MS-831: Jack, Joseph, and Morton Mandel Foundation Records, 1980 – 2011.
Series E: Mandel Foundation Israel, 1984 – 1999.

Box	Folder
D-1	2062

CIJE Best Practices project correspondence and reports. Lead Communities and MEF reports, 1993.

SHULMAN LECTURE AT COLLOQUIUM

Opening Remarks: Walter Ackerman

- Lee Shulman as an example of a top intellectual who has been drawn to and remains involved in Jewish educational matters.

- An opportunity this evening to look at underlying assumptions and to see if they are applicable to Jewish education.

- Shulman has docused on standards - 4 questions in Harvard Educational Review.

1. What are the sources for Knowledge Base Teaching?
2. In what terms can these be conceptionalized?

3. Whate are the processes of pedagogical reasoning?

4. What indications for teaching policy and reform?

Prof. Lee Shulman

It's new for Shulman to get involved in educational reform.

Shulman drew from theoretical work on knowledge base of teaching into

What are implications of what works for setting standards?

Can this be done with introducing a dogma or doctrine that makes centitude?

Can you deal with question of standards with creating standardization (and becoming miseducated = closing off opportunities).

First reponse re: Carnegie = very little to be learned for Jewish education.

As he looked at assumptions = so different and so different conditions than conditions of Jewish education.

Second response:

Leave to us as to how far we want to generalize.

Under current conditions little generalizability.

If we take ______ of Carnegie, must change conditions of Jewish education.

Analysis of Carnegie Report

Part of waves of reform.

I - First Wave:

- Nation at Risk - "Excellent" report
- called for higher standards - expect more from kids
- raise graduation requirements
- said very little about how to do these things
- "Better" defined as "More"
- through schools rotten spend more time in them

*Response to First Wave:

- Ever state institute new

A - a higher standard

- testing requirements for high school

B - effective schools - movement rudden, et al

(Could take schools where students were doing badly on tests and improve them)

- focused on school climate
emanating from principles leadership
- Major players - principles, policy makers - students
- teachers not seen as having much agency

C - Testing Teachers - in Texas - each teacher had to take a test of reading and simple math (eight grade level)

Interesting after first wave - 2nd wave

- does not simply build on the first wave
- second is a response to it
- metaphor of undertone of first wave

II Second Wave = Carnegie plus Holmes Group (Tomorrow's Teacher)

- fascinating - who is visible?
- stars are the teachers
- invisible folks - school principals and supervised school board folks
- clash of fundamental assumptions about how you make schools better

One set of Assumption

- top town
- more reform to the institution
- leadership is a property of those who have the position
- bureaucracy

Second Wave Assumption

- bottom up
- as much talent and autonomy on the street level bureaucrat
- dismantle bureaucrecy
- individual school becomes focus of decision making
- "Lead" teacher - thats where the leadership is
- synonymn for principal teacher

Carnegie is a 2nd wave - more than a bottom-up test

* only way to read Carnegie is as a sewing together of different threads
* it is a political document - speaks to different constituencies
* Has interesting set of authors

Four constituencies:

A:Political constituency = 2 governors
2 councils of education at stark level

B:Business Industry
? National Bureau of Standards
IBM suceeds because it outhinks competions

Other person = Head of Civil Service

C:Two Heads of Teachers Organizations representing 2,000,000 teachers

D:Higher Education - ??

(Lavier)
- chief architect of Holmes Group =
- Teacher Educational Reform = (1300 institutions that train teachers)
- Broad Coaltion professional community / intellectual community

E:Opinion qeaders - John Gardman
- Fred Hechinger
- 2 from Minority community (Black-Hispanic)

- Attempt to stitch together the interests of different groups without which reform is impossible

Educational Reform depends on coalition of interests

Contents of Document which are problematic for Shujman^

A:BA as prerequisite to be eligible for teacher of education
- turn page and they say the opposite - (because N.J. guy had done it different)
- 2 different approaches - need extra time or MA level for skills U.S.
- can pick it up through experience

B:Merit Pay - every analysis shows that it is problematic
- people who wrote know problems
- but business know that merit pay works

= last section = "productivity" mystery text

Document has problems - stitched together

- political document
- don't look for deeper meaning to resolve contradictions

Contents- Major Themes/Assumptions

1. Efforts at School Reform Top Down - has failed

a) because teachers not ?

b) because schools are kind of places where measure of effectiveness is in part variation of staff

- get most able, inflexibility etc. on teacher level too

(Distar programmed infrastrucure OK at primary level for basi skills)

- top down OK for effective schools where focus on basic skills
- not OK for excellent schools

c) if these are to be standards, teachers must have a voice in establishing them and implementing them (can't be tip-down)

= dentists have own board

d) If you want - professional community then have to have kind of job that people want to get into

a) compensation

b) quality of life in workplace

c) must change sites for Teacher education and the workplace = need to be intellectual otherwise will not attract good people

e) Teaching is hard = a profession = in technical sense ((work rests on a great deal of knowledge - theoretical and practical))

- must make adaptations
- judgement calls
- so much responsibility given over to the teachers
- requires ? and reasoning

((Members of the profession must establish their own standards))

- where does knowledge base come from?

  - how do teachers develope this knowledge base?
  - Develop ? for the complexity
  - e.g. subject matter knowledge and twaching
  - need both ((plus))
  - ability to engage in transformation

anology > ((take our understanding and transform it into representations that will make sense to a student))

  - correct new information to old information hear word "like"
  - ability to create powerful analogies
  - what makes an analogy good = what makes it dangerous

((powerful early anology = can hold on for longterm= even if ?)

NOTE: WE NEED TO LOOK AT THE KNOWLEDGE BASE NEEDED FOR JEWISH EDUCATION = DIFFERENT SET OF BASES.

IMPLICATIONS:

I: CURRENT CONDITIONS = LITTLE TO LEARN

A. Teaching Preparatory programs to reform = in Jewish Education the the programs don't exist ((only 10% of teachers trained))

B. No Teacher union

C. Lack of any evaluations that can capture attention of people that would lead to see that there is a crisis

D. Certification - senseless - don't ever have licensure - certificates make sense on top of licensure

II. PROCESS/DELIBERATION BODY — MORE IMPORTANT SESSION TO SESSION

A. Need multiple sigments - coalition
Is this a lesson for Jewish education?

analogy: Independent schools - maybe they are more like Jewish schools
- but they were created to provide different ways to achieve same ends as the public school (shared goals)

Christian Schools - growing
- own curriculum
- fundamentalistic

God's Choice - Alan Peshkin - U of C Press
-chilling book
-school not educative
-goals are indoctrination

III. CHANGE CONDITIONS - CHANGE RHETORIC

A. Emphasis on what would we have to do to make classroom teaching a profession

QUESTIONS

ACKIE: NOT FIRST TIME REFORM IDEAS
MAT DID NOT SUCCEED
ARE CONDITIONS TODAY DIFFERENT?

A. May not succeed* 25.33% chance of success
MAT - interest only to one constitutency *
Can ? reform re: commonplaces
MORE or can ? re in whose interests is the reform?
INVESTORS not just investors/also players
NOW

- how to keep unions involved
- teachers feel they have something at stake

FOX - Power of coalition *

* Dramatizes the emergency -

* Vision/* a way to change conditions -

- Is top down a valid a ? at a certain time?
-

A) * Don't invest energies in reforming existing programs -

(Create/many models to substantiate a vision to move forward)

(Keep an eye on Rochester - they are the first ones to negotiate
a context based on Carnegie Report)

(CONSTANT DELIBER ?
CONSTITUENCIES)

= start salaries - 28,000 lead to 70,000 top 100,000 (CPA)
= rearange such system to get that kind of money - took out
middle management
= University of Rochester want to document what is happening

General vision

. vision

Fund ?

Study them

Make them ? TEACHERS NEED A SENSE OF COMMUNITY
VISION CONDITIONS STANDARDS

FAX

Council for Initiatives in Jewish Education

Date: September 26, 1993

To: Alan Hoffmann
From: Barry Holtz
at Fax number: 212-864-6622
Number of pages (including this one): 5
Re: Ellen Goldring's stuff concerning educator's survey

(if there is difficulty in transmission, please call 212-864-3529)

Topics addressed by the Educator Survey

1. **Profiles of Teachers:**

   A. General Background--Who are the teachers in our community?
   (Background section: Q 38-56)
   For example: Gender, Jewish affiliation, ritual observance, income, etc.

   B. Training: What is the educational background and training of the teachers in our community ? To what extent are they formally trained?
   (Q 57-60)
   For example: What degrees do they hold? In what subjects? How many hold teaching certificates?

   C. Previous Work Experience: What work experiences do our teachers have?
   (Q6-11)
   For example: How stable is our workforce? (Q9,10)
   How experienced is our workforce? (Q11)
   What socializing experiences do teachers have? Do most teachers have experience as youth group leaders and camp counselors? (Q6)

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

   D. Present Work Settings: What is the nature of our teachers work? ((20-28, 33-35)
   For example: How many schools do they teach in?
   Are they full time or part time? Would they like to be full time?
   Which benefits are available? Which do they receive?
   Advantages and disadvantages of working in more than one school?

2. **Careers in Jewish Education**

   A. Recruitment: How are teachers recruited and attracted?
   (Q 1, 29, 32, 35, 37)
   For example: Why did the teachers first become Jewish educators?
   How did they find their positions?
   What affected their decision to work at a particular school?

   B. Retention: What are the teachers' future plans?
   (Q2, 61)

3. **Professional Development: What are the opportunities for teacher professional development?**
(Q 12-19, 30)
For example: To what extent do teachers participate in different types of professional development activities?
What is their assessment of these activities?
What skills and knowledge would they like to develop further?
Who is providing help and support?

4. **Sentiments About Work as a Jewish Educator: How do the teachers feel about their work?**
(Q 3, 4, 5)
For example: What is their level of satisfaction?
Do they feel respected by others in their community?

<u>Questions Milwaukee will be addressing:</u>

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

What is relationship between a teacher's perception that s/he has a career in Jewish Education (Q2) and:
Q 36 working full or part time
Q 56 importance of income from Jewish education
Q 33 benefits
Q 5 overall job satisfaction
Q 26 work setting
Q 8 having experience in general education
Q 61 future career plans
Q 22 hours of work

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

What is the relationship between future career plans (Q61) and:
Q 26 setting
Q 36 working full or part time

What is the relationship between the importance of the income from Jewish education (Q56) and:
Q 36 working full time or part time
Q 26 setting
Q 33 benefits
Q 5 overall satisfaction

What is the relationship between receiving certain benefits (Q 33) and:
  Q 36 working full or part time
  Q 26 setting

What is the relationship between seniority at the present school (Q9) and:
  Q 5 overall satisfaction
  Q 2 perceptions of having a career
  Q 36 working full or part time

The following belongs to the section on **Careers-Recruitment:**

What is the relationship between having experience in general education (Q 8) and:
  Q 36 working full or part time
  Q 5 job satisfaction
  Q 26 setting
  Q 56 importance of income from Jewish education

Q What is the relationship between educational training (Q58 or Q 60) and:
  Q 2 perception of having a career
  Q 26 setting
  Q 36 working full time or part time

The following issues pertain to settings:

What is the relationship between working in a particular setting (Q26) and:
Q 22 hours of work
Q 36 full/part time educator
Q 5 overall satisfaction scale

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

What is the relationship between seniority (Q 9) and:
  Q14 overall helpfulness of workshops
  Q 30 overall help and support received
  Q 16 areas desired for skill development
  Q 17 areas desired to increase knowledge

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

What is the relationship between overall helpfulness of workshops (Q 14) and:
  Q 26 setting
  Q 58 or 60 educational training

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

What is the relationship between level of help and support received and (Q30) and:
  Q26 setting
  Q 58 or 60 educational training

What is the relationship between holding a license in Jewish or general education (Q60) and:
  Q 16 areas desired for skill development
  Q 17 areas desired for increase knowledge

What is the relationship between setting (Q 26) and:
  Q16 areas desired for skill development
  Q17 areas desired for increase knowledge
  Q12 whether or not in-service is required

CC: Adam Gamoran
    Roberta Goodman
    Julie Tammivaaria

To: Shmuel Wygoda:

From: Barry Holtz

A. I looked at your agenda briefly, faxed it to Gail and discussed it with her, although she still hasn't seen it yet. First reaction: on the surface it covers all the issues BUT we are both concerned that it nowhere deals directly at any rate with what we are both concerned with in addition to all this content: Namely, how is the CIJE supposed to work next year; what is the role of alan, barry, gail? what is the day to day role of Israel and the Mandel inst.? who is responsible for what? This needs time for discussion, somewhere, somehow.

