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

Box	Folder
D-1	2023

CIJE staff meeting book. Includes Lead Communities and MEF reports, 1992-1993.

3101 Clifton Ave, Cincinnati, Ohio 45220
513.487.3000
AmericanJewishArchives.org

COUNCIL FOR INITIATIVES IN JEWISH EDUCATION

CIJE Staff Meeting

August 19 - 20, 1993

Table of Contents

Minutes:	**Lead Communities Consultation**
Date of Meeting:	May 11–12, 1993
Date Minutes Issued:	June 2, 1993
Participants	Lauren Azoulai, Chaim Botwinick, Ruth Cohen, Shulamith Elster, Seymour Fox, Adam Gamoran, Jane Gellman, Ellen Goldring, Annette Hochstein, Alan Hoffmann, Stephen H. Hoffman, Barry Holtz, Virginia F. Levi (Sec'y), Marshall Levin, Arthur Naparstek, Daniel Pekarsky, David Sarnat, Louise Stein, Shmuel Wygoda, Henry L. Zucker
Copy To:	Morton L. Mandel

I. Overview

A. Welcoming Remarks

Henry L. Zucker opened the meeting, reminding participants that the Lead Communities Project is a long-term effort to impact Jewish education for the entire North American Jewish community. It is being undertaken as a partnership among three local communities and CIJE, a continental organization. The need to reconcile the autonomy of the local communities with the agendas of continental organizations is evident, and will require adjustments as we progress, since it is a new kind of partnership between a national body and local communities.

The Commission on Jewish Education in North America reflected a serious concern for Jewish continuity among North American lay leadership, and a shift in perspective which places Jewish education at the top of the community agenda. This reflects a major change in the point of view of lay leaders. The Commission brought about a new alliance among educators, community lay leaders, family foundations, rabbis, religious leaders and other Jewish professionals. The result was a commitment to improve the quality and quantity of well-prepared and dedicated Jewish

educators and to mobilize the Jewish community to provide adequate financial and moral support for Jewish education.

Mr. Zucker noted that the Lead Community concept is a new one and that its implementation is bound to include some tensions between CIJE and the local communities. It will be important to discuss and resolve differences as we move forward. This seminar was intended to clarify the Lead Communities concept and to enhance the partnership between CIJE and the communities and among the three communities.

B. Introduction and Review of Materials

Following introductions of the participants in the workshop, Annette Hochstein reviewed the agenda, making clear that it was to serve as a starting point for these deliberations and was open to revision.

It was agreed that the primary goals of the consultation were:

1. To continue joint planning and intensify partnership.

2. To foster and develop relationship within and across Lead Communities and with the CIJE.

3. To agree upon the role, content, and method of implementation of each element involved in the Lead Communities project.

4. To develop an integrated joint action plan and calendar for each LC and for the three LCs and the CIJE for the next 18-24 months.

II. Partnership and Joint Planning

A. Marshall Levin led a discussion intended to identify the partners in this project and their relationships. The initial discussion referred to the relationships among professionals involved in the project. His formulation, as modified through discussion, is as a series of concentric circles with communications flowing from the center. In the center are two circles of CIJE personnel and Federation senior staff in each Lead Community. Communications between these two groups are direct and comprehensive. Following, then, is a list of the groups within each circle working out from the center (see chart, attached).

1. CIJE
   Professional staff (Cleveland and Jerusalem)
   Consultants
   Field Researchers

2. Federation senior staff

3. Senior educators and rabbis

4. Other educators, other Federation staff, and staff of other Federation-funded agencies

5. Informal Jewish education organizations, foundations, *and universities*

It was suggested that the Federation senior staff serve as the intermediaries between CIJE staff and all others in the community. Federation's role is to manage the process for a broader community. Ideas may come from the center of the circle, i.e. CIJE or Federation senior staff, or they may come from any other group within the community, in which case they will be brought to the CIJE by the Federation. In any case, buy-in and sign-off must occur with both CIJE and Federation senior staff.

It was suggested that this might be described as a "partnership with parity." Partners come together with different perspectives and work together to define the partnership from each perspective so that others can buy in.

It was noted that the model was being put forth as a communications tool, not necessarily a means for making policy decisions. It puts the burden on Federation senior staff to manage communication, probably by designing new and different modes of communicating within the community.

III. Elements of Systemic Change

Seymour Fox opened the discussion by reminding participants that the Commission on Jewish Education in North America had concluded that the basic elements necessary to upgrade the quality of Jewish education are *personnel* and *community mobilization*. These two elements have been identified by the Commission as "enabling options," i.e., options which enable the implementation of any, or all, other educational programs. Communities are encouraged to look at local educational problems from these perspectives.

CIJE will help to mobilize the denominations in the Lead Communities to help deal with these issues at the appropriate time.

For example, while considering a specific programmatic area of Jewish education, e.g. family education, a community would focus on personnel needs. The Best Practices Project could then help to identify a means of meeting those needs. It was suggested, however, that in order to bring about systemic change, the scope of the total Lead Communities discussion must be broad. The content component for work on personnel is the Best Practices Project. It was noted that there is a direct relationship, which was described as follows:

Personnel→needs "content"/Best Practices→scope→standards/quality

If, in the example, described above, a community were to come to CIJE with a serious interest in family education, CIJE would work with the community on how to approach personnel through family education. In order to bring about systemic change of sufficient scope, family education would be viewed within the larger picture of the community's vision and goals.

