



THE JACOB RADER MARCUS CENTER OF THE  
**AMERICAN JEWISH ARCHIVES**

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

---

Box  
D-1

Folder  
2003

CIJE correspondence, 1995-1996.

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

---

Date: Tue, 16 Jan 1996 12:54:36 -0600 (CST)  
From: GAMORAN@ssc.wisc.edu  
To: annetteh@umich.edu, GOLDRIEB@ctrvax.Vanderbilt.Edu,  
73321.1220@compuserve.com  
Subject: minutes from yesterday -- comments welcome

Minutes of meeting in Ann Arbor, MI, 1/15/95  
Ad: Gamoran, Ellen Goldring, Annette Hochstein, Alan Hoffmann  
Minutes prepared by Adam Gamoran

I. In the first part of the meeting, we discussed an overall strategy for MEF which consists of three "prongs": evaluation of CIJE programs, policy-oriented research, and influencing CIJE's strategic agenda.

#### A. Evaluation of CIJE programs

Our current activity in this area is the evaluation of TEI. We described our approach briefly but did not debate the content of the evaluation. Alan noted that standards of evidence is an important question. For example, how will we know that changes reported after TEI are real changes? There was consensus about evaluating change in communities as the approach to evaluating CIJE initiatives (as contrasted with evaluating changes in individuals or evaluating CIJE itself).

#### B. Policy-oriented research

Annette reminded us that this came about because originally we had no programs to evaluate, and our mobilization reports were of limited usefulness. As it turned out, our analyses of educators have had a major impact on CIJE's activities. Annette recommended a new project that could have similar impact, namely a study of content in Jewish education. Alan pointed out that calling for this research assumes that richer content leads to more learning, and Adam and Ellen indicated that substantial research in general education supports this assumption. Ellen observed that there could be political difficulties in analyzing content because of variation across the movements, e.g. Orthodox vs. reform. Adam suggested using indicators of depth, higher order thinking, and substantive conversation to indicate the quality of content, without valuing one specific Jewish content over another. Ellen noted that many Jews do not care about content in Jewish education because they are seeking affective outcomes. In response, Annette suggested we need to convince people that better content leads to better affect.

Adam noted that a study of content could include informal as well as formal settings. He argued that to be meaningful, it would have to include observations of interactions between educators and learners, and this would make it a very large undertaking.

No decision was reached on Annette's suggestion, but we will discuss it with the CIJE NY staff.

#### C. Influencing CIJE's strategic agenda

We discussed various modes of operation, and reached consensus that it is appropriate for MEF to describe and analyze the changes through which CIJE has gone, for consideration by the director, the advisory board, and the steering committee.

\*Note from Adam: In light of our subsequent discussion, I do not think there is a mandate for MEF to evaluate CIJE's operation and changes over the past four years.

MEF can also influence CIJE's strategic agenda by making a case for particular interpretations of data, for new data collections,

II. In the second part of the meeting, we discussed how we might structure a process of reviewing what we have learned about CIJE and its work. The more we discussed the idea, the less convinced we became that this would be a fruitful exercise. We postponed a firm decision for a conference call scheduled for Wednesday, Jan. 31, at 3:00pm Eastern Time, but we left the meeting leaning against this idea. For the record, I will summarize our discussion.

#### A. Audience and schedule

The audience would be an internal one consisting of the CIJE staff, including the new director, and the MEF advisory committee including possible new members.

The best date seemed to be July 3, 1996. Other possibilities were August 21, 1996 or some time in November, 1996.

#### B. Content

Alan initiated a list of nine topics that could be examined in a review process:

1. the idea of CIJE
2. Lead Communities
3. content and goals
4. community mobilization and lay leadership
5. building the profession
6. the role of MEF
7. the intersection of 3, 4, 5, and 6
8. why informal education (and other topics) have been left out so far
9. the challenges ahead

After some discussion of difficulties in examining this list, noting its vast scope and the need to avoid a simplistic chronological approach, Alan suggested a more thematic approach:

1. Does the model of federation as convener, developing a coalition of lay leadership, and focusing on professional development work?
2. Is it possible to think about systemic change without visions of educational outcomes?
3. Is working at the national and local levels simultaneously an effective strategy?
4. How has the problem of limited human capacity affected CIJE's endeavors?
5. How has the role of the synagogue and rabbi figured in what has occurred in the communities in which CIJE has worked?

The idea here would be to take three or four seminal questions and subject them to intense examination, possibly along with a cross-community mobilization report. Ellen suggested that such questions could be addressed through different lenses that represent different approaches to studying change. Annette expressed concern that this procedure, while interesting, may not lead to concrete policy decisions.