B. Have you spoken with Milwaukee yet as we talked about at the last telecon?

C. Tomorrow at around 9:15 NY time, I am going to call the Mandel Institute to speak to Seymour about where and how I should send the next volume of Best Practices, as per our conversation at the telecon. You will be getting this fax when you get in in the morning. If Seymour will not be there at 9:15 my time can you let me know when I can reach him?

This fax is being sent from my home machine and I will be at home all day on Tuesday: 212-864-3529 (phone); 212-864-6622 (fax).

Thanks.

MELTON
RESEARCH
CENTER
for Jewish Education

Jewish Theological Seminary
3080 Broadway
New York, NY 10027
(212) 678-8031
Fax (212) 749-9085*

To: Shmuel [illegible]

At FAX Number: [illegible]

From: Barry Holtz

Date: July 13

Total pages including this one: 4

RE:

Shmuel – I tried to send this electronically via internet. I think it may not have worked. Let me know. The file was called Board.

Barry

*If you experience difficulty transmitting to this FAX number, please use the JTS main FAX number as an alternate; (212) 678-8947. Kindly indicate that this message should be forwarded to the Melton Research Center. Thank you.

Memo

July 13, 1993
To: CIJE Board
From: Dr. Barry W. Holtz
Re: Update—The Best Practices Project

The Best Practices Project is an operation that 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 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 expert report writers
Stage four: Writing up reports by expert report writers
Stage five: Editing those reports
Stage six: Printing the edited version
Stage seven: "Advertising" and 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 five. The volume should come out at the end of the summer.

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 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 on the "best practice issues" involved with the successful trip to Israel.

9)C0mmunity-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 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 Practices 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 CUE 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 CUE 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 advertise and 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.

MELTON
RESEARCH
CENTER
for Jewish Education

Jewish Theological Seminary
3080 Broadway
New York, NY 10027
(212) 678-8031
Fax (212) 749-9085*

To: Seymour Fox

At FAX Number:

From: Barry Holtz

Date: July 11

Total pages including this one: 1

RE:

Seymour —

I was expecting to get a call from you today at 11 AM NY time. What's up?

(I heard about Sam Melton)

Barry

*If you experience difficulty transmitting to this FAX number, please use the JTS main FAX number as an alternate: (212) 678-8947. kindly indicate that this message should be forwarded to the Melton Research Center. Thank you.

35

Thursday June 24

To: Seymour Fox

From Barry Holtz

I would like a phone call with you next week to discuss a number of matters including CIJE Best Practices and Melton matters.

Most any time is okay.

Fax me suggested times to my home fax 212 864 6622

I am out of town until Sunday night.

B.

MELTON RESEARCH CENTER
for Jewish Education

Jewish Theological Seminary
3080 Broadway
New York, NY 10027
(212) 678-8031
Fax (212) 749-9085*

Shawn R/

Please see my note — [illegible] 1st page

To: Caroline (for Seymour Fox

At FAX Number:

From: Barry Holtz

Date:

Total pages including this one: 4

RE:

Here's the whole thing, again!

Let me know if you got it

*If you experience difficulty transmitting to this FAX number, please use the JTS main FAX number as an alternate: (212) 678-8947. Kindly indicate that this message should be forwarded to the Melton Research Center. Thank you.

Best Practices Project
June 16, 1993
Next Steps,
Part 2
1993-4

The Best Practices Project is an operation that has many long-range implications. Documenting "the success stories of Jewish education" is something that has never really been done in a systematic way and it is a project that cannot be "completed" within a short range of time. However, what I propose here is a way of looking realistically at how the Best Practices Project should unfold over the next 1 to 2 years.

The easiest way to think about the Best Practices Project-- and probably the most useful-- is to see it as one large project with eight or nine areas (what we have called "divisions") to cover. Our long-range goal has always been to see successive "iterations" in each of the divisions, but what we are talking about at this point (for the short run) is what will it take to put out a best practices publication, similar to what we've done for the Supplementary School division, in each of the other areas. To get to that point we have to go through the following stages for each division.

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

For this memo, I've taken each "division" and each stage and tried to analyze where we currently are headed. (This memo is based on my recent presentation of the 1993-4 Best Practices Project Budget.)

What about implementation from staff training through pilot projects? What happened to the whole translation bit?

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

2) Early childhood programs
Here we are at stage five. The volume should come out at the end of the summer.

3) JCCs
Here we are at stage three. This will require visits, reportwriting, etc. The complicating factor here is the role of the JCCA.

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

a) for the Orthodox schools:
We are at Stage three for centrist Orthodox schools. We've had a meeting at YU and I need to put together the memo, choose the report writers and places and make assignments.

For Torah UMesorah: I need to meet with Rabbi Fishman and start the process.

b) for the Conservative schools:
I've met with Bob Abramson. The step is to move into the Stage one preliminary meeting, hopefully in the early fall.

c) for the unaffiliated schools:
I need to meet with the JESNA staff person who coordinates these schools and put together a Stage one preliminary meeting.

d) for the Reform schools
I've met with Michael Zeldin (of HUC-LA) and discussed with him how to put together the Stage one preliminary meeting, possibly in LA, but coordinated with the UAHC as well.

5) College campus programming
Here we are at stage three, at least in so far as Hillel is concerned. 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 players 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 players is probably more complex.

8) The Israel experience
This project is going in a different direction, due to the complicated politics involved. My guess is that this will require some work with consultants in meetings or some travel.

9) Community-Wide initiatives
This project would use JESNA's assistance and would probably mostly involve travel to sites. I've had two meetings with JESNA and could probably launch this rather quickly.

The plan above is quite optimistic in terms of the number of different divisions that we could advance this year. If more of my time is spent in the Lead Communities, less will get done in the Best Practices Project.

→ good!

Seymour,

You asked me to put in writing some of things we talked about when we met for lunch in New York:

1) We discussed ways that CIJE might be staffed in the next stage and who would have responsibility for what. This included the Gail Dorph possibility and other things as well. A secondary issue was the matter of reopening the possibility of a CIJE "branch office" in New York.

2) I expressed an interest to be included, if it is thought appropriate, in some of the "inner circle" meetings of CIJE, MAF, Mandel Institute, etc. If I can be helpful in any of those settings and you or whoever think it makes sense for me to be there, I would happy to be involved.

3) We talked about my own work in best practice and other matters and if it might make sense (to me it does) for that ultimately to be located in a Mandel Institute-America rather than CIJE. We talked about how such an Institute might be set up or where, coming to no particular conclusion, but exploring some possibilities. I think you realize that personally speaking I'd be interested in keeping such an option open, as things develop over the next while.

4) I asked you to consider contacting Edy Rauch and inviting him in some fashion to spend some time in Israel at the Mandel Institute, perhaps with some funding for housing or travel. I thought perhaps a year from now/ he might be interested. He's also given thought to a sabbatical after my two-year leave and perhaps he'd want to spend some part of that in Israel, but in the shorter run such an invitation would be a nice gesture and it's obvious that he could make a unique contribution in any kind of project that the Institute has going.

for part of a summer

5) Finally-- and the sooner the better on this-- you said you could share some kind of academic backup for me on the whole issue of the legitimacy of relying on the "expertise of experts", as I've been calling it, in the Best Practice work. Is there anything in writing on this aside from an oral heksher from Coleman?

Thanks. I hope we can speak soon on that memo I sent concerning next steps and issues for best practice.

Barry

May 25, 1993

To: CIJE staff and consultants
From: Barry W. Holtz
Re: Next Steps: Best Practice

During the past few months, I've been very involved with visits to the Lead Communities and during this time, ongoing work on Best Practices has been slow. Starting July 1, I am full time with CIJE and therefore (I hope), I should be able to balance the Lead Communities piece and the Best Practices piece in a better way.

As you will recall, we identified eight different areas to explore in best practice. Here is an update on our current situation.

1) Supplementary schools
Version one is published. Please note that there are still two more reports outstanding and many other places have been proposed. If we're serious about making this an evolving project, (subsequent iterations, as we've been saying) we will eventually need another "round". In the meanwhile, however, we can put this on the back-burner.

2) Early childhood programs
Reports have been finished. They need editing, but we should have a publication similar to the Supplementary School volume by the August Board meeting.

3) JCCs
This was put in the hands of the JCCA and they've been slow. They should have results of their survey of JCCs very soon, but a writing up process will have to take place in the fall, perhaps with visits.

4) Day schools
A complicated project, but it has been launched. It's pretty clear that we have to go the denominational route here. Shulamith and I have met with a group of Orthodox day school folks at YU; we've met with Bob Abramson; I've met with Michael Zeldin (re Reform); still to come (in the fall): a meeting with Conservative educators similar to the YU meeting, a meeting with JESNA folks concerning "non affiliated" day schools; visits and writeups. My guess is that this will/should take place in fall with finished products in the winter.

5) College campus programming
SE and I met with Hillel people and should be able to launch visits and write-ups in the fall.

6) Camping/youth programs
Next year we need to start this process. I think gathering the right players will be relatively easy.

7) Adult education.
Next year we need to start this process. Here gathering the players might be difficult: we need to think about adult ed in synagogues of various stripes, free floating programs like Wexner Heritage and CLAL, Hebrew Colleges, (JCCs?--if not covered in the JCC area), study experiences in Israel?

8) The Israel experience
Here I need help: We have the Cohen/Wall paper in draft form. Is it finished? What is the relationship of this area to CRB, if anything.

Finally, I strongly recommend 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. JESNA is not looking to get paid for this, but would want CIJE to subvent travel costs for doing write-ups.

Problem: I'm afraid we're going to run short of the potential "report writers" by going back again and again to "the usual suspects" (the Joe Reimers and Carol Ingalls). This could slow things down.

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

INTRODUCTION

Barry W. Holtz

What is the Best Practices Project?

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

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

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

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

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

We should be clear, however, that the effective practical use of the best practices project is a complex matter. Knowing that a best practice exists in one place and even seeing that program in action does not guarantee that the Lead Communities will be able to succeed in implementing it in their localities, no matter how good their intentions. What makes a curriculum work in Denver or Cleveland is connected to a whole collection of factors that may not be in place when we try to introduce that curriculum in Atlanta, Baltimore or Milwaukee. The issue of translation from the Best Practice site to the Lead Community site is one which will require considerable imagination. I will try to indicate some ways that such translation may occur at the end of this introductory essay.

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

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

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

Or we could have looked at the specific populations served:
--- adults
---children
---prospective converts to Judaism

There were numerous other possibilities as well.

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

Best Practice in the Supplementary School: The Process

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

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

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

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

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

The Reports: An Overview

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

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

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

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

A second way of expanding the research in the supplementary school area would be in the "depth" of the current reports. Many of the report writers have said that they would like the chance to look at their best practice examples in more detail than the short reports have allowed. I have called this the difference between writing a "report" and writing a "portrait" or study of an institution.[1] As further iterations of the Supplementary School volume develop, we would like to see more in-depth portraits of schools and programs.

---

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

Improving Supplementary Schools: Some Practical Suggestions

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

1. Use the Guide

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

2. Improve the School at the Systemic Level

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

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

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

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

Implications and Possible Recommendations

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

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

3. The Leader is Crucial

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

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

Implications and Possible Recommendations

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

4. *Invest in Teachers*

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

For some of the best practice schools recruitment is not a major problem. A place like "Temple Bnai Zion" has a staff of veterans and experiences a very small amount of turnover.

In general, good schools tend to perpetuate themselves because their reputations are well known in the community of educators and when openings appear, teachers will want to come to work in such an institution. Here in a slightly different way, the educational leader makes a difference. Who would not want to work for the revered principal of "Congregation Beth Tzedek"?