The discussion concluded with a reiteration of the centrality of personnel and community mobilization to the work of the Lead Communities project.

IV. Calendar

A. CIJE Calendar

A proposed calendar of meetings of various groups related to the Lead Communities project was presented for discussion. It was proposed that key lay leaders and professionals of the Lead Communities and CIJE meet three times a year, including one meeting to be held in conjunction with the GA. The purpose of these meetings would be to bring lay people on board and get their input.

It was suggested that the key professionals of the Lead Communities and CIJE meet five times each year, for two or three days each time, to work together on the overall design of the project. In addition, CIJE staff would be in each Lead Community every four to six weeks.

It was suggested that the location of the joint meetings be rotated among the Lead Communities. This would save on expense while permitting the

communities to share their work. The issue of cost was discussed. It will be important to make the case for the centrality of these joint meetings in order for funding not always to be an issue. It was suggested that by dovetailing the meetings of lay leaders with those of professionals, some savings could be realized.

At the conclusion of the seminar, the proposed calendar was reviewed and revised to reflect deliberations. A copy of the revised calendar is attached.

B. Local Calendars

Each community was asked to outline its local calendar of Lead Community activities.

1. Milwaukee
   a. Commission – will continue to meet quarterly beginning June 1993
   b. Steering Committee – every six weeks (ongoing)
   c. Task Forces
      1. Personnel – on a two year time line
      2. Strategic planning – working on five year plan including visioning and goals project.
   d. Educators' Survey – administered now through June '93, data analysis Summer '93.
   e. Market analysis
      Needs Analysis
      following plan outline
      ⎫
      ⎬ ——→ Fall '93
      ⎭
   f. Fund Development – beginning November '93

2. Baltimore
   a. The Center for Advancement of Jewish Education has just been formed (CAJE).
   b. CAJE will establish a CIJE committee – July 1, 1993.
   c. Strategic planning by CIJE committee – July to August '93.
   d. Convene rabbinic and senior educator leadership – August '93.
   e. Launch CIJE Committee – September '93.
   f. Conduct Educators' Survey – September to October '93.
   g. Monthly meetings of CIJE Committee – October '93 to June '95.
   h. Finance resource development.

3. Atlanta
   a. Council on Jewish Continuity – continue to meet every two months.
   b. New director of Jewish Educational Service to begin July 15, 1993.
   c. Educators' Survey – administer in September '93.
   d. Task Force on Israel Experience – form in August/September '93.
   e. Task Force on Teacher Training – establish Fall '93.
   f. JCC Judaic content study to be undertaken.
   g. Market study on formation of second Jewish high school – Spring '93.
   h. Resource development – ongoing

In the discussion that followed, communities were asked to consider how their calendars work to further the goals of community mobilization and personnel development as two key enabling options. It was suggested that the local commissions consider these issues in relation to their current priority concerns. It will be important for CIJE to work closely with the local commissions as they set their agendas.

V. Lay Leadership Relationships

A chart for communications among lay leaders was designed to parallel the chart designed for professional staff. The concentric circles of a parallel chart move from the center outward as follows:

A. CIJE
Board members

B. CJF and Local Federation Leadership
(As with the professional staff, these first two groups would work together closely)

C. Local congregations and synagogues plus continental denominational leadership; local schools and agencies; informal Jewish education organizations; national Jewish education organizations (e.g., JESNA, JCCA, Hillel, etc.); universities.

D. Foundations cut across all these lines.

It was suggested that the model for lay leaders requires further refinement.

VI. Goals Project

Seymour Fox described a project of the Mandel Institute on "the educated Jew." This is a theoretical approach to the desirable products of Jewish education. It grapples with such issues as what might be the ideal outcomes of Jewish education and what might an educated Jew look like.

As this project is unfolding, CIJE is working with the major training institutions and denominations for help in defining goals for their own groups. Each movement is working on its own set of objectives which will be available for local denominational groups to use.

Discussion focused on the importance of goals for the measurement of outcomes. It was noted that this will be an ongoing discussion as this project unfolds.

VII. Funding and Fundraising

Art Naparstek reported on his activity related to fundraising for CIJE. He is in touch with both Jewish foundations and secular funding sources for support of various aspects of the project. In addition, it was suggested that we should work together to tap into sources of local community support and Federation endowments.

It was suggested that ongoing support for the Lead Communities Project should be sought locally, while national sources might be approached to support innovative ideas. The approach to national foundations should be coordinated through CIJE, which can help by demonstrating the potential for impact beyond the local communities.

It was suggested that a development committee be established within CIJE, to include representatives of the Lead Communities as well as the CIJE board. This committee would go to the Lead Communities to challenge their peers to support the project.

The role of CIJE is to work with national foundations where there is a specific focus and to help the local communities develop a coordinated approach to certain foundations which would be more interested in a project which spans the communities. At the same time, individual communities will have their own interests and should be able to approach CIJE for assistance in submitting proposals to foundations.