After further discussion it became apparent that MEF did not have enough information to examine questions with this broad scope. Alan then suggested a more modest approach, where the questions



... have we learned from MEF?" "What has MEF taught us about CIJE's work in communities?" While this approach is feasible in that we have plenty of evidence to answer the questions, it's not clear how much we would learn, and whether it would contribute substantially to CIJE's strategic thrust.

The idea of the review will be discussed at the staff meeting on Jan 21, and in a conference call of Annette, Alan, Ellen, and Adam on Jan 31, when a final decision will be reached.

**\*\*Note from Adam:** If we decided against the review, Adam and Ellen will still prepare a substantial briefing for the new director, addressing the question of what we have learned from MEF. Thus, this important function of the review would not be lost, even if we decide not to hold the review.

III. Next, Alan provided an update on the Evaluation Institute. He discussed its aims, how it fits into CIJE's mission, and the steps we are taking to bring it about. We listed elements of a possible curriculum for the Institute, including:

- The CIJE Study of Educators
- CIJE's experiences in community mobilization
- Ilana' Shohamy's assessment of Hebrew in day schools
- the Nativ study of the Israel Experience
- a manual for program evaluation in Jewish education

This last item, a nuts-and-bolts manual for program evaluation, must be produced by CIJE by August 1996. Alan will hire someone to write this manual.

IV. Adam gave an update on publications in the pipeline, including:

- 3-city ed leaders report (on hold)
- 3-city teachers report (will be distributed shortly)
- memos on TEI (doc #1 to be discussed at Jan 22 staff mtg)
- teacher power and teacher in-service (due Jan 31)
- "levers" paper (revision pending new analysis)
- leaders paper for AERA (will be completed by April)

We then discussed possible ideas for new policy briefs. Alan expressed the concern that policy briefs must be accompanied by plans for action, including CIJE's own plans. Annette noted that it's important to keep the debate alive, and producing policy briefs helps us do that. Alan proposed, therefore, that we write a policy brief on early childhood, using leaders and teachers data, for release at the 1996 GA. He gave the following reasons for the importance of this topic:

- early childhood education is growing
  - it is therefore an opportunity to attract more children to Jewish education
  - moreover, good early childhood education involves parents, so it is an opportunity to increase the Jewish learning and involvement of families
- early Jewish education leads to later Jewish education
- early childhood education crosses denominations and settings (including JCCs), so it is of broad interest

His idea will be discussed at the staff meeting on Jan 22 to see how it fits into the rest of CIJE's agenda.

Possibly by November of 1997 we will be ready to produce a policy brief on leaders.

... Finally, we decided that we will not be able to hold a meeting of the MEF advisory committee on Feb 18, because the planning committee for the "professors in Israel" program has greater urgency. Instead, we will decide about the most pressing issue - whether or not to carry out a review procedure -- in a conference call on Jan 31.



Date: Fri, 26 Jan 1996 08:20:29 -0600 (CST)  
From: GAMORAN@ssc.wisc.edu  
To: 73321.1220@compuserve.com  
Cc: 73321.1220@compuserve.com, 73321.1217@compuserve.com,  
74671.3370@compuserve.com, 75457.3560@compuserve.com,  
GOLDRIEB@ctrvax.Vanderbilt.Edu, 74104.3335@compuserve.com,  
76322.2406@compuserve.com, Annette@vms.huji.ac.il  
Subject: DRAFT work plan for Research and Evaluation (MEF) 1996

Work Plan for 1996  
CIJE Research and Evaluation Domain  
January 24, 1996

Background: Work in the domain of Research and Evaluation is organized in three major areas: Building a Research Capacity, Building an Evaluation Capacity, and Evaluating CIJE Initiatives. We now employ one full-time staff researcher along with the two part-time project directors.

I. Building a Research Capacity in North America

A. Conducting high-quality research

- File 1. Revision and dissemination of reports on teachers and leaders in the lead communities
- File 2. Completion, revision and dissemination of papers on teacher power, teacher in-service, and levers for change
- 3. Paper on leadership in Jewish schools, to be presented at the 1996 AERA conference
- 4. Presentation of The CIJE Study of Educators at the 1996 conference of the Network for Research in Jewish Education
- 5. ? Policy Brief on ?