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

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

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

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

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

The best practice schools use local central agencies, denominational organizations and at times commercial Jewish textbook publishers for teacher education sessions. Teachers are also sent to conferences, most notably the national CAJE conference, local mini-CAJE conferences where they exist, conferences connected to the various denominational educational organizations and experiences in Israel.

Introduction

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

Implications and Possible Recommendations

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

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

The best practice schools do various things to work on <u>retaining</u> teachers. In general the focus is on raising the status of the school, and hence teaching in the school, within the congregation as a whole. Singling out the accomplishments of teachers through the synagogue bulletin and rabbinic support is coupled with treating teachers in a professional manner, giving them the appropriate workplace and supporting teachers' trips to conferences and other inservice sessions. Different localities deal with recruitment in different ways. The efforts described in the reports of some congregations to use teenagers and parents in the school as teachers or adjunct teachers may be appropriate for adaptation by schools who have difficulty finding teachers.

5. <u>Involve the family</u>

"Family education" has become a catchword in contemporary Jewish education, but it is obvious from the best practice reports that the term is used in many different ways in different settings. The overall goal of family involvement is clearly an important one for many reasons. Family involvement helps support the goals of the school (and <u>probably</u> the quality of discipline in the school), reinforces what children learn in school in the home, helps give children a sense that Judaism is not "just for Hebrew school," and "empowers" parents by assisting them in doing the home-based informal educating that has been typical of Jewish life for generations. The best practice reports show that family involvement may take many forms--adult learning, family retreats, actual teaching by parents in the school or an entire curriculum focused on family education, and others as well. There is little doubt that an increased and serious investigation of more family involvement in the synagogue school can have a powerful impact on its success.

Lead Communities and Best Practice: Implementation

In what way can the Best Practices Project directly assist the Lead Communities? We see three immediate uses of the project: knowledge, study, adaptation. First, the Best Practices Project offers "existence proofs" for the successful supplementary school, knowledge that such places actually exist. It is possible to answer "Yes" to the question, "is there a Hebrew school that works?"

Beyond merely knowing that such schools exist, we can use the best practice reports as models that can be studied. These schools "work" and they work in a variety of ways. Professor Seymour Fox has often spoken about the Best Practices Project as creating the "curriculum" for change in the Lead Communities. This should include: Exploration of the particular schools through study of the reports, meetings with the researchers who wrote them up and the educators who run those schools along with visits to the best practice sites.

Finally, it is crucial to think hard about adapting the best practice sites to the specific characteristics of the Lead Communities. It is unlikely that a program that exists in one place can simply be "injected" into a Lead Community. What must happen is a process of analysis, adaptation, revision, and evaluation. What the Best Practices Project does is give us the framework to begin the discussion, explore new possibilities and strive for excellence.

From Best Practice to New Practice

Best practice is only one element in the improvement of Jewish education. Even those programs which "work" can be improved. Other ideas as yet untried need to implemented and experimented with as well. The Lead Community idea allows us a chance to go beyond best practices in order to develop new ideas in Jewish education. At times we have referred to this as the "department of dreams." We believe that two different but related matters are involved here: first, all the new ideas in Jewish education that the energy of the CIJE and the Lead Community Project might be able to generate and second, the interesting ideas in Jewish education that people have talked about, perhaps even written about, but never have had the chance to try out. It is likely that developing these new ideas will come under the rubric of the Best Practices Project and it is our belief that the excitement inherent in the Lead Community Project will give us the opportunity to move forward with imagining innovative new plans and projects for Jewish educational change.

APPENDIX I

Council for Initiatives in Jewish Education
Best Practices Project

Barry W. Holtz

Guide for Looking at Best Practice in the Supplementary School

A "best practice" supplementary school should be a place...:

I. Systemic Issues

a. --with well articulated educational and "Jewish" goals
[What are those goals and by what means are they articulated? Meetings? Publications? Sermons?]

[What are the outcomes that the school seeks to achieve and how does the school measure success?]

b. --where stakeholders (such as parents, teachers, laypeople) are involved in the articulation or at least the validation, of these goals in an ongoing way
[What is the process by which this articulation and involvement happens?]

c. --with shared communication and an ongoing vision
[How do we see this in the day to day life of the school?]

d. --where one feels good to be there and students enjoy learning
[In what way do you see this? What is the atmosphere in classes? The nature of student behavior and "discipline"?]

e. --where students continue their Jewish education after Bar/Bat Mitzvah
[Does the school have actual data about this?]

II. Curriculum and Instruction Issues

a. --which takes curriculum seriously and has a serious, well-defined curriculum
[Is it a written curriculum? Do they use materials published by the denominational movements? By commercial publishers?]

b. --and in which, therefore, students are learning real "content"
[Do you have a sense of what the students learn? About Jewish religious life and practice? Moral principles? History? Hebrew language? Israel, etc. In what way, if any, does the school monitor student progress?]

c. --in which one sees interesting and "strong" teaching
[Is there a particular style of teaching that you see in the school? (Discussions? Lectures? Group work? etc.)
Who are the teachers? What is their Jewish educational background and preparation? What is their relationship to the students?
What is the stability of the staff over time? What does the school do to help new teachers enter the school?]

d. --in which one sees attention given to "affective" experiences for children
[Is there occasion for "practice" in Jewish living or values? For example, is there a tzedakah project, an Israel project, a mitzvah project in the school? Is there a Junior congregation or other opportunity for experiencing prayer? Are there programs in the arts—music, dance, etc? Is there a retreat or shabbaton program for children?]

d. --with family or parent education programs
[What does the school do in this area? Do they use any specific materials or programs? (which ones?) How often does this happen? Is there a retreat or shabbaton program for families? Are parents required to engage in some kind of adult learning? In what way?]

III. Supervision Issues

a. --which engages in regular serious inservice education and/or supervision of teachers
[Who does the supervision? What is it like? How regular is it? Does the school use outside consultants for inservice? Are teachers sent to inservice sessions? Where and in what way does this take place? Is there a retreat or shabbaton program for teachers?]

b. --with an effective principal who serves as a true educational leader
[In what way does the principal demonstrate this leadership? How do the teachers...the parents....the rabbi perceive him/her?]

APPENDIX H

Team Members: Best Practice in the Supplementary School

Report Writers:

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

Additional Consultants:

Dr. Isa Aron (Hebrew Union College-Los Angeles)
Dr. Sherry Blumberg (Hebrew Union College-New York)
Ms. Gail Dorph (University Of Judaism, Los Angeles)
Dr. Samuel Heilman (Queens College, NY)

Introduction

Melton Research Center
3080 Broadway
New York, NY 10027

Jewish Theological Seminary
3080 Broadway
New York, NY 10027
(212) 678-8031
Fax (212) 749-9085*

To: Annette Hochstein
At FAX Number: Mandel Inst.
From: Barry Holtz
Date: February 8 1993
Total pages including this one: 15
RE:

Annette — Here is the introduction
for Best Practice in Supp. School —
Can you get it to Seymour for comments?

Thanks
Barry

*If you experience difficulty transmitting to this FAX number, please use the JTS main FAX number as an alternate: (212) 678-8947. Kindly indicate that this message should be forwarded to the Melton Research Center. Thank you.

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

INTRODUCTION
Barry W. Holtz

What is the Best Practices Project?

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

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

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

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

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

We should be clear, however, that the effective practical use of the best practices project is a complex matter. Knowing that a best practice exists in one place and even seeing that program in action does not guarantee that the Lead Communities will be able to succeed in implementing it in their localities, no matter how good their intentions. What makes a curriculum work in Denver or Cleveland is connected to a whole collection of factors that may not be in place when we try to introduce that curriculum in Atlanta, Baltimore or Milwaukee. The issue of translation from the Best Practice site to the Lead Community site is one which will require considerable imagination. I will try to indicate some ways that such translation may occur at the end of this introductory essay.

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

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

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

Or we could have looked at the specific populations served:
-- adults
-- children
--prospective converts to Judaism

There were numerous other possibilities as well.

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

Best Practice in the Supplementary School: The Process

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

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

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

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

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

The Reports: An Overview

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

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

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

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

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

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

Improving Supplementary Schools: Some Practical Suggestions

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

1. Use the Guide

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

2. Improve the School at the Systemic Level

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

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

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

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

Implications and Possible Recommendations

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

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

3. The Leader is Crucial

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

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

Implications and Possible Recommendations

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

4. Invest in Teachers

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

For some of the best practice schools recruitment is not a major problem. A place like "Temple Bnai Zion" has a staff of veterans and experiences a very small amount of turnover.

In general, good schools tend to perpetuate themselves because their reputations are well known in the community of educators and when openings appear, teachers will want to come to work in such an institution. Here in a slightly different way, the educational leader makes a difference. Who would not want to work for the revered principal of "Congregation Beth Tzedek"?

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

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

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

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

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

The best practice schools use local central agencies, denominational organizations and at times commercial Jewish textbook publishers for teacher education sessions. Teachers are also sent to conferences, most notably the national CAJE conference, local mini-CAJE conferences where they exist, conferences connected to the various denominational educational organizations and experiences in Israel.

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

Implications and Possible Recommendations

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

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

The best practice schools do various things to work on <u>retaining</u> teachers. In general the focus is on raising the status of the school, and hence teaching in the school, within the congregation as a whole. Singling out the accomplishments of teachers through the synagogue bulletin and rabbinic support is coupled with treating teachers in a professional manner, giving them the appropriate workplace and supporting teachers' trips to conferences and other in-service sessions. Different localities deal with recruitment in different ways. The efforts described in the reports of some congregations to use teenagers and parents in the school as teachers or adjunct teachers may be appropriate for adaptation by schools who have difficulty finding teachers.

5. <u>Involve the family</u>

"Family education" has become a catchword in contemporary Jewish education, but it is obvious from the best practice reports that the term is used in many different ways in different settings. The overall goal of family involvement is clearly an important one for many reasons. Family involvement helps support the goals of the school (and <u>probably</u> the quality of discipline in the school), reinforces what children learn in school in the home, helps give children a sense that Judaism is not "just for Hebrew school," and "empowers" parents by assisting them in doing the home-based informal educating that has been typical of Jewish life for generations. The best practice reports show that family involvement may take many forms--adult learning, family retreats, actual teaching by parents in the school or an entire curriculum focused on family education, and others as well. There is little doubt that an increased and serious investigation of more family involvement in the synagogue school can have a powerful impact on its success.

Lead Communities and Best Practice: Implementation

In what way can the Best Practices Project directly assist the Lead Communities? We see three immediate uses of the project: knowledge, study, adaptation. First, the Best Practices Project offers "existence proofs" for the successful supplementary school, knowledge that such places actually exist. It is possible to answer "Yes" to the question, "is there a Hebrew school that works?"

Beyond merely knowing that such schools exist, we can use the best practice reports as models that can be studied. These schools "work" and they work in a variety of ways. Professor Seymour Fox has often spoken about the Best Practices Project as creating the "curriculum" for change in the Lead Communities. This should include: Exploration of the particular schools through study of the reports, meetings with the researchers who wrote them up and the educators who run those schools along with visits to the best practice sites.

Finally, it is crucial to think hard about adapting the best practice sites to the specific characteristics of the Lead Communities. It is unlikely that a program that exists in one place can simply be "injected" into a Lead Community. What must happen is a process of analysis, adaptation, revision, and evaluation. What the Best Practices Project does is give us the framework to begin the discussion, explore new possibilities and strive for excellence.

From Best Practice to New Practice

Best practice is only one element in the improvement of Jewish education. Even those programs which "work" can be improved. Other ideas as yet untried need to implemented and experimented with as well. The Lead Community idea allows us a chance to go beyond best practices in order to develop new ideas in Jewish education. At times we have referred to this as the "department of dreams." We believe that two different but related matters are involved here: first, all the new ideas in Jewish education that the energy of the CIJE and the Lead Community Project might be able to generate and second, the interesting ideas in Jewish education that people have talked about, perhaps even written about, but never have had the chance to try out. It is likely that developing these new ideas will come under the rubric of the Best Practices Project and it is our belief that the excitement inherent in the Lead Community Project will give us the opportunity to move forward with imagining innovative new plans and projects for Jewish educational change.