VIII. Additional Issues

A. Definition of the Feedback Loop

It was noted that there is a field researcher in each of the three communities for the Monitoring, Evaluation and Feedback Project. Among the tasks of the field researcher is to observe work related to the Lead Communities project and continually feed in useful information on a timely basis. As the project moves forward, feedback should be provided on a monthly basis to designated CIJE and Federation senior staff and lay leadership. This process should highlight issues raised by the Lead Community as well as those which the field researchers believe are important to address. At present, this is a process of monitoring and feedback. Evaluation can begin once the goals of the project are more clear.

A survey is being conducted on the professional lives of educators in each of the communities. The first round of the Educators' Survey will entail formal educators. The Educators' Survey will provide information to the community about the following items on Jewish educators:

- Their perceptions of Jewish education
- Their current and prior experience
- Their training and staff development experience
- The schools they work in
- Their personal background.

As a report is drafted, CIJE will check with each community to determine issues which should be addressed.

B. Definition of a Lead Community Project

It was noted that in the excitement of the identification of each community as a Lead Community, projects are being initiated and identified as "Lead Community projects" by people or organizations in a particular community without these necessarily going through any process of content, quality control or sign-off by either the community or CIJE that would make it part of the LC Project.

It was suggested that CIJE and the local community be open to requests for the names of people who might be helpful in the development of a

project. However, in order for any project to be a "Lead Community project," it must fit within the goals of the LC project and its specific plans. Guidelines should include the following:

1. Process—has to fit within the plans defined by the local CIJE commission.

2. Content—has to fit within the enabling options.

3. Scope—has to be strategic, with potential for long-term impact.

4. Quality—has to fit within the goals of the Lead Communities project.

If a CIJE consultant or staff member is approached by someone in a Lead Community for advice on a project, that person should report this to the local Federation contact for follow- up—outside the Lead Communities process.

C. Vision

Besides the goals project described earlier in the seminar, it was noted that the communities are working toward developing visions for Jewish education to serve as the basis of mission statements. The basic question is what a Lead Community should look like in the twenty-first century. It was suggested that it is important to set forth the ideal in order to develop the strategies necessary to move forward.

D. Concluding Remarks

It was reported that Shulamith Elster has decided that the time has come for her to work closer to home. She will be available to work with CIJE on special projects in the future, but will be leaving her role as Education Officer for CIJE. All present noted their gratitude for the work she has done in moving this project forward and in being the CIJE's link to the communities.

At the conclusion of the meeting it was suggested that participants take some time to reflect on the deliberations and to absorb what was said, following which decisions should be operationalized by CIJE and Federation senior staff. This was seen as the first of a series of meetings to help us move forward together toward a common goal.

Foundations
Other Educators
Senior
Federation
CIJE
Staff
Rabbis
Federation-Funded Agency Staff
Universities

Communications & Policy Model
Within Local LC
Pro



Draft 2

PROPOSED CALENDAR OF MEETINGS
LEAD COMMUNITIES AND CIJE

1993									1994			
MEETING	May	June	July	Aug.	Sept	Oct.	Nov.	Dec.	Jan.	Feb.	Mar.	Apr.
1. Key Lay Leaders & Pros—L.C.s & CIJE (2X/Year + GA)					X		X			X		
2. Key Professionals L.C.s & CIJE (5X/Year)	X		X		X		X			X		
3. CIJE Staff to Each LC (Every 4-6 Weeks)												
Atlanta		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Baltimore		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Milwaukee		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
4. Educator's Survey												
Atlanta					—	—	—	—				
Baltimore					—	—	—	—				
Milwaukee	—	—	—	—	—							
5.												
6.												

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:

1. Build the profession of Jewish education and thereby address the shortage of qualified personnel;
2. 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
   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, that 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.

2. 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.

3. 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 supplemen- tary 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 impiementation.

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 COMMUNITIES

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-inventing" 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.

4. *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, CLAL, 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 individual institutions*
- *by the denominations*
- *by the community as a whole.*

In addition, dealing with the content might involve having a "dream department" or "blues-kying 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 participation.

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.

1/93

THE CIJE – PRELIMINARY WORKPLAN 1992/1993

A. Function, Structure and Staffing Assumptions

The following assumptions guide this plan:

1. The function of the CIJE is to do whatever is necessary to bring about the implementation of the Commission's decisions. This includes initiating action, being a catalyst and a facilitator for implementation. The CIJE is not a direct provider of services except consultations.

2. The CIJE is a mechanism of the North American Jewish community for the development of Jewish education. Optimally an increasing number of leaders would see it as their organization for purposes of educational endeavours.

3. It will always be a small organization with few staff and high standards of excellence. We assume that its staff will include, in addition to the Executive Director, and an administrative support staff, a planner, a chief education officer, a director of research and community projects, as well as possibly some additional staff with content expertise.

4. The plan is based on the assumption that the assignment includes fundraising for the CIJE and for the CIJE's contribution to Lead Communities.

B. Establishing Lead Communities

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

C. Elements of the Workplan for Lead Communities

- ***Immediate: Preparation, Negotiations and Launch***

1. Prepare written guidelines for lead communities (LC), including proposed agreement, planning guidelines, description of the project and of the CIJE's support role.