I. Building an Evaluation Capacity in North America

A. Evaluation Institute

- 1. Work with the director of the Evaluation Institute to design a curriculum
- 2. Participate (among others) as faculty of the Institute
- 3. Advise the person hired to write a "Manual for Program Evaluation in Jewish Education"

B. Community Consultations

- 1. Continue to provide limited advice to communities engaged in studying their educators, including Atlanta, Baltimore, Chicago, Cleveland, Columbus, and Milwaukee.
- 2. Distribute the CIJE Manual for the Study of Educators to communities that are considering studying their educators
- 3. Revise and complete the Coding Instructions for the CIJE Study of Educators, a companion to the Manual

II Evaluating CIJE Initiatives



... Evaluation of Teacher-Educator Institute (Cummings project)

1. Assist in the collection of questionnaires of programs for professional development
2. Analyze the questionnaires and summarize the results
3. Prepare a baseline report on professional development opportunities in 5 communities targeted for intensive study: Atlanta, Baltimore, Cleveland, Hartford, and Milwaukee
4. Interview TEI participants
5. Prepare a report about changes so far for TEI participants, addressing such topics as:
  - how TEI participants think about professional development
  - how they perceive their thinking to be changing
  - plans and activities for professional development in their institutions, including plans for change
  - who they work with, and how their roles may be changing

B. Explore the possibility of evaluation a pilot project of the Goals Project

C. Prepare documents and a briefing for the new CIJE director

IV. Products

.. Research

1. Research paper: "Teachers in Jewish Schools" (analysis of survey data from three communities): DRAFT COMPLETED, WILL BE UNDER REVIEW BEGINNING IN FEBRUARY
2. Research paper: "Educational leaders in Jewish Schools" (analysis of survey data from three communities): DRAFT COMPLETED, REVIEWS RECEIVED, CURRENTLY SHELVED, MAY UNDERGO FURTHER REVISIONS
3. Research paper on "Teacher Power": NEW DEADLINE FOR FIRST DRAFT IS JAN 31, 1996
4. Research paper on "Teacher In-service": NEW DEADLINE FOR FIRST DRAFT IS JAN 31, 1996
5. Research paper on "Lever for change": DRAFT COMPLETED, NEW ANALYSES HAVE BEEN CARRIED OUT, FINAL REVISION EXPECTED IN FEBRUARY
6. Paper on educational leadership for Jewish schools (for AERA presentation): APRIL
7. Documents to accompany presentation of The CIJE Study of Educators at the conference of the Network for Research on Jewish Education: JULY
8. Policy Brief ?

. Evaluation

1. TEI Evaluation memo #2a: Baseline analysis of professional growth offerings in which TEI participants and their agencies/institutions are currently involved: MARCH
2. Interview protocol for TEI participants: APRIL

3. TEI Evaluation memo #2b: How TEI participants think about professional growth, how they perceive their views and activities to be changing: JULY





Date: Fri, 26 Jan 1996 08:18:37 -0600 (CST)  
From: GAMORAN@ssc.wisc.edu  
To: Annette@vms.huji.ac.il  
Cc: 73321.1220@compuserve.com, GOLDRIEB@ctrvax.Vanderbilt.Edu,  
74104.3335@compuserve.com, 74671.3370@compuserve.com,  
73321.1217@compuserve.com, 74043.423@compuserve.com  
Subject: summary of MEF section of the staff meeting

To: Annette  
From: Adam  
Cc: Ellen, Bill, Alan, Barry, Gail, Nessa, Dan P.

Annette, I'm writing to give you a report on the MEF section of the CIJE staff meeting on Jan 22. The MEF topics were: TEI evaluation, review of CIJE, data collection on content, the Research Network conference, and policy brief of early childhood.

Really I should be saying "Research and Evaluation" instead of MEF, since we aren't doing MEF in Lead Communities any more, and since that's what the CIJE domain is called. But MEF is shorter.)

#### .. TEI evaluation

Staff regards the evaluation plan as acceptable as far as it goes, but pointed out four limitations that should be addressed if possible:

1. The evaluation plan as stated does not address participants' thinking about professional growth, but that is a chief mechanism through which change is expected to occur. In response, we need to incorporate this issue into the interviews with targeted participants that we have scheduled for this spring.
2. We plan to assess change in professional growth opportunities with survey questions administered before and after. A weakness in this plan is that we will not have observations to confirm that reported changes have actually occurred. In response, we hope to use follow-up surveys of lead community educators to triangulate, so that we will have evidence from beyond the TEI participants themselves.
3. The TEI evaluation does not assess change in teacher-student interactions in classrooms, nor does it assess change in student outcomes. In response, near the end of the three-year TEI program, we may ask participants to collect baseline data in areas in which positive results of their professional development offerings are most likely to occur. (Adam's note: This is a good idea, but it may not be practical because it puts a heavy burden on TEI participants.
4. The issue of funding for professional development is absent from our evaluation. (Adam's note: This is a separate topic and cannot be incorporated in our TEI evaluation.)