APPENDIX I

Council for Initiatives in Jewish Education
Best Practices Project

Barry W. Holtz

Guide for Looking at Best Practice in the Supplementary School

A "best practice" supplementary school should be a place...:

I. Systemic Issues

a. --with well articulated educational and "Jewish" goals
[What are those goals and by what means are they articulated? Meetings? Publications? Sermons?]

[What are the outcomes that the school seeks to achieve and how does the school measure success?]

b. --where stakeholders (such as parents, teachers, laypeople) are involved in the articulation or at least the validation, of these goals in an ongoing way
[What is the process by which this articulation and involvement happens?]

c. --with shared communication and an ongoing vision
[How do we see this in the day to day life of the school?]

d. --where one feels good to be there and students enjoy learning
[In what way do you see this? What is the atmosphere in classes? The nature of student behavior and "discipline"?]

e. --where students continue their Jewish education after Bar/Bat Mitzvah
[Does the school have actual data about this?]

II. Curriculum and Instruction Issues

a. --which takes curriculum seriously and has a serious, well-defined curriculum
[Is it a written curriculum? Do they use materials published by the denominational movements? By commercial publishers?]

b. --and in which, therefore, students are learning real "content"

[Do you have a sense of what the students learn? About Jewish religious life and practice? Moral principles? History? Hebrew language? Israel, etc. In what way, if any, does the school monitor student progress?]

c. --in which one sees interesting and "strong" teaching

[Is there a particular style of teaching that you see in the school? (Discussions? Lectures? Group work? etc.)

Who are the teachers? What is their Jewish educational background and preparation? What is their relationship to the students?

What is the stability of the staff over time? What does the school do to help new teachers enter the school?]

d. --in which one sees attention given to "affective" experiences for children

[Is there occasion for "practice" in Jewish living or values? For example, is there a tzedakah project, an Israel project, a mitzvah project in the school? Is there a Junior congregation or other opportunity for experiencing prayer? Are there programs in the arts—music, dance, etc? Is there a retreat or shabbaton program for children?]

d. --with family or parent education programs

[What does the school do in this area? Do they use any specific materials or programs? (which ones?) How often does this happen? Is there a retreat or shabbaton program for families? Are parents required to engage in some kind of adult learning? In what way?]

III. Supervision Issues

a. --which engages in regular serious inservice education and/or supervision of teachers

[Who does the supervision? What is it like? How regular is it? Does the school use outside consultants for inservice? Are teachers sent to inservice sessions? Where and in what way does this take place? Is there a retreat or shabbaton program for teachers?]

b. --with an effective principal who serves as a true educational leader

[In what way does the principal demonstrate this leadership? How do the teachers...the parents....the rabbi perceive him/her?]

APPENDIX H

Team Members: Best Practice in the Supplementary School

Report Writers:

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

Additional Consultants:

Dr. Isa Aron (Hebrew Union College-Los Angeles)
Dr. Sherry Blumberg (Hebrew Union College-New York)
Ms. Gail Dorph (University Of Judaism, Los Angeles)
Dr. Samuel Heilman (Queens College, NY)

Melton Research Center
3080 Broadway
New York, NY 10027

Jewish Theological Seminary
3080 Broadway
New York, NY 10027
(212) 678-8031
Fax (212) 749-9085*

To: Annette Hochstein

At FAX Number: Mandel Inst

From: Barry Holtz

Date: Feb 5

Total pages including this one: 2

RE:

My schedule in March

*If you experience difficulty transmitting to this FAX number, please use the JTS main FAX number as an alternate: (212) 678-8947. Kindly indicate that this message should be forwarded to the Melton Research Center. Thank you.

MELTON
RESEARCH
CENTER
for Jewish Education

February 5, 1993

To: Annette
From: Barry W. Holtz
Re: My schedule

Hi Annette:

It was nice to spend time with you last week. As it turned out, because of my son's illness, we cancelled our trip to Florida. My own cold got worse-- partially thanks to the airplane ride home from Cleveland, my ears got messed up. So it's been a glorious few days.

I am sending this fax so you'll know that I rescheduled Florida for March. If there is going to be that planners meeting in March I will only be available on March 2nd; on the 3rd we are going south (I hope) and will return on March 10th. Keep that in mind as you think about using me for whatever.

Thanks. Best wishes to all.

The Jewish Theological Seminary of America
3080 Broadway • New York, New York 10027 • Telephone (212) 678-8031 • Fax (212) 749-9085

To: CIJE Interested Parties
From: Barry W. Holtz
Re: **Pilot Projects**
February 22, 1993

We have spent some time talking about the concept of the "Pilot Projects" for the Lead Communities. In this memo I will put down some ideas that Shulamith Elster and I have been thinking about that may help our discussions about the Pilots.

A Pilot Project is an initiative undertaken by a Lead Community in its start-up phase, even before the planning process is completed. The purpose of the Pilots is to "jump start" the process for change the Lead Communities as well as to build local enthusiasm for the Lead Communities Project. In addition Pilot Projects can help in the planning process or test on a small scale what may later be attempted in a larger context.

All Pilot Projects should be centered around the two main "directives" of the CIJE, as stated in **A Time to Act**: a) build community support for Jewish education; b) build the personnel of the profession of Jewish education.

Shulamith and I have conceptualized three different "cuts" into the Pilots (which we call Pilot A, B and C), all or some of which can be launched in each Lead Community.

Pilot A

Pilot A is a series of consultations-- an ongoing educational seminar-- by the CIJE and its guest consultants developed for the Lead Community Commission. Its purpose is to help the Lead Communities plan, envision and launch the implementation of educational change. These consultations would, in essence, form the beginnings of the "content" side of the planning process outlined in **the Lead Communities Planning Guide** (see specifically pp. 31-33).

The "curriculum" of these consultations would be based on the work of the Best Practices Project. Shulamith and I would lead (or arrange for other consultants to lead) a presentation and discussion about each of the areas in the project: supplementary schools, early childhood Jewish education, the Israel Experience, JCCs, day schools, the college campus, adult education, camping, and community-wide initiatives (those programs in training, recruitment, board development, etc. that have been done at the community^level such as Federation or BJE). In addition, we will devote sessions to the process of implementing change in educational settings.

Where the publications of the Best Practices Project are available (e.g. the supplementary school), we will use those volumes as the "text"; where they are not available, experts in the field who are working on the project will present to the group.

The seminar will also include presentations from educators in the Best Practices sites and visits by the Lead Communities Commission (or relevant task forces within it) to actual Best Practices sites.

Pilot B

Pilot A works at the level of community leadership; Pilot B aims at the educational leadership in the local Lead Community. It focuses on the introduction of new ideas into the the community. Here we could imagine a similar approach to Pilot A, but with a different audience: sessions with relevant educational leaders based around the Best Practices Project; visits to sites; visits from Best Practices practitioners.

Pilot C

Pilot C aims to be less oriented on planning and more focused on practical skills, for a number of different potential populations:

#1: The Rabbis Seminar for supplementary schools. Based on Joseph Reimer's work for the Commission, this would be a mini-course for local rabbis on improving their supplementary school. It would include visits by rabbis the Best Practices Project supplementary schools. This could be organized by the denominations or trans-denominationally.

#2: The Supervisor Level: a mini-course oriented toward the principals of schools or agency directors around some skills important for their work-- leadership in education, supervision, board relations, etc.

#3: The "front line soldier": a project oriented for the teachers in the field. This might include an inservice project for early childhood teachers, an Israel oriented program etc. It is likely that these could come from national training and service organizations.

Examples:

The Melton Research Center/JTS has proposed an intensive program on teaching using the arts for the Baltimore BJE. This project could serve as a Pilot C, #3 project.

The Hebrew University's Melton Centre has proposed developing a number of options for the communities teachers-- a) sending a teacher from each community to the Senior Educator program; b) using the

Melton Mini-School in the Lead Communities to provide Jewish content knowledge for early childhood educators, etc. c) A Seminar in Israel could be arranged for principals of Lead Communities dayschools to prepare them for bringing their staff the next summer.

Yeshiva University could be approached to offer a program for Lead Communities day school teachers.

Date: Sun, 3 Apr 1994 09:27 CDT
From: <GAMORAN@WISCSSC>
Subject: next message
To: annette@hujivms
Original_To: ALANHOF, ALHOFUS
Original_cc: ANNETTE, ELLEN, GINNY, GAMORAN

The next message contains the proposed MEF work plan through December 31, 1994. I am sending a hard copy, with a budget attached, to Ginny.

I am looking forward to our meeting in Milwaukee on May 1, as the next step in discussing where we go from here.

Alan, as per our last phone conversation, I am anticipating your giving me the ok to tell Roberta and Julie that we wish to extend their contracts through Decemebr 31, 1994. That would allow us to carry out the work described in this work plan. We will make a decision about next year when we have a firmer idea about the direction the MEF project will take after this year.

From: <GAMORAN@WISCSSC>
Subject: proposed MEF work plan
To: annette@hujivms
Original_To: ALANHOF, ALHOFUS
Original_cc: ANNETTE, GINNY

CONFIDENTIAL -- FOR DISTRIBUTION ONLY WITHIN CIJE

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

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

I. Ongoing Monitoring and Evaluation

A. Monitoring and Evaluation of the Personnel Action Plan

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

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

B. Monitoring and Evaluation of Lead Community Projects

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

C. Monitoring of Community Mobilization

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

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

II. Community Profiles

A. Educator Surveys and Interviews

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

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

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

B. Institutional Profiles

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

1. To provide information for communal and institutional planning. As goals for Jewish education are identified, information on the current state of Jewish education will make it possible to map out a plan for moving from the current situation towards the desired goals.

2. To establish a baseline so that subsequent changes in the provision of Jewish education can be measured against an initial starting point.

3. To engage the communities and their institutions in a self-study process, nurturing "reflective communities" and helping to foster mobilization.

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

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

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

Products and Time Line

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

November 30	Report on educational leaders in Atlanta	Adam Ellen Bill
December 31	Reports on progress of personnel action plans in Atlanta, Baltimore, and Milwaukee	Julie Roberta Bill
December 31	Paper on teaching force in all three communities	Adam Ellen Roberta Bill Julie
December 31	Proposal to survey institutional practices	Bill Robinson

Date: Sun, 3 Apr 1994 22:17 CDT
From: <GAMORAN@WISCSSC>
Subject: next message
To: annette@hujivms
Original_To: ALANHOF, ALHOFUS, GINNY, ANNETTE
Original_cc: ELLEN, GAMORAN

The next message contains a revised memo for distribution to members of the CIJE Board Committee on Research and Evaluation, for distribution prior to the board meeting and for use on that day. For those who saw an earlier version, the only revision Esther Leah wanted was to add a note at the end that these items will by discussed at the committee meeting.

By the way, the dual emphasis on research and evaluation in the memo is Esther Leah's idea, and Ellen and I are fully comfortable with and supportive of that.

I am sending a hard copy to Ginny. Please use the hard copy for distribution to board members; it is much prettier than an e-mail message! Of course, if the memo needs to be revised, I will revise it.

Esther Leah raised the following question, to which we would like guidance from Alan: Would it be a good idea to have a brief presentation, written or oral, on the findings of the MEF project? (That is, findings so far on personnel.) The reason for doing so would be to give the Committee members a more concrete understanding of the research/evaluation we are doing. The reasons for not doing this are: First, Esther Leah was concerned that it might divert the Committee's attention to the specific findings and Lead Community issues and away from the Committee's broader agenda; second, I am concerned about confidentiality issues, since we have so far a report on only one community.

Perhaps we could prepare a handout with a few basic frequencies on all three communities, labeled "Community A," "Community B," and "Community C," on just a few essential items such as the percent with professional educational certification, percent with no Jewish education after age 13, percent of pre-school teachers that are not Jewish --just as examples, followed by a description of the type of report we are writing for the communities, without the specifics on a particular community.