2. Prepare CIJE staff for the assignment with LCs and have periodic staff meetings for ongoing work. Items 1 and 2 involve further preliminary development of the concept of Lead Communities, its translation into specific content and practice.

3. Offer ongoing guidance and backing to the two support projects: Best Practices and Monitoring, Evaluation and Feedback.

4. Launch the dialogue with lay and professional leadership in each LC towards an understanding of the broad lines of the project, an agreed-upon process for the project and the formulation of an agreement or contract. The chronology is to be determined. IN particular, we discussed the question of whether we ought to push for rapid, written agreement, or rather engage in a joint learning process that would lead to agreement when the communities are more knowledgeable. Whatever the decision, the dialogue with the communities would revolve around the concept of Lead Community, the terms of the project, the planning and decisionmaking process, the relationship with the CIJE—including funding and the two projects.

5. Work with educators and rabbis in the community: they usually have strong views, commitments and expectations on which we will want to build.

6. Convene an ongoing (monthly?) planning seminar of the lead communities and the CIJE to further develop and design the concept of LCs. Given the innovative and experimental nature of the project, much needs to be worked out jointly with the best available talent joining forces for the design and planning work. This will also provide a basis for networking among LCs.

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

7. Set up the various expert contributions of the CIJE:

   a) Provide planning guidance and guidance for the community mobilization process (community organization and ongoing trouble- shooting). Prepare guidelines and

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

b) Negotiate with foundations, organizations and purveyors of programs the nature of their involvement and their contribution to lead communities. Begin training them for the assignment (e.g., discuss the institutions of higher Jewish learning, their role in in-service and pre-service training, as well as their role for the articulation of visions or goals of Jewish education; work with the JCCA, JESNA, CAJE, CLAL; approach program-oriented foundations with specific programs). This requires preparing background documents—for example, what would the Israel experience be in a lead community—and discussing with the appropriate organization or foundation their interest in taking all or part of the program upon themselves.

c) Provide funding facilitation as required.

d) Provide planning guidance for:

1) The self-study

2) The one-year plan

3) Pilot projects to be launched in year 1

4) The five-year plan

e) Complete plans for the introduction of the Best Practices project into the community and make educational consultants available to the communities.

f) Introduce the Monitoring and Evaluation project in the community (field researchers to conduct preliminary interviews) and help process the findings of the periodic reports (first one in January 1993).

g) Provide guidance for the development of vision-, mission-, goal- statements at institutional and community levels.

h) Appoint a key staff consultant for each community to mediate the content (community mobilization; building the profession) and make educational consultants available for specific needs (e.g., develop in-service training programs for early childhood educators; re-invent a best practice supplementary school model into the community).

i) Develop networking between communities.

j) Develop means of communications and P.R.

8. Toward the end of the year: gear-up towards implementation

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

1) Board meetings (August and February), executive group, board committees (lead communities, Monitoring/Evaluation, Best Practices) and camper assignments.

2) Senior advisory group meetings or conference calls.

3) Monthly CIJE-lead communities planning seminar.

4) Fundraising.

5) Ongoing contacts with constituencies (organizations, purveyors of programs, foundations, lay leaders, educators, rabbis).

6) Staff meetings (for planning and discussion of educational content—twice a year).

7) Guidance to key projects.

8) Networking with educators, organizations and institutions.

9) Plan the second and third years of the project.

D. Beyond Lead Communities:

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

1. *Community mobilization and communications*

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

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

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

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

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

2. *Building the profession of Jewish education*

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

3. *Developing a research capability*

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

4. *Establishing lead communities*

(See above).

Appendix A

CIJE -- Workplan -- Draft

Task Name	Start	End
Lead Communities	15/Sep/92	02/Sep/93
	15/Sep/92	15/Sep/92
Launch Activities	15/Sep/92	02/Sep/93
Prepare written guidelines	15/Sep/92	20/Oct/92
Written agreement	15/Sep/92	30/Sep/92
Planning guidelines	15/Sep/92	20/Oct/92
Negotiate Agreement	15/Sep/92	30/Nov/92
Present project to Community	15/Sep/92	01/Dec/92
CIJE staff preparation	15/Sep/92	01/Dec/92
Launch Monitoring	15/Sep/92	26/Aug/93
Introduce in community	15/Sep/92	25/Sep/92
Develop feedback loop	15/Sep/92	30/Nov/92
Set terms for first report	15/Sep/92	27/Nov/92
Feedback from findings	19/Jan/93	26/Aug/93
Launch Best Practices	15/Sep/92	02/Sep/93
Introduce	15/Sep/92	30/Nov/92
develop method	15/Sep/92	02/Sep/93
provide consultants	15/Sep/92	02/Sep/93
Vision project	15/Sep/92	31/Aug/93
develop project	15/Sep/92	31/Aug/93
work with IHJL etc..	15/Sep/92	26/Aug/93
introduce in communities	16/Nov/92	26/Aug/93
Convene first planning seminar	01/Dec/92	01/Dec/92
Community process	15/Sep/92	26/Aug/93
Work with educators, rabbis	15/Sep/92	27/Aug/93
Planning guidance	15/Sep/92	26/Aug/93
Self study	06/Nov/92	30/Apr/93
First year plan	15/Sep/92	31/Dec/92
Pilot projects	08/Feb/93	08/Feb/93
Five year plan	01/Dec/92	26/Aug/93
Work with foundations	15/Sep/92	26/Aug/93
Work with program purveyors	15/Sep/92	26/Aug/93
Work with national organizations	15/Sep/92	26/Aug/93
Funding facilitation	15/Sep/92	26/Aug/93



