to Act. The Report claims that fundamental improvement in Jewish education is not possible without radical change in areas such as recruitment, training, salaries, career tracks, and empowerment of educators. Hence, the evaluation project will establish baseline conditions which can serve as standards for comparison in future years.

Field research may center on characteristics and conditions of educators including background and training, salaries, and degree of satisfaction with salaries; school facilities; cohesiveness of school faculties cohesive; administrative support for innovation; and so on. Additionally we will observe a subset of educational programs that are in place as the lead communities project begins. These observations will be used as baseline data for comparative purposes in subsequent years. We will try to consider programs which, according to the visions articulated in the community, seem ripe for change.

II. METHODS

In the long term (e.g., four years?) it is possible to think about quantitative assessment of educational change in lead communities. This assessment would involve limited surveys that would be administered in 1993-94 and repeated perhaps every two years. For the present, the evaluation project will make only limited use of quantitative data, relying mainly on information gathered by the community itself, such as participation rates, trends in funding, teacher turnover, etc. The bulk of the assessment carried out by the evaluation project, at least during the first two years, will emphasize qualitative assessment of the process of change in lead communities. The main methodological tools will be interviews and observations.

Snowball sampling for interviews. A "snowball" technique for selecting interview respondents appears appropriate here. In this approach, the researcher identifies an initial group of respondents, and adds to the list of subjects by asking each interviewe to suggest additional respondents. At some point in an interview, for example, the researcher might ask, "Who else is involved in (program x)? Who else is a leader in this area in this community?" Subsequently, the researcher interviews some of those named by previous subjects, particularly if new subjects are named by more than one previous informant.

In the snowball approach, it is important to begin with multiple starting points, so that one does not become confined to a narrow clique within the community. We might use the following three starting points from which we would snowball outward:

- (1) Key actors identified in the lead communities proposal from each community.
- (2) A list of leaders of all community organizations that are involved in education, possibly prepared by the head of the local Jewish federation. The list must include leaders of any organizations that are not participating in the lead communities project.
- (3) Random samples of educators and lay persons not included in (1) or (2).

These samples should clarify the social ecology of the Jewish community.

Aims of evaluation. The purpose of the evaluation, especially in the first two years, is weighted more towards developing policy than towards program accountability. Feedback on the process is seen as much more important than summative evaluation, at the present time. We suspect that most Jewish educators recognize that Jewish education is not succeeding, and will understand that the field researchers are not there to document their failures. Instead, the field researchers can serve the educators and their communities by helping them reflect on their situations and by serving as mirrors in which their programs can be viewed alongside their goals.

In one sense, the evaluation project does emphasize accountability. By the end of the first year, lead communities are expected to have well-articulated visions for change, and implementation plans developed. The evaluation project will help judge whether the processes within the lead communities are leading towards these outcomes, and will assess progress toward these general goals in the spring of 1993.



Received: by HUJIVMS via NJE ((HUyMail-W6k); Wed,, 27 Jan 93 12:39:28 +0200

Received: from RL.IB by UKACRL.BITNET ((Mailer R2.07)) with BSMTP id 1332; Wed,

27 Jan 93 10:38:36 GMT

Received: ffrom RL.IB by UK.AC.RL.IB ((Mailer R2.07)) with BSMTP id 7/118; Wed, 27

Jan 93 10:38:34 GMT

Via: UJK AAC .FED .FFRCCVAXX; 227 JAAN 993 1100:3388 311 GMTT

Date: Weed, 2277 JAAN 983 1100:3399:0014

Firom: FFKJC686FFRCWAX FEDINBURGH.AAC.UKK

To: ammestite@inujjivmas

Subject: "tips" for speaking about evaluation to Fed execs.

Sender: JANET "EKICES@UK.AC.EDINBURGH.ERCVAX"

<EKJC68@ERCVAX.EDINBURGH.AC.UK>

RATIONALE FOR THE PROJECT

How will we know whether the lead communities have succeeded im creating better structures and processes for Jewish education? On what basis will CIJE 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 success.