#### . Review of CIJE or MEF

We reported on our meeting of Jan 15, concluding with the recommendation that we not put the review on MEF's work plan. Staff members found the decision understandable, but had some regrets. Both Nessa and Barry are particularly concerned that we have not done enough with what we have learned, and that we did not have advice to offer other communities or change agents.

The staff decided to hold a 1-day staff meeting on "what have we learned," for which each staff member would prepare a 2-page memo about their own insights and conclusions. This would help satisfy our need for self-

without draining staff energies more than is warranted. Possibly, after going through this process, we may decide to work on a document for an external audience.

### C. Data collection on content

The staff found your idea about a new data collection on content to be intriguing and provocative. There was some concern that the response to such a study would be "so what," unlike the response to the study of educators. Most staff members think the American Jewish audience would not be particularly concerned about weak content.

One idea that resulted from this discussion is that we could begin work in this area by examining content in a setting that is working with the Goals Project. In a subsequent discussion with Dan Pekarsky (who was unable to attend the staff meeting), he was very interested in the idea of examining content in a pilot site before and after working with him. This could constitute evaluation of a Goals Project pilot project. We plan to explore this idea further.

### D. The Research Network conference

The conference is scheduled for July 29-August 1, 1996, in Israel. It does not fit my schedule or Ellen's, but Alan is very eager for us to make a major presentation that would inform this audience -- which, this year, will include many Israeli academics -- about the whole CIJE Study of Educators. (This is particularly important because last year's presentation, unfortunately, failed to show CIJE in its best light.)

Barry Holtz will approach the conference organizers about the possibility of devoting a session to a CIJE symposium on our study. The session would include 5 papers:

- (1) Background to the CIJE Study of Educators: Theory and Policy Context
- (2) Instruments for the CIJE Study of Educators
- (3) Research findings: Commitment in a non-professional context
- (4) Policy implications: Building the personnel of Jewish education
- (5) Implementation of policy: Improving opportunities for professional growth

In addition, Dan P. is submitting a paper on goals and Barry is submitting one on best practices for presentation at the conference.

### E. Policy brief on early childhood

We decided to hold off on the policy brief on early childhood for now, possibly waiting until 1997. The reason for this decision is that we do not yet know what CIJE's policy response will be, and we do not yet know whether new data may be required to support that policy response.

We think we could tell a good story about Jewish early childhood education, using the data we already have. But is it a story that would further CIJE's policy efforts? That's what is not yet clear.

Should we return to the idea of a policy brief on leaders? There, too, CIJE's policy response is not yet determined. But I am concerned about Annette's point about maintaining momentum and keeping the attention of the North American audience.



7810)  
7/27

Date: Sun, 3 Dec 95 19:21 +0200  
From: <ANNETTE@HUJIVMS>  
To: mandel  
Subject: Danit - for my next trip  
Cc: annette  
Subject: January 15

Hi Adam and Ellen,

January 15 is just fine. I assume three main agenda items:

- ✓ 1996 workplan
- ✓ MEF meeting at Harvard (may have to be Tuesday, 20 - am still working at it)
- ✓ next publications (have some remarks re-policy brief on leaders - if it will be).

Is that right? Will you prepare the detailed agenda and let me have any relevant document in advance?

Shavua Tov!

annette

- >
- > We are working on a date for us to meet in January in Detroit. Would
  - > Monday, January 15 work for you? We have to go to NY that evening, so it
  - > would be a good day for us -- we could come to Detroit in the morning as we
  - > did last time.
  - >
  - > Jan 15 is Martin Luther King Day; I don't know if that will affect your
  - > planning. State universities are closed that day, which is another reason
  - > it's a good day for me.



From: IN%"GAMORAN@ssc.wisc.edu" 3-JAN-1996 16:08  
To: IN%"73321.1220@compuserve.com"  
CC: IN%"GOLDRIEB@ctrvax.Vanderbilt.Edu"  
Subj: alan, please look this over and offer any comments, before I send it off

Return-path: <GAMORAN@ssc.wisc.edu>

Received: from robin.ssc.wisc.edu (robin.ssc.wisc.edu)

by ctrvax.Vanderbilt.Edu (PMDF V5.0-5 #11488)

id <01HZKVI4T85C8XGB3X@ctrvax.Vanderbilt.Edu> for

GOLDRIEB@ctrvax.Vanderbilt.Edu; Wed, 03 Jan 1996 16:07:55 -0600 (CST)