Date: Sun, 3 Apr 1994 09:28 CDT

Date: Sun, 3 Apr 1994 22:20 CDT
From: <GAMORAN@WISCSSC>
Subject: memo to Board Committee on Research, revised after further consultation with Esther Leah and Ellen
To: annette@hujivms
Original_To: ALANHOF, ALHOFUS, ANNETTE, GINNY, ELLEN

April 1, 1994

Council for Initiatives in Jewish Education

Memorandum

CIJE Board Committee on Research and Evaluation

> A research capacity for Jewish education in North America will be developed at universities, by professional research organizations, as well as by individual scholars. They will create the theoretical and practical knowledge base that is indispensable for change and improvement....The research results will be disseminated throughout the Jewish community for use in short-term and long-term planning. Data on Lead Communities will be analyzed to ensure that their individual programs are educationally sound and are meeting with success.
>
> -- A Time To Act, p. 70

Definition and Purposes of the Committee

The Committee on Research and Evaluation is charged with developing strategies for creating a capacity for research on Jewish education in North America. At present, very little knowledge is being gathered and disseminated that can help Jewish educators improve. There is no real infrastructure for Jewish educational research; there are only a few professors of Jewish education, and they have many other responsibilities besides research.

Another mission of the Committee is to foster self-evaluation of Jewish educational programs throughout North America. Related to the near-absence of research, programs and institutions in Jewish education rarely assess their own programs to monitor performance or gauge success. A goal of CIJE is to encourage evaluation-minded communities; that is, communities that examine their own programs as a step towards self-improvement.

CIJE Research and Evaluation to Date

Thus far, research and evaluation sponsored by CIJE has occurred in Lead Communities, our "local laboratories" for educational innovation. A Monitoring, Evaluation, and Feedback (MEF) team has studied educators and issued policy-oriented reports on educational personnel to the communities. The MEF team has also analyzed the process of mobilization for Jewish education in the Lead Communities. These reports and analyses have been narrowly focused on issues relevant to educational change within the Lead Communities. No steps have yet been taken towards wider dissemination.

Possible Activities for the Committee

A number of possible activities for the Committee may be considered:

(1) The question of translating evidence gathered in Lead Communities into usable knowledge for the rest of North American Jewry may be a major topic for discussion. What are the appropriate mechanisms for reaching out to the wider Jewish community of North America? What should be the relative priorities within CIJE of data-gathering and report-writing for the purpose of stimulating action within the Lead Communities, as compared with the broader goal of disseminating information throughout North America?

(2) CIJE has a small internal research capacity, but the ultimate goal is to stimulate research on a broad scale, involving many partners including universities, foundations, agencies, and individual scholars. How can CIJE move towards the broader agenda?

(3) How can CIJE encourage communities other than the Lead

Communities to become more reflective? What activities or programs might stimulate and support self-evaluation in Jewish education?

These issues will serve as agenda items for the Committee meeting on April 21. The Committee meeting is scheduled in conjunction with the CIJE Board meeting.

אלן, לידיעתך SW

Received: by HUJIVMS via NJE (HUyMail-V6l); Wed, 06 Oct 93 23:03:39 +0200
Date: Wed, 6 Oct 1993 16:03 CDT
From: <GAMORAN@WISCSSC>
Subject: Atlanta search
To: ALANHOF@HUJIVMS
Original_To: ALANHOF

Alan,

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

```
Yours,

Adam




BMAIL>
```

get from Caio tomorrow
Send to Mike with question

Topics addressed by the Educator Survey

1. Profiles of Teachers:
   - A. General Background-Who are the teachers in our community?
     (Background section: Q 38-56)
     For example: Gender, Jewish affiliation, ritual observance, income, etc.

   - B. Training: What is the educational background and training of the teachers in our community ? To what extent are they formally trained?
     (Q 57-60)
     For example: What degrees do they hold? In what subjects? How many hold teaching certificates?

   - C. Previous Work Experience: What work experiences do our teachers have?
     (Q6-11)
     For example: How stable is our workforce? (Q9,10)
     How experienced is our workforce? (Q11)
     What socializing experiences do teachers have? Do most teachers have experience as youth group leaders and camp counselors? (Q6)

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

   - D, Present Work Settings: What is the nature of our teachers work? (20-28, 33-35)
     For example: How many schools do they teach in?
     Are they full time or part time? Would they like to be full time?
     Which benefits are available? Which do they receive?
     Advantages and disadvantages of working in more than one school?

2. Careers in Jewish Education
   - A. Recruitment: How are teachers recruited and attracted?
     (Q 1, 29, 32, 35, 37)
     For example: Why did the teachers first become Jewish educators?
     How did they find their positions?
     What affected their decision to work at a particular school?

   - B. Retention: What are the teachers' future plans?
     (Q2, 61)

3. Professional Development: What are the opportunities for teacher professional development?
   (Q 12-19, 30)
   For example: To what extent do teachers participate in different types of professional development activities?
   What is their assessment of these activities?
   What skills and knowledge would they like to develop further?
   Who is providing help and support?

4. Sentiments About Work as a Jewish Educator: How do the teachers feel about their work?
   (Q 3, 4, 5)
   For example: What is their level of satisfaction?
   Do they feel respected by others in their community?

Questions Milwaukee will be addressing:

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

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

Q 36 working full or part time
Q 56 importance of income from Jewish education
Q 33 benefits
Q 5 overall job satisfaction
Q 26 work setting
Q 8 having experience in general education
Q 61 future career plans
Q 22 hours of work

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

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

Q 26 setting
Q 36 working full or part time

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

Q 36 working full time or part time
Q 26 setting
Q 33 benefits
Q 5 overall satisfaction

What is the relationship between receiving certain benefits (Q 33) and:
Q 36 working full or part time
Q 26 setting

What is the relationship between seniority at the present school (Q9) and:
Q 5 overall satisfaction
Q 2 perceptions of having a career
Q 36 working full or part time

The following belongs to the section on Careers-Recruitment:

What is the relationship between having experience in general education (Q 8) and:
Q 36 working full or part time
Q 5 job satisfaction
Q 26 setting
Q 56 importance of income from Jewish education

Q What is the relationship between educational training (Q58 or Q 60) and:
Q 2 perception of having a career
Q 26 setting
Q 36 working full time or part time

The following issues pertain to settings:

What is the relationship between working in a particular setting (Q26) and:
Q 22 hours of work
Q 36 full/part time educator
Q 5 overall satisfaction scale

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

What is the relationship between seniority (Q 9) and:
Q14 overall helpfulness of workshops
Q 30 overall help and support received
Q 16 areas desired for skill development
Q 17 areas desired to increase knowledge

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

What is the relationship between overall helpfulness of workshops (Q 14) and:
  Q 26 setting
  Q 58 or 60 educational training

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

What is the relationship between level of help and support received and (Q30) and:
  Q26 setting
  Q 58 or 60 educational training

What is the relationship between holding a license in Jewish or general education (Q60) and:
  Q 16 areas desired for skill development
  Q 17 areas desired for increase knowledge

What is the relationship between setting (Q 26) and:
  Q16 areas desired for skill development
  Q17 areas desired for increase knowledge
  Q12 whether or not in-service is required

CC: Adam Gamoran
Roberta Goodman
Julie Tammivaaria

Shmuel -
Are you going to answer this?
O

DATE :: Aug 07, 1993

TO :: Annette Hochstein
:: Mandel Institute

FROM :: Adam Gamoran
:: University of Wisconsin-Madison

FAX PHONE :: 6082652140

VOICE PHONE :: 6082634253 (office) or 6082333757 (home)

MESSAGE : This message is for Shmuel or Annette. Thanks.
:
:

August 7, 1993

Dear Friends,

Shavua Tov! I'd be grateful if you would confirm that you received my Board Report, which I sent by e-mail over a week ago. Aside from that, I'll be happy to hear your reactions to all we've been sending this summer whenever you are ready.

Adam

Annette [illegible]

```
read 10
2JH10   GAMORAN@WISCSSC => ANNETTE@HUJIVMS; 28/07/93, 19:25:43; M
GAMORAN.MAIL
    EBCDIC (<GAMORAN@WISCSSC>)
MIME  type: text/plain

Received: by HUJIVMS via NJE (HUyMail-V61); Wed, 28 Jul 93 19:25:43 +030
Date:      Wed, 28 Jul 1993 11:04 CDT
From:      <GAMORAN@WISCSSC>
Subject:   this is not my board report, but that's coming, I
           promise!
To:        annette@hujivms
Original_To:  ELLEN, ANNETTE




July 27, 1993


Ms. Annette Hochstein

Hit <CR> for next page, : to skip to next part.....
BMAIL>
Mandel Institute of Jerusalem
22a HaTzfira St.
Jerusalem, ISRAEL

Dear Annette,

I"m writing to report on a very productive meeting I held with
with Esther Leah Ritz earlier today.  Although this is a very
hectic time for her -- she was in the midst of moving apartments
and is about to leave for a month in Europe -- she was good
enough to spend nearly two hours with me.  The purpose of the
meeting was for me to brief her on (a) what the MEF project
accomplished during 1992-93; and (b) what we have proposed to do
during the coming year.  (My agenda for the meeting is attached.)

In the course of my report, Esther Leah raised several important
points which I want to share with you:

(1) She reminded me of the role of our project in helping the
lead communities become "evaluation-minded communities;" that is,
communities in which evaluation is a normal component of any

Hit <CR> for next page, : to skip to next part.....
BMAIL>
ongoing project.  We discussed the ways our project can
contribute to this effort.  I indicated that for starters, we
plan to work on this in two ways:

     (a) We will work with all new initiatives within the Lead
     Communities to ensure that each has an evaluation component
```

built in from the start. I noted that the language of CIJE implementation now takes this into account: Originally, the criteria for lead community projects was content, scope, and quality; evaluation is now the fourth component.

(b) Our plans include support for "reflective practitioners," two educators within each community who, under the guidance of our field researchers, will reflect on their work in systematic ways over the course of the year.

As a consequence of my discussion with Esther Leah, I now plan to include "encouraging reflective communities" as a third purpose of the MEF project. (The other two purposes are for replication in the long term and for feedback in the short term.)

Hit <CR> for next page, : to skip to next part....
BMAIL>
ElHally, I would like to add this point as an addendum to the section on ONGOING MONITORING AND FEEDBACK in our proposal for work in 1993-94. I have attached the addendum to this letter.

(2) In describing our efforts to construct a feedback loop with CIJE, I noted that although we had some successes, we had not generally succeeded in providing CIJE with new information in a timely fashion. I explained some of CIJE's other ways of getting the same information we were providing. Esther Leah responded that collecting new information should not be the primary aim of our feedback to CIJE. Rather, our purpose should be to interpret and evaluate the information that comes to light. We should put it in perspective and use it to anticipate future consequences on the basis of past and ongoing situations. This should be the nature of our regular updates to CIJE.

I found this to be highly enlightening. It would free us from the paradox of reporting information that you and Seymour already know. Rather, it guides us towards emphasizing what has been most successful in our feedback so far. For example, both the

Hit <CR> for next page, : to skip to next part....
BMAIL>
SflMmary report in February, and the oral report on Milwaukee in May, were valuable not because of the information they contained per se, but because of the perspectives they offered and the internal discussions they generated.

I am especially interested in hearing your reactions on this point.

(3) In explaining what we had studied so far, I mentioned that our work was not about education at this point, but about communities. That is, we have not had any educational reforms to study, but there has been much to say about community dynamics.

Esther Leah seized on this point. She felt it was an important insight which should be emphasized. Rather than seeing it as a drawback or failing, she saw it as something we had learned and ought to contribute to the discourse about lead communities: The process starts with community reform, and only moves to include educational reform in a subsequent phase.

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

£5$ She expressed no reservations whatsoever with our having commenced the MEF project while the implementation is still getting off the ground. In her view, evaluation starts with the planning process, so this year was the right time to start.

(5) She raised the issue of her board subcommittee: She would like to add other board members and make it into an operating committee. I responded that I want her, herself, as long as I can have her, but I had no objection to her adding a couple of additional board members with whom she and I could meet at subsequent board meetings. She said she would raise this issue with you, Seymour, and Mort.

(6) She also raised a question about the professional advisory committee for the MEF project. I described our original committee (Coleman, Fox, Hochstein, Inbar), and she explained that this was not adequate, a conclusion which, as you know, I had already reached. She advised me to form a committee which would include not only academics, but one or two persons familiar

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

QIHh Jewish education systems -- formal and informal -- and with Jewish communities. I think this is sound advice, and it is consistent with the thinking within the MEF team. I will put some thought into this, and I'd appreciate any advice you may have.