By <monitoring> we mean observing and documenting the planning and implementation of changes. <Evaluation> means interpreting information in a way that will strengthen and assist each community's efforts to improve Jewish education. <Feedback> will cour in the form of oral and written responses to community members and to the CIJE.

Better affect towards Jewish institutions? We will use our study of

the process of change to elicit the goals of the project that are particular to the three communities taking part.

The lead communities project is a direct result of A TIME TO ACT. Although that document provided the essential blueprint for the project, it was silent on the question of outcomes.

One contribution of the early stages of the evaluation project will be to enumerate the variety of specific goals envisioned within the lead communities.

Despite the ambiguity about goals at present, there are a few uncontroversial outcomes. For example, all would agree that imcreased participation in Jewish institutions by the Jews of the community is desirable. This type of measure can be monitored from the outset.

FIELD RESEARCH IN LEAD COMMUNITIES

Studying the process of change in lead communities should be a major component of the CIJE strategy. Documenting the process is especially important because the effects of innovation may not be manifested for several years. For example, suppose Community X manages to guadruple 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 cannout be detected immediately, it is important to obtain a qualitative sense of the extent to which the professional educators are being used effectively.

Jtudying the process is also important in the case of unsuccessful immovation. 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 point at which the process broke down.

It is essential to begin monitoring the process of change as soon as possible -- ideally before the change process actually begins. There are three reasons to commence this study early on:

((1) In order to understand change, it is obviously essential to gather baseline information before the change has occurred. Baseline information means not only essential quantitative data, such as enrollment figures, but understanding of the structure and culture of the community at the outset. What ideas about Jewish education are prevalent? How are these ideas, or visioms, distributed through the community? What is the nature of leadership and communication in this community? To what extent is the community mobilized for Jewish educatiom?

What characterizes the professional lives of Jewish educators? Answers to these questions must be chronicled to strengthen the collective memory for later comparison.

The earlier the evaluation staff is present, the sooner they can obtain a general background understanding of the community, and can also establish a positive rapport with community members. That way they are less likely to miss or misinterpret changes that occur once the implementation begins.

((2) The early presence of evaluation staff can help stimulate new visions for Jewish education and can heighten the mobilization of the community. Lead communities have the opportunity to consider dramatically restructured approaches to

Jewish education in addition to modifications of existing programs. By asking community members about their visions for

the future, and by providing feedback that facilitates communication about such visions, the evaluation project can encourage a constructive dialogue within the communities.

((4) The CIJE is a long-term enterprise, not a one-shot deal. There is every chance that more lead communities will be created in the next three, five, or ten years. We need to learn about the launching and gearing-up process so other communities can learn from this

experience. For example, very little is known about mobilizing lay persons in support of education. We need to watch how this occurs so other communities can follow.

To carry out this task, we have hired a team of three FIELD RESEARCHERS.

One researcher is based in each community, but they will all spend time in all three communities. This is because they have complementary strengths — they differ in their expertise as researchers, and in their knowledge of Jewish education — and because keeping more than one pair of eyes on a situation provides both a check and a stimulus for deeper interpretation.

The design of the lead communities project calls for each community of carry out a self-study, which presumably would include imformation on community composition, population trends, and emrollment figures. The field researchers are prepared to assist in this process, but they cannot be its primary agents, lest they have no time for their other activities.

For next year, we are proposing a survey component to the evaluation

project, which would gather baseline data on affective, behavioral, and cognitive outcomes, probably from a selected youth cohort within each community. We hope to proceed with the surveys despite the lack of consensus about goals, because of the overriding importance of gathering some form of baseline data on outcomes which can be tracked over the years. The surveys would incorporate community imput into their design.

I or the Advanced Study and Development 1)1" Jewish Education

AGENDA

THE LEAD COMMUNITIES PROJECT SIMULATION SEMINAR TUESDAY, APRIL 27 - 29, 1993

Participants: Harriet Blumberg, Ami Bouganim, Seymour Fox, Annette Hochstein, Alan Hoffmann, Marshall Levin, Daniel Marom, Oriana Or, Marc Rosenstein, Carmela Rotem, Shmuel Wygoda.