Received: from ssc.wisc.edu by ssc.wisc.edu (PMDF V5.0-5 #12975)

id <01HZKVIK005CHXIRR8@ssc.wisc.edu>; Wed, 03 Jan 1996 16:08:33 -0600 (CST)

Date: Wed, 03 Jan 1996 16:08:33 -0600 (CST)

From: GAMORAN@ssc.wisc.edu

Subject: alan, please look this over and offer any comments,  
before I send it off to Annette

To: 73321.1220@compuserve.com

Cc: GOLDRIEB@ctrvax.Vanderbilt.Edu

Message-id: <01HZKVIK0XSIHXIRR8@ssc.wisc.edu>

-VMS-To: ALAN

X-VMS-Cc: ELLEN

MIME-version: 1.0

Content-type: TEXT/PLAIN; CHARSET=US-ASCII

Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

7419000

In my meeting with Alan on 12/26/95, we discussed the possible agenda for our meeting with Annette on 1/15/95. We came up with the following list of topics:

1. How do we structure a process of "What have we learned from 4 years of MEF?" (Or, what did we learn from 3 years of MEF in lead communities?) Not sure exactly what the question is, but the basic idea is to take a look back at what we've learned over the past several years. This could occur in conjunction with hiring a new director. This process could take up a substantial part of Ellen's and Adam's work time during 1996, if we want to take a close look. It is important, however, that it not consume ALL the CIJE staff members' time. *Defin Q*

A the meeting Jan 15, we should consider, what is the question? and how should we structure the process of answering it?

2. Publications in the pipeline -- including discussion of possible educational leaders policy brief.

3. Evaluation Institute: Update and discussion (ADH)

4. Preliminary discussion: CIJE's strategic thrust, and implications for MEF. That is, we would discuss current and expected directions for CIJE, and how MEF can best contribute. One example may be a strong early childhood initiative.

5. Meeting of MEF advisory committee (tentatively scheduled with Annette for February 18). Possible topics include "what have we learned..."; informal education; educational leaders policy brief.

Materials

6. 1996 MEF work plan

Date: Sun, 07 Jan 1996 21:41:59 -0600 (CST)

From: GAMORAN@ssc.wisc.edu

To: Annette@vms.huji.ac.il, annetteh@umich.edu

Subject: first section is a summary of part of our meeting; second section is my thoughts on what to do next; please confirm that I've summarized our discussion accurately -- Adam

Adam's meeting with Annette: 12/27/95

Comments on the ed leaders 3-city report from Annette and Mike I.

NOTE: See Adam's conclusions at the end.

Annette reported that she and Mike enjoyed reading the paper for their personal clarification. Much of it was useful and well done. Overall, however, they think it is best viewed as a working report rather than as a report for distribution.

Annette was not able to tell from reading it who the audience was meant to be, and was quite surprised when I said the target was the 25 professors of Jewish higher education. She thinks the report would need to be sharper and more focused to make distribution appropriate. Mike thought there were two possibilities: either there should be a policy brief like the last one, focusing narrowly on a single issue, or a longer paper like this one could be distributed, but it would need to have a more focused story line, as well as a richer context. Both felt that an ignorant reader would not have enough background to fully understand the report and its implications. Also, the recommendations came off as watered down.

After I explained our goals for the paper, Annette thought it would be ok to give out this paper, or a moderately improved version, to someone who had read a policy brief on the topic and wanted more information, but that it could not stand on its own.

\*\*\*\*\*

Reflecting on all the comments we have received, I think we tried to accomplish too much in this paper. We tried to write an encyclopedic report in that we wanted to report the results of all our cross-tabs; yet at the same time we tossed in a few recommendations to try to give it a policy flavor. We brought in a few points from the outside to support our approach, but perhaps we didn't go into enough depth to really make the case. All this seems to have been too much for the paper to carry.

I suggest that we keep it on the table for a short while longer. In the meantime, we should finish up and circulate the 3-city teachers report which is almost completed. Since it was written after the community reports, and after the policy brief, we knew very well what the main story line is, so it is somewhat more focused (though perhaps still shallow in some ways). Let's see what sort of reception this paper gets, and then decide what to do with the two of them.

Adam

Date: Sun, 07 Jan 1996 21:26:21 -0600 (CST)  
From: GAMORAN@ssc.wisc.edu  
To: annetteh@umich.edu  
Subject: in case I missed you in Jerusalem....