Printed: 15/Sep/92
Page 1

Milestone Δ Summary

CIJE -- Workplan -- Draft

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



Printed: 15/Sep/92
Page 2

Milestone △ Summary

January 26, 1993

Fall Seminar – Some Suggestions

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

The components might include:

1. General meeting of CIJE and lead community representatives re: the project in general and the CIJE's contribution. Includes CIJE and lead community lay leadership (10-20 people per community plus CIJE staff and consultants, as well as lay people for part of the meetings).

   a. Communities introduce themselves, their views, hopes, ideas, past achievements, etc.

   b. The CIJE introduces the present state of the lead community idea – its evolution from the Commission to today. The notion of these communities as spearheads for systemic change – for addressing the problems of Jewish education/continuity.

2. Lay leaders to lay leaders – issues of funding and community mobilization.

3. Vision and goals: presentation and discussion followed by work with representatives of the training institutions and others who will be leading this effort.

4. Professionals, educators, rabbis: build upon their work, commitments, convictions.

   a. Discussion of the project, the process, getting to work.

   b. The Best Practices Project: presentation and discussion – includes consultants on content.

   c. Monitoring, Evaluation and Feedback: same.

   d. Planning:
      - *self-study*
      - *pilot projects*
      - *one year plan*
      - *five year plan*
      - *the ongoing CIJE seminar*

5. Networking among lead communities.

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

GOALS FOR JEWISH EDUCATION IN LEAD COMMUNITIES

The Commission on Jewish Education in North America did not deal with the issue of goals for Jewish education in order to achieve consensus. However, the Commission knew that it would be impossible to avoid the issue of goals for Jewish education, when the recommendations of the Commission would be implemented.

With work in Lead Communities underway, the issue of goals can no longer be delayed 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 a clear articulation of goals.

Goals should be articulated for each of the institutions that are involved in education in the Lead Communities 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 is necessary to determine the status of this effort in the Lead Communities. There may be individual institutions (e.g. schools, JCCs) that have undertaken or completed a serious systematic consideration of their goals. It is important to learn from their experience and to ascertain whether an attempt has been made to develop curriculum and teaching methods 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 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 -- scholars, thinkers and institutions that have deliberated and developed expertise in this area. The institutions of higher Jewish learning in North America (Y.U., J.T.S.A. and H.U.C.), the Melton Centre at the Hebrew University and the Mandel Institute in Jerusalem have all been concerned and have worked on the issue of goals for Jewish education. Furthermore, these institutions have been alerted to the fact that the institutions in the Lead Communities will need assistance in this area. They have expressed an interest in the project and a willingness to assist.

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: Professors Moshe Greenberg, Menahem Brinker, Isadore Twersky, Michael Rosenak, Israel Scheffler, Seymour Fox and Daniel Marom. Accompanied by a group of talented educators and social scientists, they have completed several important essays offering alternative approaches to the goals of Jewish education as well

as indications of how these goals should be applied to educational settings and practice. These scholars would be willing to work with the institutions of higher Jewish learning and thus enrich their contribution to this effort in Lead Communities.

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

1. Encourage the institutions in Lead Communities to consider the importance of undertaking a process that will lead to an articulation of goals.

2. Continue the work that has begun with the institutions of higher Jewish learning so that they will be prepared and ready to undertake community-based consultations.

3. Offer seminars whose participants would include Lead Community representatives 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 help and expertise.

The issue of <u>goals for a Lead Community as a whole</u>, 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.

Seymour Fox & Daniel Marom

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

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

One encouraging feature of the eighties debate about high schools is that it presented an opportunity to raise these questions. But one discouraging fact is that they were raised so infrequently. It seems plain enough that apathy, a sense of irrelevance, and compulsion are not the ingredients of good education. It seems plain that compounding this stew of sentiments with more requirements cannot improve education much; it may only further corrupt it. But if all of this is well known to educators, few voices were raised to question their corrupting effects. Nor did many commentators point out that even if problems in labor markets and higher education will not be addressed, there are other ways to cope with youth who see nothing for themselves in secondary studies. One is a national youth service, open to students of high school age. Another is lifetime educational entitlements for those who cannot make good use of secondary school on the established schedule. Still another is a lowered school-leaving age. These ideas have all been advanced before, and in one way or another America has had experience with each. Yet they found little place in the eighties debate. Whether or not schools are the appropriate target for reform, they are available, visible, and easy to hit. They are an easy mark for officials who feel they must respond to popular dismay about education, but who have not the time or inclination to probe a little into the sources of dismay.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Conclusion: Renegotiating the Treaties

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

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

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

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

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

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 sex-related 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 old-timer 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 eruptions of violence in the school. A counselor speaks