As you can see, it was an enlightening meeting to me, and I think we are very fortunate to have Esther Leah as our board advisor.

Yours,

Adam

```
cc:  Ellen Goldring

Hit <CR> for next page, : to skip to next part....
BMAIL>
2JH  Esther Leah Ritz


************
Attachment A

        Adam Gamoran -- MEF Briefing for Esther Leah Ritz
                           July 27, 1993


I.  Accomplishments and Challenges, 1992-93

     A. Goals for 1992-93
          1. Field Researchers
          2. Visions, Mobilization, and Professional Lives of Educators

     B. Adjustments
          1. Pace of change
          2. Access

     C. Products

Hit <CR> for next page, : to skip to next part....
BMAIL>
2JH       1. Interview protocols
          2. Survey of educators
          3. Reports on educators
               a. Qualitative component
               b. Quantitative component
               c. Integrated report
          4. Feedback loop
               a. To CIJE
               b. To the communities


II. Proposed plan for 1993-94

     A. Ongoing monitoring and feedback
          1. Year 1 cumulative report
               a. Mobilization
               b. Visions
          2. Continued feedback to CIJE and the communities
          3. Follow-up reports on mobilization, visions, and
          educators
          4. Facilitating evaluation-minded communities

Hit <CR> for next page, : to skip to next part....
BMAIL>
2JH       5. Special topics reports

     B. Community profiles
```

```
          1. Claire's resignation, and her anticipated replacement
          2. Changes in our scope of work

     C. Proposed assessment of 6th grade Hebrew in day schools


**************
Attachment B


           Addendum to MEF Proposed Plans for 1993-94

Under ONGOING MONITORING AND FEEDBACK, please add the following:

"The field researchers will also work with community participants to
encourage reflective practice.  Ultimately, we would like to foster
"evaluation-minded communities," that is, in which evaluation is a
routine component of all educational and social service projects and

Hit <CR> for next page, : to skip to next part.....
BMAIL>
programs.  We propose to initiate this effort in 1993-94 in two ways:

     (a) We will work with all new initiatives within the Lead Communiti
*     to ensure that each has an evaluation component built in from the

     (b) We will work with reflective practitioners in each community.
     the guidance of the field researchers, we will invite two educators
     within each community to reflect on their work in systematic ways o
     the course of the year.
BMAIL> next
2JH11   GAMORAN@WISCSSC => ANNETTE@HUJIVMS; 30/07/93, 15:42:31; M
GAMORAN.MAIL
    EBCDIC (<GAMORAN@WISCSSC>)
MIME  type: text/plain

Received: by HUJIVMS via NJE (HUyMail-V61); Fri, 30 Jul 93 15:42:31 +030
Date:     Fri, 30 Jul 1993 07:43 CDT
From:     <GAMORAN@WISCSSC>
Subject:  board report
To:       annette@hujivms
Original_To:  ANNETTE, MANDEL

Please confirm that you received the Board report I sent Wed. night.

Adam
BMAIL>
No such message #12
BMAIL>
```

07:13:17 +0300
Date: Wed, 28 Jul 1993 23:14 CDT
From: <GAMORAN@WISCSSC>
Subject: progress report for CIJE board
To: MANDEL@HUJIVMS
Original_To: MANDEL
Original_cc: ELLEN

CIJE Project on Monitoring, Evaluation, and Feedback in Lead Communities

Progress Report -- August 1993

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 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 compoment, describing the interview results; a quantitive component, presenting the survey results; and an integrative compoment, 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 and social service 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.

Received: by HUJIVMS via NJE (HUyMail-V61); Mon, 26 Jul 93 05:44:08
+0300
Date: Sun, 25 Jul 1993 21:44 CDT
From: <GAMORAN@WISCSSC>
Subject: outline for ELR briefing coming up Tuesday --
comments welcome
To: annette@hujivms
Original_To: ELLEN, ANNETTE, MANDEL

Adam Gamoran -- MEF Briefing for Esther Leah Ritz

July 27, 1993

I. Accomplishments and Challenges, 1992-93

- A. Goals for 1992-93
    - 1. Field Researchers
    - 2. Visions, Moblization, and Prof. Lives of Educators
- B. Adjustments
    - 1. Pace of change
    - 2. Access
- C. Products
    - 1. Interview protocols
    - 2. Survey of educators

3. Reports on educators
    a. Qualitative component
    b. Quantitative component
    c. Integrated report
4. Feedback loop
    a. To CIJE
    b. To the communities

II. Proposed plan for 1993-94

A. Ongoing monitoring and feedback
  1. Year 1 cumulative report
    a. Mobilization
    b. Visions
  2. Continued feedback to CIJE and the communities
  3. Follow-up reports on mobilization, visions, and educators
  4. Special topics reports

B. Community profiles
  1. Claire's resignation, and her anticipated replacement
  2. Changes in our scope of work

C. Propposed assessment of 6th grade Hebrew in day schools

Received: by HUJIVMS via NJE (HUyMail-V6l); Wed, 28 Jul 93 19:25:43 +0300
Date: Wed, 28 Jul 1993 11:04 CDT
From: <GAMORAN@WISCSSC>
Subject: this is not my board report, but that's coming, I promise!
To: annette@hujivms
Original_To: ELLEN, ANNETTE

July 27, 1993

Ms. Annette Hochstein
Mandel Institute of Jerusalem
22a Hatzfira St.
Jerusalem, ISRAEL

Dear Annette,

I'm writing to report on a very productive meeting I held with with Esther Leah Ritz earlier today. Although this is a very hectic time for her -- she was in the midst of moving apartments and is about to leave for a month in Europe -- she was good enough to spend nearly two hours with me. The purpose of the meeting was for me to brief her on (a) what the MEF project accomplished during 1992-93; and

(b) what we have proposed to do during the coming year. (My agenda for the meeting is attached.)
In the course of my report, Esther Leah raised several important points which I want to share with you:

(1) She reminded me of the role of our project in helping the lead communities become "evaluation-minded communities;" that is, communities in which evaluation is a normal component of any ongoing project.

We discussed the ways our project can contribute to this effort. I indicated that for starters, we plan to work on this in two ways:

(a) We will work with all new initiatives within the Lead Communities to ensure that each has an evaluation component built in from the start. I noted that the language of CIJE implementation now takes this into account: Originally, the criteria for lead community projects was content, scope, and quality; evaluation is now the fourth component.

(b) Our plans include support for "reflective practitioners," two educators within each community who, under the guidance of our field researchers, will reflect on their work in systematic ways over the course of the year. As a consequence of my discussion with Esther Leah, I now plan to include "encouraging reflective communities" as a third purpose of the MEF project. (The other two purposes are for replication in the long term and for feedback in the short term.) Finally, I would like to add this point as an addendum to the section on ONGOING MONITORING AND FEEDBACK in our proposal for work in 1993-94. I have attached the addendum to this letter.

(2) In describing our efforts to construct a feedback loop with CIJE, I noted that although we had some successes, we had not generally succeeded in providing CIJE with new information in a timely fashion. I explained some of CIJE's other ways of getting the same information we were providing. Esther Leah responded that collecting new information should not be the primary aim of our feedback to CIJE. Rather, our purpose should be to interpret and evaluate the information that comes to light. We should put it in perspective and use it to anticipate future consequences on the basis of past and ongoing situations. This should be the nature of our regular updates to CIJE.

I found this to be highly enlightening. It would free us from the paradox of reporting information that you and Seymour already know. Rather, it guides us towards emphasizing what has been most successful in our feedback so far. For example, both the summary report in February, and the oral report on Milwaukee in May, were valuable not because of the information they contained per se, but because of the perspectives they offered and the internal discussions they generated.

I am especially interested in hearing your reactions on this point.

(3) In explaining what we had studied so far, I mentioned that our work was not about education at this point, but about communities. That is, we have not had any educational reforms to study, but there has been much to say about community dynamics.

Esther Leah seized on this point. She felt it was an important insight which should be emphasized. Rather than seeing it as a drawback or failing, she saw it as something we had learned and ought to contribute to the discourse about lead communities: The process starts with community reform, and only moves to include educational reform in a subsequent phase.

(4) She expressed no reservations whatsoever with our having commenced the MEF project while the implementation is still getting off the ground. In her view, evaluation starts with the planning process, so this year was the right time to start.

(5) She raised the issue of her board subcommittee: She would like to add other board members and make it into an operating committee. I responded that I want her, herself, as long as I can have her, but I had no objection to her adding a couple of additional board members with whom she and I could meet at subsequent board meetings. She said she would raise this issue with you, Seymour, and Mort.

(6) She also raised a question about the professional advisory committee for the MEF project. I described our original committee (Coleman, Fox, Hochstein, Inbar), and she explained that this was not adequate, a conclusion which, as you know, I had already reached. She advised me to form a committee which would include not only academics, but one or two persons familiar with Jewish education systems -- formal and informal -- and with Jewish communities. I think this is sound advice, and it is consistent with the thinking within the MEF team. I will put some thought into this, and I'd appreciate any advice you may have.

As you can see, it was an enlightening meeting to me, and I think we are very fortunate to have Esther Leah as our board advisor.

Yours,

Adam

cc: Ellen Goldring

Esther Leah Ritz

****

Attachment A

Adam Gamoran -- MEF Briefing for Esther Leah Ritz
July 27, 1993

I. Accomplishments and Challenges, 1992-93

A. Goals for 1992-93
    1. Field Researchers
    2. Visions, Mobilization, and Professional Lives of Educators

B. Adjustments
    1. Pace of change
    2. Access

C. Products
    1. Interview protocols
    2. Survey of educators
    3. Reports on educators
        a. Qualitative component
        b. Quantitative component
        c. Integrated report

4. Feedback loop
    a. To CIJE
    b. To the communities

II. Proposed plan for 1993-94

A. Ongoing monitoring and feedback
    1. Year 1 cumulative report
        a. Mobilization
        b. Visions
    2. Continued feedback to CIJE and the communities
    3. Follow-up reports on mobilization, visions, and educators
    4. Facilitating evaluation-minded communities
    5. Special topics reports

B. Community profiles
    1. Claire's resignation, and her anticipated replacement
    2. Changes in our scope of work

C. Proposed assessment of 6th grade Hebrew in day schools

****

Attachment B

Addendum to MEF Proposed Plans for 1993-94

Under ONGOING MONITORING AND FEEDBACK, please add the following:

"The field researchers will also work with community participants to encourage reflective practice. Ultimately, we would like to foster "evaluation-minded communities," that is, in which evaluation is a routine component of all educational and social service projects and programs. We propose to initiate this effort in 1993-94 in two ways:

(a) We will work with all new initiatives within the Lead Communities to ensure that each has an evaluation component built in from the start.

(b) We will work with reflective practitioners in each community. Under the guidance of the field researchers, we will invite two educators within each community to reflect on their work in systematic ways over the course of the year.

```
Cts04.gr tty92 is now available




Press RETURN to get started.


NO CARRIER
```

Peabody College
VANDERBILT UNIVERSITY
NASHVILLE, TENNESSEE 37205
TELEPHONE (615) 322-7111

Department of Educational Leadership • Box 314 • Direct phone 322-8000

Post-it™ brand fax transmittal memo 7671 # of pages ▸ 4

To Annette Hochstein	From Ellen Goldring
Co. Mandel Institute	Co. Vanderbilt
Dept.	Phone # 615-322-8037
Fax # 972-2-619-951	Fax # 615-343-7094

To: Annette and Seymour

From: Ellen and Adam

CC: Julie and Roberta

Re: Monitoring, Evaluation, and Feedback Plans

Date: July 25, 1993

This memo presents our proposal for Monitoring, Evaluation and Feedback of Lead Communities for the next year, September 1993-August, 1994.

Our proposal is divided into three areas of work: 1) Continuation of ongoing monitoring and feedback, 2) Conducting the community profiles (self-study), and 3) Conducting Hebrew language assessment in day schools.