From: SSCB::GAMORAN 7-JAN-1996 21:21:16.01  
To: IN%"ANNETTE@vms.huji.ac.il"  
CC: ELLEN, ALAN, GAMORAN  
Subj: RE: proposed agenda for January 15, based on meeting with Alan Dec  
26

Right, ok, I will come with a list of what's already in the pipeline,  
and we can discuss what to add. But it seems to me most essential on Jan 15  
to address the specific issues we want to cover -- e.g. the possibility of  
a leaders brief, the idea of the review, CIJE's strategic direction -- and  
then see how it all comes together as a work plan.





Date: Fri, 12 Jan 96 3:04 +0200  
From: ANNETTE@vms.huji.ac.il  
To: annetteh@umich.edu

Received: by HUJIVMS via SMTP(129.59.1.21) (HUyMail-V7b);  
Mon, 18 Dec 95 22:59:45 +0200

Received: from PATHWORKS-MAIL by ctrvax.Vanderbilt.Edu (PMDF V5.0-5 #11488)  
id <01HYYGFR4GXE8X3IHR@ctrvax.Vanderbilt.Edu>; Mon,  
18 Dec 1995 14:58:41 -0600 (CST)

Date: Mon, 18 Dec 1995 14:58:41 -0600 (CST)

From: GOLDRIEB@ctrvax.Vanderbilt.Edu

Subject: Chicago Survey

To: 73321.1220@compuserve.com, annette@vms.huji.ac.il

Message-id: <01HYYGFR4GXG8X3IHR@ctrvax.Vanderbilt.Edu>

-VMS-To: in%"73321.1220@compuserve.com", in%"annette@vms.huji.ac.il", goldrieb

TIME-version: 1.0

Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

From: INTERNET:GOLDRIEB@ctrvax.Vanderbilt.Edu, INTERNET:GOLDRIEB@ctrvax.V  
anderbilt.Edu

To: Bill Robinson, 74104.3335

(unknown), INTERNET:GAMORAN@SSC.WISC.EDU

From: 12/18/95 11:35 AM

Re: Chicago Survey

Sender: goldrieb@ctrvax.vanderbilt.edu

Received: from ctrvx1.Vanderbilt.Edu (ctrvx1.Vanderbilt.Edu [129.59.1.21]) by ar  
-img-3.compuserve.com (8.6.10/5.950515)

id LAA16252; Mon, 18 Dec 1995 11:26:50 -0500

From: <GOLDRIEB@ctrvax.Vanderbilt.Edu>

Received: from PATHWORKS-MAIL by ctrvax.Vanderbilt.Edu (PMDF V5.0-5 #11488)

id <01HYY6WWYRIS8X3IHR@ctrvax.Vanderbilt.Edu>; Mon,

18 Dec 1995 10:26:08 -0600 (CST)

Date: Mon, 18 Dec 1995 10:26:08 -0600 (CST)

Subject: Re: Chicago Survey

To: 74104.3335@compuserve.com, gamoran@ssc.wisc.edu

Message-id: <01HYY6WWYRIU8X3IHR@ctrvax.Vanderbilt.Edu>

-VMS-To: IN%"74104.3335@compuserve.com", in%"gamoran@ssc.wisc.edu",

TIME-version: 1.0

Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

Well, I have a few additional comments on the Chicago survey, these pertain  
to issues specific to pre-school-ECE:

) In our own work we had some issues about whether the pre-school, ECE  
setting was  
preexisting, connected to a day-school or synagogue, or connected to a JCC.

I suggest adding this question. It has implications for accreditation,  
non-service, etc.

) The current version of the survey only asks about increasing knowledge in  
Jewish content (q15). Did they consider also asking a question about  
ECE topics. I think it would be important to ask both, given our thinking  
about pedagogical content knowledge.

) Lastly, do they want to ask whether the ECE setting they work in is  
accredited, licensed, etc (given our interest and findings about levers?)

llen

4.3 mef

15/1/96

intro:

1996 is open (loading-wise)

1995 not high

A. suggested three-prong approach:

1. program evaluation

blasting 5-day institute impact +

defensiveness

TEI - being done

2. baseline data

policy oriented

content

3. strategic direction assessed

B. "what we have learned"

3.1c review

4.content-goals

5.cty mobilization and il

6. mef role

1.the idea of cije

2building the prof

7 the interrelationship between goal, mob

bldg the prof.

from here to major questions:

nowhere

audience: CIJE staff and MEF new expanded advisory group





----- MON, 29 Jan 1996 21:31:34 -0600 (CST)

From: GAMORAN@ssc.wisc.edu

To: 76322.2406@compuserve.com

Cc: GOLDRIEB@ctrvax.Vanderbilt.Edu, Annette@vms.huji.ac.il,

73321.1220@compuserve.com

Subject: MEF call

Def ,

We are waiting to hear from Alan whether we will have an MEF call:

- (a) Wed Jan 31 at 9:15am eastern
- (b) Wed Jan 31 at 3:00pm eastern
- (c) either of those times, but without Alan
- (d) with Alan, but not on Wed Jan 31

The call includes Alan, Annette, Ellen, and Adam. We would like Alan to be included in the call. Ellen let you know, I think, that she cannot participate at 6pm eastern on any day.