- 1) Introduction
- 2) Communities Updates.
- 3) The Lead Communities project as a systemic approach to change.
- 4) The Goals Project.
- 5) The role of the denominations and the training institutions in the Lead Communities project.
- 6) Immediate recruitement and training of personnel for the Lead Communities.
- 7) Pilot Projects.
- 8) Monitoring Evaluation and Feedback
- 9) Best Practices
- 10))) I lowards the May seminar in Cleveland.

MAIN ELEMENTS

- A) THE LEAD COMMUNITIES PROJECT AS A SYSTEMIC APPROACH TO CHANGE
- B) THE GOALS PROJECT
- C) THE ROLE OF THE DENOMINATIONS & THE TRAINING INSTITUTIONS IN THE LEAD COMMUNITIES PROJECT
- D) IMMEDIATE RECRUITMENT AND TRAINING OF PERSONNEL FOR THE LEAD COMMUNITIES
- E) BEST PRACTICES
- F) PILOT PROJECTS
- G) MONITORING, EVALUATION & FEEDBACK

A) THE LEAD COMMUNITIES PROJECT AS A SYSTEMIC APPROACH TO CHANGE

TOPICS & ISSUES

- 1) The difference between enabling & programmatic options
- 2) Community mobilization:
 - a) The concept
 - b) Wall-to-wall coalition—lay leaders, rabbis, educators & professionals
- 3) The shortage of personnel:
 - a) Training plan
 - b) Strategies
- 4) Dealing with goals at the level of the entire community
- 5) Relationship between formal & informal education
- 6) Comprehensive & planned approach to:
 - Content
 - Scope
 - Quality

RELATED READING MATERIAL

- Marshall Smith & Jennifer O'Day: "Systemic School Reform," pp. 233-267
- A Time to Act
- Lead Communities program guidelines
- Annette Hochstein: "Lead Communities at Work"
- CUE Planning Guide
- Adam Gamoran: "The Challenge of Systemic Reform: Lessons From the New Futures Initiatives for the CIJE"
- Commission on Jewish Education in North America: Background materials to meetings 3, 4, 5

OPERATIONAL IMPLICATIONS. E.G.:

- Launch through meeting between CIJE board member & local lay "champion"
- Presentation & discussion of the idea with various constituencies: rabbis, educators, lay leaders, community professionals
- Creation & operation of local commissions (wall-to-wall)
- Appointed project director
- Planning process including research & planning (e.g., Educators' Survey)

TOPICS & ISSUES

- 1) The importance of goals (see also general education)
- 2) The need to articulate goals for effective evaluation
- 3) The discussion of goals (at the local & institutional level) as a means for aspiration to excellence.
- 4) The role of the denominations in the discussion on goals
- 5) The educational role of the training institutions in the discussion on goals
- 6) The "Educational Audit" of the community & its educational settings
- 7) The Educated Jew Project
- 8) Relationship between goals & accountability

RELATED READING MATERIAL

- Sara Lightfoot: The Good High-Schools ast ... <u>Athagsacularing Aradires Lankingh-schools</u>, pp. 316-323
- David Cohen; The Shopping Mall High-School,
 pp. 304-309
- Marshall Smith & Jennifer 0, Day: "Systemic School Reform," pp. 233-267
- Seymour Fox & Daniel Marom: "Goals for Jewish Education in Lead Communities"

OPERATIONAL IMPLICATIONS, E.G.:

- Generate discussions on goals at the local institutional & community level
- Gather & sort material on goals produced by local institutions & communities
- Establish links between local institutions & denominations/training institutions to address the issue of goals
- Develop modes of accountability that with address the suggested goals
- Introduce the Educated Jew Project