1) <u>ONGOING MONITORING AND FEEDBACK</u>

In the fall, we will present to the lead communities and CIJE a year one, cumulative report about mobilization and visions. This will follow our cumulative reports about the professional lives of educators. Next year we will continue to monitor the three areas that are central to the initial phases of the MEF plan and the LC effort: mobilization, visions, and professional lives of educators. We will focus and refine our questions on specific issues which are emerging from our first years' work. For example, in terms of mobilization, one of the questions we will continue to monitor is, Are lay leaders being mobilized into the lead community process? In terms of visions, we will ask, What is the nature of the visioning process?

Perhaps the area in which we expect to see the most activity is around the topic of personnel and the professional lives of educators. In this area we will monitor how information is being utilized from the educator survey and professional lives of educator reports, and whether a plan for personnel is being developed. We will learn about the components, scope, and implementation of such plans. In addition, we will continue our work on personnel and professional lives of educators by studying informal educators and adult educators.

As implementation progresses, we will ask, what is considered when a new project is proposed? That is, who is informed, what entities are considered, what steps are taken in what order, etc.

We will engage in a dialogue with you and the LCs to refine the specific questions for this aspect of our work.

The products of this aspect of our monitoring and feedback for next year will include:
1) monthly feedback to the lead communities,
2) monthly updates to CIJE,
3) cumulative, year two reports to communities and CIJE about mobilization, visions, and personnel, and
4) special topic reports as issues arise (e.g., the changing roles of BJEs).

2) COMMUNITY PROFILES (SELF STUDY)

Due to the slow pace of implementation in the lead communities, we are willing to take on as our responsibility the self-study. (Since this is no longer a self-study, we are terming this aspect of our work, community profiles.) Building full community profiles will be a two year process. In the first year we propose that we emphasize collecting data from community institutions and agencies to address the question: What is the educational profile of the lead communities? In the second year we propose a needs analysis/market oriented survey of clients and constituencies to determine their views and needs in regard to Jewish education in the lead communities.

In the first year we will focus on the issues set forth in the planning guide concerning the self-study (pages 10-12). The MEF team, in conjunction with the CIJE staff person taking shulamith's place, will begin to work with the communities to coordinate and implement this effort. Our goal is to cultivate enthusiasm and secure ownership through the CIJE/LC partnership.

We will meet with the LC coordinators to get their input into the types of information that will be useful to them as well as learn about the types of information already available. We will collect examples of the types of demographic and/or educational profiles that have been used in other communities. After these consultations we will develop a methodology and reporting form that can be used by all the LCs to report the community profile information. The field researchers will work with the LC coordinators to facilitate the process. We will enter the information into a data base, and provide each community with a profile based on the analyses generated from the information provided. Furthermore, qualitative data collected through our ongoing monitoring process will be included as integral components of the community profiles.

The outcomes of this aspect of our work will be:
1) a methodology and reporting forms for community profiles,
2) analyses and reports of the community profile of each LC, and
3) a summary report of the profiles of all three LCs.

In order for us to begin this aspect of our work, CIJE will need to put this project on the agenda so all the LCs know that this will be a major endeavor to begin in the fall. In addition, the question of resources will need to be clarified with the LCs. While some of the information of the community profiles will be readily available, new information will need to be collected and generated. This may incur certain expenses, as well as ancillary fees for mailings, forms, secretarial assistance, data processing, etc.

3) <u>Assessment of Hebrew Language Achievement</u>

Local data from community profiles is not sufficient for a long-term study of change. Thus, we propose that the third part of the MEF plan for next year begin the quantitative assessment of outcome data that are important to the advancement of Jewish education and continuity. This component is crucial in order to begin to monitor trends in the outcomes of Jewish education.

We have chosen to focus the initial assessment of outcomes on Hebrew language. We have chosen this outcome for two reasons: 1) Hebrew language is one key outcome of Jewish education, and 2) Assessment procedures are readily available for our use.

The assessment of Hebrew language by MEF will provide baseline data about Hebrew language for the Lead Communities and CIJE. In addition, the initial assessment will provide feedback to the schools about their Hebrew language achievement and MEF can re-evaluate Hebrew language two or three years later, thus providing longitudinal data about the processes and outcomes of change in these schools. The field researchers will monitor the processes of change in these schools. Furthermore, if LC's are focusing on personnel and other key building blocks for educational improvement in a systemic manner, we should see changes in the Hebrew language performance of students: more resources, better curricula and teachers and more emphasis on learning should affect Hebrew language. We believe that this is an important resource that CIJE can make available to the communities.

We suggest that we contract with Elana Shahamy from the Melton Center to carry out this assessment process. Elana has developed a diagnostic system for Hebrew Language assessment for day schools and is presently developing such a system for supplementary schools. This system is unique in that it takes into account the specific curriculum of each school and provides the school with diagnostic feedback based on the results of the test. Elana has carried out this assessment in numerous day schools in the US, and can immediately begin work with CIJE.

We propose the following plan for Day Schools-Sixth Grade in 1993-94:

1) After approval of this aspect of the MEF project, Elana Shuhamy and each Field Researcher will meet with the LC coordinator in each

community to explain the project. We anticipate this will occur in the fall (Elana will be in the states in Sept-Oct).

2) After this initial meeting, each LC coordinator will decide on the best way to approach and contact the day schools. Elana can do this with a letter and a follow up, or it could be handled centrally by the LC coordinator, etc.

3) After initial contact has been made with the schools, Elana will contact the principals to explain the project and to begin to set up a work plan with each school.

4) Once a work plan is in place fur each school the process begins: Elana and her team meets with the principal to learn about the schools curriculum, a test is developed, testing takes place, analyses are done of the tests by the Melton center in Jerusalem, diagnostic feedback is provided to each school by Elana and her team.

5) The field researchers will assist Elana in the process of testing. Elana and her team provide each school with an individual report. The MEF team will provide the LC with a report about the Hebrew Language Assessment of the community based on the results provided in Jerusalem.

6) The FR will monitor the feedback process in the schools and will observe and monitor the processes of change in the day schools during the next two years. In other words, they will be looking at the ways in which the schools are changing and acting upon the diagnosis provided to them by the Hebrew Assessment. This is a crucial step of the MEF project and can provide information for the ongoing feedback loop in the community as well.

7) Two or three years after this initial assessment, the assessment will be carried out again. Gains can be measured, and the monitoring information can be used to explain where gains have been found and where no gains have been realized.

8) Since Elana has comparative data from other day schools in the US, we can compare the results of the schools in the LC's with other, similar day schools, in other communities.

Issues of funding for this project will need to be addressed. We suggest that CIJE provide the necessary resources to support this project.

The outcomes of this aspect of uur work next year will be:

1) Baseline data of Hebrew language for sixth grade day school students,
2) feedback to the schools about the baseline assessment,
3) a process in place for monitoring and measuring change in Hebrew language.

We look forward to discussing these plans with you.

Received: by HUJIVMS via NJE (HUyMail-V6l); Fri, 23 Jul 93 20:11:36 +0300
Date: Fri, 23 Jul 1993 12:00 CDT
From: <GAMORAN@WISCSSC>
Subject: Baltimore meetings
To: MANDEL@HUJIVMS
Original_To: ANNETTE, MANDEL
Original_cc: ELLEN

Further thoughts about my participation in the Baltimore meetings:

If the "self-study" is going to be an important agenda item, I could probably be useful at the meeting, since we are proposing to play a significant role in carrying out the studies. If that is not a major agenda item, I don't see the need for me to come -- if it is just a question of monitoring the implementation process,
the Roberta and Julie can cover it.

Adam

Received: by HUJIVMS via NJE (HUyMail-V6l); Thu, 22 Jul 93 00:08:01
+0300
Date: Wed, 21 Jul 1993 15:36 CDT
From: <GAMORAN@WISCSSC>
Subject: memos etc.
To: MANDEL@HUJIVMS
Original_To: ANNETTE, MANDEL

Dear Shmuel and Annette,

Thanks for letting me know you'll be in touch soon. In addition to the e-mail message from last week and the fax from earlier this week, we will send tomorrow (Thurs.) our proposed plan of work for 1993-94.

I've had to schedule a meeting with Esther Leah Ritz for next Tuesday, July 27, because this was the only day we could meet for the next month. I plan to tell her what we've done this year, and what we've proposed to do for next year.

I will attend the LC/CIJE meeting in Baltimore on Aug. 23-24 if you deem it a top priority. As you know, my ability to travel is very limited, and I need to make at least one and probably two trips for the MEF project this fall. This means I will definitely not be available for any other trips for CIJE for the next several months.

This fax consists of ___9___ pages. If you have problems with its transmission, please contact Roberta Goodman in the United States at 608-231-3534 or by fax 608-231-6844.

To: Annette, Seymour and Shmuel

From: Roberta Goodman

Adam has asked me to fax this to you. Hope all is well in Jerusalem!

MEMORANDUM

July 18, 1993

To: Annette, Seymour, and Shmuel
From: Adam
CC: Ellen, Roberta, Julie
Re: Ambiguities in CIJE terms and concepts

Attached are two documents:

(1) A glossary of key terms and concepts for CIJE, which you may wish to circulate.

(2) A discussion of ambiguities related to these terms and concepts. This is intended as feedback to CIJE.

Here's a brief explanation of the documents:

Glossary

At the May meetings in Cleveland it emerged that many of the key terms and concepts of CIJE were not fully clear to all participants. Consequently we decided to prepare a glossary of terms and concepts. The primary purpose of the glossary is to ensure that our own understandings are correct. However, we think the glossary might have more general usefulness. For example, you may wish to circulate it among CIJE staff, Lead Community staff, and/or lay people. I'm writing to ask the following:

- Are our definitions accurate and reasonably complete?
- If you wish to distribute the glossary more widely, are there other terms you'd like us to add?

Ambiguities

Preparing the glossary provided an excellent opportunity to discuss the issues and concepts represented by these terms. We reviewed many long-standing ambiguities and raised new issues as well. Hence, another reason I'm writing is to advise you of the ambiguities we discussed. Some of these may be easily settled by you; if so, we'd appreciate your quick response. Others cannot be addressed simply, but we hope that by raising the questions we can help you prepare for future deliberations within CIJE and with the lead communities and others. Thus, the discussion of ambiguities is intended to be feedback to CIJE.

CIJE -- A GLOSSARY OF TERMS AND CONCEPTS
July 1993

Abbreviations used in the Glossary

ATA:	A Time to Act. The Report of the Commission on Jewish Education in North America. Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 1990.
BPSS:	Best Practices Project: The Supplementary School, edited by Barry Holtz, CIJE, 1993.
CSR:	"The Challenges of Systemic Reform: Lessons from the New Futures Initiative for the CIJE," by Adam Gamoran, CIJE 1992.
GJE:	"Goals for Jewish Education in Lead Communities," by Seymour Fox and Daniel Marom, CIJE 1993.
LCAW:	"Lead Communities at Work," by Annette Hochstein, CIJE 1993.
LCC:	"Lead Community Consultation", minutes of the CIJE/Lead Community meetings held in Cleveland, OH, May 12-13, 1993.
PlaG:	Planning Guide. CIJE, February 1993.
ProG:	Program Guidelines. CIJE, January 1992.

Glossary of Terms

Best Practices -- A CIJE project to develop an inventory of effective educational practices which will serve as a guide to Jewish educational success. As a resource, Best Practices can be adapted for use in particular Lead Communities.

Further reading: ATA 67, 69; PlaG 31-32; BPSS 1.

Content/Scope/Quality -- See *Lead Community Project.*

Goals Project -- A collaborative effort to stimulate a high level of discussion on the goals of Jewish education in Lead Communities. Participants include: Lead Communities, CIJE, Mandel Institute, Melton Centre at Hebrew University, Hebrew Union College-Jewish Institute of Religion, Yeshiva University, and the Jewish Theological Seminary. Papers on "The Educated Jew" serve as a resource for this discussion.

Further reading: GJE 1-22.

Lead Community -- A geographic community serving as a local laboratory for the development of exemplary models of Jewish education. A Lead Community sets high educational standards, raises additional funds for education, and establishes a *wall-to-wall* coalition to guide its educational reform efforts. On August 26, 1992, Atlanta, Baltimore and Milwaukee were selected as the first three Lead Communities in North America. (See also *Lead Community Project.*)

Further reading; ATA 67-69; ProG 2.