SARA LAWRENCE LIGHTFOOT, THE GOOD HIGH SCHOOL: PORTRAITS OF CHARACTER AND CULTURE (NY, BASIC BOOKS, 1983

and learn the difference between my own inhibitions and fears 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 subtle discrimination of tokenism. But one is more impressed with the thorough integration of boys and girls, the multiple leadership roles girls play in the life of the school, and the easy, comfortable relationships that

liberate attempts to define boundaries between inside and out. Bob Mastruzzi 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 debilitating negativism from neighborhood forces. But Mastruzzi does not merely reach out and embrace the community, he also articulates the strong contrasts between neighborhood values and priorities and those that guide the school. It is not that he capitulates to community pressure. Rather, he sees his role as interpreter and negotiator of the dissonant strains that emerge in the school-community interface. Sometimes he must engage in calculated, but intense, battles where the differences flare into heated conflicts. He was ready and willing to fight when he believed the Marblehead residents in the nearby working-class neighborhood did not adhere to the negotiated settlement both parties had reached.

However, Mastruzzi's concern with defining workable boundaries is not limited to establishing relationships with the wider community. He is at least as preoccupied with negotiating the bureaucratic terrain of the New York City school system. There are layers of administrators and decision makers in the central office whose priorities and regulations affect the internal life of Kennedy. These external requirements are felt most vividly by the principal and assistant principals, who must find effective and legal adaptations of the prescribed law. Once again, 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.[7]

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

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

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

In these three examples we see great variations in the ways in which boundaries are drawn between the school and the community. St. Paul's high standards, goals, and values are most protected from societal imperatives, most preciously guarded, and most thoroughly ingrained. They are chosen and defended. Highland Park mirrors the societal shifts, sometimes offering resistance but rarely initiating conscious 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-

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

The connections to church and religion, though less clearly etched, underscore the fervor attached to education by generations of powerless, illiterate people. The superintendent of Atlanta uses spiritual metaphors when he urges parents and students to join the "community of believers."[8] Carver faculty and administrators reinforce the religious messages and link them to themes of self-discipline, community building, and hard work at school. Hogans's rhetoric is culturally connected, clearly articulated, and visibly executed in student programs, assemblies, and reward ceremonies. The ideology is legible and energizing to school cohesion.

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

Highland Park lacks this clear and resounding ideological stance. The educational vision shifts with the times as Principal 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

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

Yet despite the extreme material contrasts, there are ways in which each institution searches for control and coherence. Gaining control seems to be linked to the development of a visible and explicit ideology. Without the buffers of land and wealth, Carver must fashion a strong ideological message. It is not a surprising message. Even with the newly contrived rhetoric of "interfacing" and "networking" 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 dangers of disruption and warned about acting "uppity" or arrogant. Although they were encouraged in their patience, these Black ancestors recognized the profound injustices, the doors that would be closed to them even if they behaved admirably. Industriousness was the only way to move ahead and ascend the ladders of status, but Black folks recognized that the system was ultimately rigged.

Carver's idelogical stance, enthusiastically articulated by Hogans, echoes these early admonitions—be good, be clean, be mannerly, and have a great deal of faith. Recognize the rigged race but run as hard as you can to win. School is the training ground for learning skills and civility, for learning to lose gracefully, and for trying again in the face of defeat. Education is the key to a strong sense of self-esteem, to personal and collective power. 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 he reinforces between education and religion. When Carver students, in their gleaming white Explorer jackets, cross the railroad tracks and enter the places of money and power in downtown Atlanta, their eyes are open to new life possibilities. Hogans tells them their dreams can come true. The work programs at Carver provide the daily experiences of industry,

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

FEMININE AND MASCULINE QUALITIES OF LEADERSHIP

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

A successful school

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

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

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

only a vision but also an atmosphere – or 'school climate' – that is conducive 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 conducive 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.[3] 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 achievement gains unattainable. Of course, such reasoning ignores the exciting examples of creative and successful schooling situated in unfriendly environments among students

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-w ch and promoting collective responsibility. We believe that the goals should focus primarily on the core functions of the system; that is, on teaching and learning. To meet the demands of the future, however, they must go well beyond the 'basic skills' goals of the 1960s, '70s and early '80s. They must provide a standard that challenges the public and the educational system to prepare our youth to grapple thoughtfully with those problems that defy algorithmic solutions and to be skilled and confident learners in school and later on. Moreover, the goals and indicators must address not only the average level of opportunity and student achievement in the state but also the variation. Justice requires that the goals of the state promote equality as well as quality.

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

A coherent system of instructional guidance

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

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

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

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

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

A unifying vision and goals

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

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

MEMORANDUM

July 13, 1993

To: CIJE Board

From: Dr. Barry W. Holtz

Re: **Update - The Best Practices Project**

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

Documentation and Work in the Field

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

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

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

The Steps in Documentation: First Iteration

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

Next Steps

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

1) *Supplementary schools:* Mostly done in "iteration #1". There may be two more reports coming in which were originally promised.

2) *Early childhood programs:* Here we are at stage six. The volume is in print.

3) *JCCs:* Here we are at stage three. This will require visits, report writing, etc. The JCCA is our partner in implementing the documentation.