The agenda for the call includes:

- 1. Final decision on MEF "review"
- 2. Other possible topics:
  - further discussion of a study of content
  - possible survey of informal educators in Atlanta
  - (time permitting) further discussion of possible policy brief

CAPACITY

AMERICAN JEWISH  
ARCHIVES



date: Tue, 30 Jan 1996 12:03:14 -0600 (CST)  
from: GAMORAN@ssc.wisc.edu  
to: GOLDRIEB@ctrvax.Vanderbilt.Edu, Annette@vms.huji.ac.il  
subject: fyi

from: IN%"73321.1220@compuserve.com" "Alan" 30-JAN-1996 08:51:01.62  
to: IN%"GAMORAN@ssc.wisc.edu" "Adam Gamoran"  
C: IN%"76322.2406@compuserve.com" "Debra abcPerrin"  
uk.. survey of informal educators in Atlanta?

DAM,

LIKE THE IDEA OF A COMMUNITY PILOT WHICH FORCES US TO  
ASK SOME OF THE BIGGER QUESTIONS ABOUT INFORMAL EDUCATORS -  
AN ISSUE WHICH WE KEEP AVOIDING.

MY CONCERN IS ABOUT HOWMUCH OF YOUR AND ELLEN'S TIME (AND  
BILL'S TIME) THIS WILL TAKE UP, BUT EVEN MORE THE QUESTION OF  
THE ONGOING QUALITY CONTROL AT THE CONCEPTUAL LEVEL. IF WE  
HAVE HAD SO MUCH DIFFICULTY DEFINING THE FIELD, WHY SHOULD  
WE BE MORE SUCCESSFUL?

SP: MEF FILE

lan,

As you can see from the message below, youth group directors in Atlanta  
are interested in a self-study. This could be an opportunity for us to  
develop and pilot a survey of personnel in informal education. I suggest  
that we give Bill the green light to work on this, and that Ellen and I  
keep close tabs on it, particularly with regard to survey development.

dam

from: IN%"74104.3335@compuserve.com" "Bill Robinson" 25-JAN-1996 13:52:1  
.23  
to: IN%"gamoran@ssc.wisc.edu" "Adam Gamoran", IN%"goldrieb@ctrvax.vander  
bilt.edu" "Ellen Goldring"  
subj: Informal education

dam and Ellen,

Steve Chervin met with the youth group directors in Atlanta (last week) and they  
are interested in participating in a study of themselves (somewhat like our  
Educators Study).

Steve would like our help and support in doing this (as I mentioned to Adam over  
inner).

It seems that this would be a good place to begin thinking in a practical manner  
and with informal educators about what should a study of informal educators  
include. We could use the experience to develop and pilot test a set of  
instruments for a larger study.

I suggest we use this opportunity, and if I'm still spending some of my time for  
Atlanta then this is the obvious project to work on.

The next step is for Steve to arrange a meeting with the head of the youth  
directors council in Atlanta, himself and me to discuss "the why and the what"





2/28  
MEF

Received: by HUJIVMS via SMTP(141.211.63.88) (HUyMail-V7b);  
Thu, 29 Feb 96 16:23:36 +0200  
Received: from seawolf.rs.itd.umich.edu by seawolf.rs.itd.umich.edu (8.7.1/2.2)  
id JAA26001; Thu, 29 Feb 1996 09:23:13 -0500 (EST)  
Date: Thu, 29 Feb 1996 09:23:11 -0500 (EST)  
From: Annette Hochstein <annetteh@umich.edu>  
X-Sender: annetteh@seawolf.rs.itd.umich.edu  
To: HOCHSTEIN ANNETTE <ANNETTE@VMS.HUJI.AC.IL>  
Subject: fyi -- Bill's progress in developing evaluation tools for TEI (fwd)  
Message-ID: <Pine.SOL.3.91.960229092301.25968A-100000@seawolf.rs.itd.umich.edu>  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