C) THE ROLE OF THE DENOMINATIONS & THE TRAINING INSTITUTIONS IN THE LEAD COMMUNITIES PROJECT

TOPICS & ISSUES

- 1) Most of the Jewish educational system in North America related "de facto" to the denominations
- 2) Educational "pre-service" and "in-service" training in North America by and large denominations (!
- 3) What are the main institutions which are perceived as primary educational resources by the local communities & institutions (personnel, curriculum, etc.)
- 4) The role of the denominations & training institutions with regards to the "Goals Project"
- 5) The issue of goals for communal organizations & community organizations (not related to religious denominations, e.g., JCCs)
- B) MAP Arcinto # ### ## ##

RELATED READING MATERIAL

• A Time to Act

OPERATIONAL IMPLICATIONS, E.G.:

- Forge workable links between lead communities
 & training institutions & religious denominations
 to define appropriate roles
- CIJE work with training institutions & religious denominations

OF PERSONNEL FOR THE LEAD COMMUNITIES COMMUNITIES

TOPICS & ISSUES

- 1) Immediate infusion of additional talent to the communities
- 2) Immediate response to shortage of personnel
- 3) Systematic upgrading of the Jewish educational system
- 4) Introduction of systemic ongoing in-service training

RELATED READING MATERIAL

- Aryeh Davidson: "The Preparation of Jewish Educators in North America: A Status Report" (A report submitted to the Commission on Jewish Education in North America)
- A Time to Act

OPERATIONAL IMPLICATIONS, E.G.::

- Identify potential quality personnel in each lead
 community and set up immediate training
 program for each
- Immediate recruitment of personnel from existing training programs for senior personnel in Jewish education, e.g., Jerusalem Fellows, Melton Senior Educators Program, etc.
- Set-up of recruitment programs designed to serve the lead community for middle- and long-range

TOPICS & ISSUES

- 1) Best Practices as an inventory of "success stories" in Jewish education
- 2) The distinction between "good" and "ideal" practices in education
- 3) The need to define features which generate good practices
- 4) The attempt to determine pre-conditions for the replicability (translation) of these features
- 5) Initial areas in which Best Practices will be developed:
 - Supplementary schools
 - Day schools
 - Early childhood programs
 - Israel experience
 - JCCs
 - College campus programming
 - Camping/youth programs
 - Adult education
- 6) Best Practices in the supplementary school: Initial findings & implementation

RELATED READING MATERIAL

- Barry W. Holtz: "The Best Practices Project"
- Barry W. Holtz: "Best Practices Project: The Supplementary School!/" CLJE

OPERATIONAL IMPLICATIONS, E.G.:

- Presenting the findings of the supplementary school to the various institutions & educators in the lead communities
- Training seminars for various constituencies (lay leaders, educators, rabbis)
- Initial project: Best practices in supplementary schools—training educators for specific applications

TOPICS & ISSUES

- 1) Jump-start the process & show progress
- 2) Respond to immediate needs in the communities
- 3) Initial try-out of some of the ideas
- 4) Establish networking amongst the three lead communities
- 5) Examples of pilot projects:
 - a) In-service training for principals, JCC execs, teachers (formal & informal)
 - b) Israel summer seminar

G) MONITORING, EVALUATION & FEEDBACK FEEDBACK

TOPICS & ISSUES

- 1) MEF as the tool to document the entire lead communities project & gauge its success
- 2) MEF as basis for broadening the lead communities project & diffusing some of its programs
- 3) The two main aspects of the MEF project::
 - a) What is the <u>process</u> of change in the lead communities (qualitative & quantitative data, monitoring & evaluation)
 - b) What are the <u>outcomes</u> of change in the lead communities (relation to Goals Project)
- 4) The role of the field researchers:
 - a) Gather baseline information before the change has occurred
 - b) Attend meetings & interview participants in the Jewish educational community, in order to monitor progress of efforts put in the project
 - c) Help (through their presence & work) stimulate new visions for Jewish education in the community
- 5) Building the feedbdack loop

RELATED READING MATERIAL

- Adam Gamoran: "Monitoring, Evaluation & Feedback in Lead Communities—Tenative Plan of Work for 1992-93 (August 1992)
- Adam Gamoran: Update from January 1993