4) *Day schools:* Here we are at stage one, two or three, depending on the religious denomination. Because this involves all the denominations, plus the unaffiliated schools, this will be the most complicated of the projects for the year.

5) *College campus programming:* Here we are at stage three, with the national Hillel organization as a partner. One question to deal with is non-Hillel campus activities and how to move forward with that. As to Hillel programs, we need to choose report writers, visit sites, etc.

6) *Camping/youth programs:* Here we are at the preliminary stage. We should be able to have a stage one meeting this year. It's probably fairly easy to identify the right participants via the denominations and the JCCA.

7) *Adult education:* Here we are at the preliminary stage. We should be able to have a stage one meeting this year. Here gathering the right participants is probably more complex.

8) *The Israel experience:* We hope to move this project forward with consultation from the staff of the CRB Foundation. As they are moving forward with their own initiative, we hope to be able to work jointly on the "best practice issues" involved with the successful trip to Israel.

9) *Community-wide initiatives:* Finally, I have recommended that we add a ninth area—Community-wide initiatives using JESNA's help. This refers to Jewish education improvement projects at the Federation or BJE level, particularly in the personnel or lay development area. Examples: The Providence BJE program for teacher accreditation; the Cleveland Fellows; projects with lay boards of synagogue schools run by a BJE; salary/benefits enhancement projects. This project would use JESNA's assistance and could probably be launched rather quickly.

Lead Communities: Implementation—and How to Do It

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

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

How Can We Spread the Word?

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

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

CIJE Project on Monitoring, Evaluation, and Feedback in Lead Communities
Progress Report — *August 1993*

Dr.Adam Gamoran and Dr. Ellen Goldring

How will we know whether the Lead Communities have succeeded in 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 (MEF) component to document its efforts and gauge its success.

By monitoring we mean observing and documenting the planning and implementation of changes. Evaluation entails interpreting information in a way that strengthens and assists each community's efforts to improve Jewish education. Feedback consists of oral and written responses to community members and to the CIJE.

This progress report describes the activities in which the project has been engaged during 1992-93 and the products it has yielded. The main activities include: (1) Ongoing monitoring and documenting of community planning and institution-building; (2) Development of data-collection instruments; (3) Preparation of reports for CIJE and for community members.

I. *Ongoing Monitoring and Feedback*

To carry out on-site monitoring, we hired three full-time field researchers, one for each community. The field researchers' mandate for 1992-93 centered on three questions:

(1) What is the nature and extent of mobilization of human and financial resources to carry out the reform of Jewish education in the Lead Communities?

(2) What characterizes the professional lives of educators in the Lead Communities?

(3) What are the visions for improving Jewish education in the communities?

The first two questions address the "building blocks" of mobilization and personnel, described in *A Time to Act* as the essential elements for Lead Communities. The third

question raises the issue of goals, to elicit community thinking and to stimulate dialogue about this crucial facet of the reform process.

Monitoring activities involved observations at virtually all project-related meetings within the Lead Communities; analysis of past and current documents related to the structure of Jewish education in the communities; and, especially, numerous interviews with federation professionals, lay leaders, rabbis, and educators in the communities.

Each field researcher worked to establish a "feedback loop" within her own community, whereby pertinent information gathered through observations and interviews could be presented and interpreted for the central actors in the local lead community process. We are providing feedback at regular intervals (generally monthly) and in both oral and written forms, as appropriate to the occasion. An important part of our mission is to try to help community members to view their activities in light of CIJE's design for Lead Communities. For example, we ask questions and provide feedback about the place of personnel development in new and ongoing programs.

We are also providing monthly updates to CIJE, in which we offer fresh perspectives on the process of change in Lead Communities, and on the evolving relationship between CIJE and the communities. For instance, in July 1993 we presented views from the communities on key concepts for CIJE implementation, such as Lead Community Projects, Best Practices, and community mobilization. This feedback helps CIJE staff prepare to address community needs.

II. *Instrumentation*

A. Interview Protocols

The MEF team developed a series of interview protocols for use with diverse participants in the communities. These were field tested and then used beginning in late fall, 1992, and over the course of the year. The interview schema for educators were further refined and used more extensively in spring, 1993.

B. Survey of Educators

We also played a central role in developing an instrument for a survey of educators in Lead Communities. The MEF team worked with members of Lead Communities, and drew on past surveys of Jewish educators used elsewhere. The survey was conducted in Milwaukee in May and June, 1993, and it is scheduled to be implemented in Atlanta and Baltimore in the fall of 1993.

The purpose of the educator survey is to establish baseline information about the characteristics of Jewish educators in each communty. The results of the survey will be used for planning in such areas as in-service training needs and recruitment priorities. The survey will be administered (was administered in Milwaukee's case with a response rate of 86%) to all teachers in the Lead Communities. Topics covered in the survey include a profile of past work experience in Jewish and general education, future career plans, perceptions of Jewish education as a career, support and guidance provided to teachers, assessment of staff development opportunities, areas of need for staff development, benefits provided, and so on.