----- Forwarded message -----

Date: Thu, 22 Feb 1996 12:46:59 -0600 (CST)  
From: GAMORAN@ssc.wisc.edu  
To: Annette@vms.huji.ac.il  
Subject: fyi -- Bill's progress in developing evaluation tools for TEI  
  
From: IN%"74104.3335@compuserve.com" "Bill Robinson" 22-FEB-1996 11:02:40.16  
To: IN%"dball@msu.edu" "Deborah Ball", IN%"snemser@msu.edu" "Sharon Feiman  
-Nemser"  
CC: IN%"73321.1217@compuserve.com" "Gail Dorph", IN%"gamoran@ssc.wisc.edu"  
"Adam Gamoran", IN%"goldrieb@ctrvax.vanderbilt.edu" "Ellen Goldring"  
Subj: Coming to talk with you

Sharon and Deborah,

Hope your trips back were pleasant!

As I mentioned briefly, I'd like to come and talk with you about TEI and its evaluation. I can travel to Michigan (or to NY if you will both be there and have free time). Based on what I'd like to talk about (see below), I think we would need about five hours together. Ideally, I'd like to split the time in half: a late afternoon or evening meeting and then a morning meeting the following day. This would allow me a period of time to digest the information and think of new questions/ideas/etc.

There are three topics that I'd like us to talk about:

1. A general discussion on what has been occurring during the TEI sessions and what you envision will occur over the next three sessions ----> I need to be make sure that I understand all of the ideas that have been discussed and to try to get "ahead of the curve".
2. A general review and discussion on the evaluation design for TEI.
3. A more focused discussion on the content and process of (me) interviewing the TEI participants, as the next step in the evaluation ---> developing the interview protocol.

If you have any time available, I'd like to do this as soon as possible. My schedule for March is pretty open: the only days I have to be in Atlanta are March 6th (late afternoon) to March 10th.

Thanks!

Bill

Don  
MEF

March 22, 1996

To: Alan

From: Adam, Ellen, Bill

CC: Gail, Nessa, Barry, Danny, Annette

RE: policy brief on pre-school educators

In a recent conference call, we agreed to prepare a list of what we could say in a policy brief on Jewish early childhood educators given the data we have at present. Here's an outline:

## POLICY BRIEF ON EDUCATORS IN JEWISH PRE-SCHOOLS

I. BACKGROUND -- Would be a very upbeat introduction, emphasizing early childhood education as a "growth industry" and claiming that it serves as an entry point for Jewish education. I don't know if the latter is true, but we could make it an argument. We could support the former with the following data: Evidence on the expansion of secular early childhood education nation-wide; evidence on increases in the number of early childhood programs in the Lead Communities since 1993. In addition, we could note findings in general education that early learning leads to later learning.

In this section we would also introduce our main questions for this brief: Who are the educators in Jewish pre-schools? Are they prepared to lead the way into the Jewish world for young children and their parents? Are their experiences of training, professional growth, and general working conditions well-suited to this important task?

## II. PROFESSIONAL BACKGROUND AND TRAINING

### A. Pre-service training

1. Teachers -- many are formally trained as educators, but few have formal

- preparation in Jewish content
- many even lack pre-collegiate and informal preparation in Jewish content
- 10% are not Jewish

## 2. Educational leaders

- most are early childhood professionals, but they have little or no formal background in Jewish content or in administration

## B. Professional growth

1. Extent of in-service meets professional standards in most pre-schools
2. Little emphasis on Jewish content
3. Few other professional growth activities that address Jewish content
4. Isolation from colleagues outside their schools

## III. WORKING CONDITIONS

### A. Earnings

1. Low!
2. Compare inequality of earnings (day vs. pre) to secular world
  - probably similar
3. Dissatisfaction with earnings

### B. Benefits

1. Scarce!
2. Dissatisfaction

### C. Lack of outside support -- isolation from rabbis, lay leaders

## IV. CAREER PATTERNS

### A. Entry -- How did pre-school educators get into the field?

### B. Career paths tend to be segregated, i.e. little experience in other settings (unlike educators in day and supplementary schools)

### C. Pre-school teachers and directors tend to be career-oriented and plan to stay in their jobs. Most directors work full time.

## V. CONCLUSIONS -- could emphasize three main themes:

### A. Warmth, commitment, enthusiasm, stability, etc. -- all the good stuff



## B. Weak preparation in Jewish content

-- In this section, we should respond to the common misconception that early childhood teachers don't need much content knowledge. We could draw on research in general education to argue for the importance of content

knowledge among Jewish early childhood teachers. We could also argue that there is something special about Jewish pre-schools that requires teachers to have a rich knowledge of Jewish content.

## C. Isolation and feeling of inadequate support