III. *Reports*

A. Reports on the Professional Lives of Jewish Educators

Each community is to receive three types of reports on educators: A qualitative component, describing the interview results; a quantitive component, presenting the survey results; and an integrative component, which draws on both the qualitative and quantitative results to focus on policy issues. The schedule for delivering these products is dictated by the specific agendas of each community.

The qualitative reports elaborate on elements of personnel described in A Time to Act, such as recruitment, training, rewards, career tracks, and empowerment. Examples of key findings in reports written so far are the extent of multiple roles played by Jewish educators (e.g., principal and teacher; teacher in two or three different schools), and the tensions inherent in these arrangements; the importance of fortuitous entry into the field of Jewish education, as opposed to pre- planned entry, and the challenges this brings to in-service training; and the diversity of resources available to professional development of Jewish educators, along with the haphazard way these resources are utilized in many institutions.

B. Reports on Mobilization and Visions

Information about mobilization and visions has been provided and interpreted for both CIJE staff and members of Lead Communities at regular intervals. In September, we are scheduled to provide a cumulative Year-1 report for each community which will pull together the feedback which was disseminated over the course of the year. These reports will also describe the changes and developments we observed as we monitored the communities over time.

IV. *Plans for 1993-94*

A. Ongoing Monitoring and Feedback

A central goal for 1993-94 will be the continued monitoring and documenting of changes that occur in the areas of educational personnel, mobilization, and visions. In addition, we are proposing to play a larger role than we initially anticipated in the community self-studies, just as we did with the educators survey. (The educators survey is in fact the first element of the self-study, as described in the Planning Guide.)

In the spring, our field reseacher for Atlanta notified us that she would be resiging her position, effective July 31. Although we regret her resignation, we are trying to use it to our advantage by hiring a replacement whose skills fit with the evolving responsibilities of the MEF project. The new field researcher in Atlanta will have expertise in survey research, and will play a lead role in working with the communities to carry out the self-studies.

B. Outcomes Assessment

Although specific goals for education in lead communities have yet to be defined, it is essential to make the best possible effort to collect preliminary quantitative data to use as a baseline upon which to build. We are proposing to introduce the diagnostic Hebrew assessment for day schools, created by Professor Elana Shohamy of the Melton Centre in Jerusalem, as a first step towards longitudinal outcomes analysis. The great advantage of the Shohamy method is its value as a diagnostic tool, encouraging schools to use the results of the assessment to guide their own school improvement efforts. The tests have common anchor items, but are mostly designed especially for use in each school.

C. Encouraging Reflective Communities

The MEF project will be successful if each Lead Community comes to view evaluation as an essential component of all educational programs. We hope to foster this attitude by counseling reflective practitioners — educators who are willing to think systematically about their work, and share insights with others — and by helping to establish evaluation components in all new Lead Community initiatives.

AGENDA FOR THE CIJE STAFF MEETING.
AUGUST 19-20th 1993.
American Friends of the Hebrew University.
Institute of Contemporary Jewry
11 East 69th street. New - York . N-Y

Session 1. Thursday August 19th: 10a.m.-12p.m.

The conception reconsidered.

Background material:

- *Commission background reports (meetings of June 14th 1989; October 23rd 1989; February 14th 1990) .*
- *Time to Act ;*
- *Minutes of the May 1993 CIJE / LC Cleveland seminar*

Session 2. Thursday August 19th: 12:45 - 2:15 p.m.

Discussion

Session 3: Thursday August 19th: 2:30 - 4:00 p.m.

Some basic concepts:

" Systemic reform "
" Content, Scope , Quality "

Background material

- *" Lead Communities at Work "*
- *" Lead Communities Preliminary Work plan 1992-93 "*

Session 4: Thursday August 19th : 4:15 - 6:00

Working with the Communities:

1) Planning
2) Local Commissions
3)Problems in implementing the idea of the Lead Community

Background material:
CIJE Planning Guide : February 1993

Session 5: Thursday August 19th: 7:00 - 8:30 p.m.

Working with the Communities: (continuation)

4)Community mobilization ; Wall to wall coalition ; Partnership, Funding
5) Programmatic options ; Enabling options
6) Educational profile of the Communities

Session 6: Friday August 20th: 9:00 - 10:30 a.m.

Content and Goals for Lead Communities:

Ideas, Vision, Visioning, Goals

Background material:

- *Goals for Jewish Education in Lead Communities*
- *David Cohen: " The Shopping Mall High-School " , pp.304-309*
- *Sara Lightfoot: " The Good High-School", pp.316-323*
- *Smith & O' Day: " Systemic School Reform " pp.235-6, 246-7*

Session 7: Friday August 20th : 10:45 a.m. - 12:15 p.m

Support Projects: Best Practices, Monitoring Evaluation & Feedback

Background material:

- *Best Practices project's director's report to the CIJE Board*
- *MEF project's director's report to the CIJE Board*

Session 8: Friday August 20th : 1:00 - 2:30 p.m.

Work plan:

- 1993-94 Outcomes
- 1993-94 Process

Session 9: Friday August 20th : 2:30 - 4:00 p.m.

Next meetings:

- Friday August 27th, 1:00 - 5:00 p.m.
  Meeting place: To be decided upon
  Agenda: Next steps

- October
- Future agenda for staff
- Seminar in Israel