Lead Community Project -- This term has been used in two ways: "THE Lead Community Project" refers to the entire CIJE/LC enterprise, a joint continental-local collaboration for excellence in Jewish education. "A Lead Community Project" refers to new programs and initiatives in Lead Communities. These programs and initiatives are characterized by: 1) wide scope, 2) high quality, 3) important content, and 4) an evaluation component.

Further reading: ProG 1; LCC 4, 9-10.

Mobilization -- Mobilization refers to organizing people and institutions for action directed towards the enhancement of Jewish education, and the financial support necessary for such action to be taken. Within Lead Communities, mobilization means involving people form differing movements and roles, and to both lay and professional leaders; a mobilized community has a *"wall-to-wall coalition."* Mobilization is one of the two essential building blocks for the improvement of Jewish education.

Further reading: ATA 50, 63-66.

Monitoring, Evaluation and Feedback -- A component of *The Lead Communities Project* that documents its efforts and gauges its success. "Monitoring" refers to observing and documenting the planning and implementation of changes. "Evaluation" entails interpreting information in a way that will strengthen and assist each community's efforts to improve Jewish education. "Feedback" consists of offering oral and written responses to community members and to the CIJE.

Further reading: LCAW 5-7.

Partnership -- The collaborative relationship between CIJE and the lead communities, in which both partners share ideas, plans, and policies for their mutual benefit. Partnership also characterizes relationships within a Lead Community.

Further reading: LCC 2-3.

Personnel --All those who work in the field of Jewish education including formal and informal education and professional and volunteer staff. Attention to personnel is one of the two building blocks necessary for the improvement of Jewish education. Personnel issues must be addressed in all *lead community projects*.

Further reading: ATA 49-50, 55-63.

Systemic Reform -- A plan for change that recognizes that one cannot improve Jewish education by reforming one element at a time. Instead, the entire enterprise must be changed in a coherent and coordinated fashion. Systemic reform requires a unifying *vision* and *goals* and a broad-based *(wall-to-wall) coalition* of change agents.

Further reading: CSR; also Marshall S. Smith and Jennifer O'Day, "Systemic School Reform," Politics of Education Association Yearbook 1990, 233-267.

Vision --A desired state or process in Jewish education toward which the community as a whole or segments of the community are working; an ideal characterization of Jewish education in terms of structure, content and process.

Further reading: PlaG 26; LCC 9; LCAW 2.

Wall-to-Wall Coalition --The *partnership* within a Lead Community among participants across denominations and levels of agencies and institutions. It includes lay people as well as professionals. (See also *Mobilization.)*

Further reading: LCAW 4; ATA 63-66.

Ambiguities and Uncertainties
July 1993

Best Practices -- There is still a great deal of confusion in the communities on how Best Practices relate to the building blocks of personnel and mobilization. How is Best Practices supposed to be translated into action? How does it reach the educators? What sequence of events is planned?

The concerns we raised in our Summary Report of February 1993 are still relevant:

> "With Best Practices under way, the central challenge lies in strengthening what is currently a vague articulation between CIJE and the communities in the content area. How, exactly, will the Lead Communities and the Best Practices project interact?....Will the communities initiate the relationship by requesting assistance in particular areas? Or will Best Practices provide them with a "menu" from which to choose? Is Best Practices to serve as a source of information, inspiration, or both?
>
> "The link between Best Practices and the communities may become stronger and more clear after community educators have been drawn into the Lead Communities process. Presumably, contacts between Best Practices and the communities will occur with educators, not mediated by communal workers. When educators are drawn into the coalitions, they are likely to develop content-related ideas for change that fit their contexts, and to call on Best Practices to help them implement their ideas. Hence, the need for better articulation may be best addressed by mobilizing the educators" (Summary Report, Feb. 1993).

The role of Best Practices in systemic reform is also unclear. As we commented in February;

> "Another concern is utilizing Best Practices in the context of systemic reform. A principal feature of the Lead Communities project is that instead of addressing isolated institutions or programs, it aims to reform the entire system of Jewish education in the communities. This feature is seen as a strength by many respondents across the three communities. Yet the Best Practices project, which focuses on particular institutions one at a time, appears to conflict with the systemic approach. How will CIJE encourage systemic use of Best Practices? Broader mobilization of the community is required to ensure that Best Practices are drawn upon in a coordinated rather than a fragmented way" (Summary Report, Feb. 1993).

This issue is a source of great confusion and uncertainty in the communities, particularly in Milwaukee and Atlanta. At the meetings in May, we came to understand that Best Practices will be a resource upon which the communities can draw as they translate their visions into site-based action. How this process will work is still not clear in the communities.

Goals Project -- This is not yet a coordinated and integrated effort, and the lead communities have not yet been involved. What will push the goals project off the drawing board? What will be the forum for discussions? Also, some community members in Baltimore and Milwaukee are wondering when they will receive the Educated Jew papers.

Lead Community -- We have observed over time, and it was clear in May, that CIJE staff use the term differently than residents of the three communities. From the community perspective, Atlanta, Baltimore, and Milwaukee are lead communities; members of the communities see their cites as models already. From the perspective of CIJE staff, they are in the process of becoming lead communities. CIJE staff know these cities were selected for their potential for radical reform in Jewish education, and the quality of current policies and programs was not the key consideration.

Thus, for example, what CIJE staff term "business as usual" in Baltimore is seen as "the lead community process" by members of that community. I may be oversimplifying a bit, but I think it's not inaccurate to say that Baltimore federation leaders see their plan, which has been progressing since 1989, as one of systemic reform, and one which is consistent with CIJE's approach. CIJE has not effectively communicated to them, or has not succeeded in convincing them, which elements are missing, and which if any elements are misdirected. The two partners have at least agreed to disagree on the pace of change: CIJE believes it is too slow, and Baltimore leaders believe it is the correct pace for effective change.

A perception held in Baltimore is that the strategic planning and visioning that is being initiated in Milwaukee, under CIJE's guidance, has already occurred in Baltimore. While this was not brought about by CIJE per se, it was very much influenced by the Mandel Commission and by A Time to Act, as one can see by the language of Baltimore's strategic planning documents.

Another ambiguity concerns the term "bottom-up" used in ATA (p.68). We found this term confusing (and omitted it from our glossary definition) in two respects. First, the logic of "bottom-up" vs. "top-down" implies a hierarchy, but more recently CIJE has described its relationship with lead communities as a "partnership." Second, "bottom-up" implies reforms generated from within the community, but thus far CIJE has specified not only the two "building blocks," but numerous structural elements such as the federation as the "central address" for the project, a new role of lead community project director, monitoring designed by CIJE, and other specific roles for consultants and CIJE staff. Best Practices also seems to come across as a "top-down" reform, although it is not intended that way.

Thus far, discussions between CIJE and the communities have mainly focused on structure. Perhaps as content becomes more central, the reform process -- and the relation between CIJE and the communities -- will be more one of partnership.

Lead Community Project --Within the communities, there is still much uncertainty about (a) what constitutes a "lead community project" and (b) how the criteria of content, scope, and quality are to be applied. Do all lead community projects initiate with the central planning (visioning) process within the community, or can they begin from the grass-roots as long as the criteria are satisfied? (For example, a rabbi in Milwaukee wants to name his entire supplementary school a Lead Community Project.) If the latter, who is to decide when the criteria are to be satisfied? If the former, how can the good ideas of those not directly involved be included?

Planners in Baltimore and Milwaukee have expressed concerns about the "ownership" of Lead Community Projects as they think about mobilizing large donors. How will they provide a satisfactory level of recognition to donors who fund Lead Community Projects? What degree of control can be granted to donors, and what level of accountability should be worked out? I wouldn't call this a problem at present, but it is on the minds of community planners. A current example is the Machon L'Morim, a Meyerhoff-funded program for selected teachers from three day schools in Baltimore, one each from the Reform, Conservative, and Orthodox movements. It appears likely to meet CIJE criteria, but must be clearly identified as a Meyerhoff program.

Finally, if there is room for grass-roots projects (i.e., those initiated outside the central planning process) to become Lead Community projects, how can they be incorporated into systemic reform?

Mobilization -- We are avoiding the term "enabling option" which, although it does not appear in ATA, has often been used by CIJE staff, and is the source of much confusion. "Enabling option" sounds as if one has a choice about it, but that is not so in CIJE's model. It is important that CIJE staff stop using the term "enabling option."

During the staff meeting in May, the involvement of major donors emerged as especially important during the discussion of the Milwaukee report. To our knowledge, this issue has been raised with Milwaukee participants to the extent of encouraging them to get Esther Leah Ritz involved with the Milwaukee Commission and/or Steering Committee. If the concern is a broader one, it still needs to be addressed.

From the community perspective, a difficulty in involving major donors now is the current uncertainty as to the specifics of Lead Community projects. Ordinarily, we are told, professionals in all three communities solicit major gifts for designated purposes. Without the specifics of Lead Community Projects, professionals feel they lack sufficient "ammunition" for soliciting funds. One can think about this problem as a sequencing issue: Which comes first, development of content or mobilization of funds? In May, Milwaukee participants explained that they wanted a better idea of the content of their reforms before they approached major donors about funding the reforms.

Another ambiguity is that so far, mobilization in the communities has meant representation of diverse constituencies rather than full involvement of these constituencies. At this time, Commissions are generally inclusive in the sense that they involve representatives from a wide variety of institutions. However, there is no established mechanism for these representatives to inform and galvanize support in their constituencies. We are particularly concerned with the involvement of educators. What CIJE or community resources will be devoted to involving educators, not just as representatives of institutions, but more broadly as developers and implementers of educational innovations?

Monitoring, Evaluation and Feedback —Two important uncertainties about our project both have to do with dissemination. The first concerns feedback to CIJE. Most of our reporting is directed towards Annette, yet much of what we have to say is relevant to other staff. What is the mechanism for distributing our update memos (such as this one) to other staff members?

We can conceive of two approaches to feedback: one in which our reports go to Annette, and they are then distributed as you see fit; and a second in which we report to whomever we see fit as the occasion arises, including but not exclusively Annette.

The second uncertainty concerns feedback to the communities. We have not established any regular procedure or mechanism for getting feedback disseminated outside our central contacts. We have had many informal conversations in which we provided feedback requested by community members, but as we learned in May, these do not concern the issues of central interest to CIJE.

Partnership —Unfortunately the minutes of the May meetings did not reflect the depth of discussion on what "partnership" means, and we welcome any elaboration.

Wall-to-Wall Coalition -- Are there some absolutely essential partners (e.g., large donors)? Are some partners more essential than others?

Peabody College
VANDERBILT UNIVERSITY
NASHVILLE, TENNESSEE 37203 Telephone (615) 322-7311

Department of Educational Leadership • Box 514 • Direct phone 322-8000

[illegible]

To: Annette Hochstein and Seymour Fox

From: Ellen and Adam

RE: August Meetings in the US

DATE: July 13, 1993

[illegible]

Baltimore [illegible]

We contacted Ginny to ask about the upcoming meetings scheduled for August. She informed us that three sets of meetings are planned:

Staff meetings-August 19-20 in New York

LC-CIJE meetings-August 23-24 in Baltimore

Board meetings-August 25 (planning)-26 in New York.

Given our own schedules and work plans we propose that:

- Ellen attend the staff meetings in New York on August 19 and 20;
- The field researchers (Roberta and Julie) attend the LC-CIJE meetings in Baltimore as observers; and
- Adam attend the board meetings in New York.

Hence, someone from the MEF team will be present at all the meetings.

We would like to begin to make our arrangements for these meetings as soon as we hear from you.

Post-it™ brand fax transmittal memo 7671 | # of pages ▸ 1

To Annette Hochstein	From Ellen Goldring
Co. Mandel Institute	Co.
Dept.	Phone # 615-322-8039
Fax # 972-2-619951	Fax # 615-343-7094

FAX COVER LETTER

DATE: 06/28/93
TIME: 13:14

Wisconsin Center for Ed Research
1025 W. Johnson St.
Madison, WI 53706
TEL
FAX 608-265-2140

0 Pages Follow

TO: Shmuel Wygoda

COMPANY: Mandel Institute

FROM: Adam Gamoran

COMPANY: University of Wisconsin

COMMENTS

Thanks, we are well though still getting settled in. I'm glad the contracts are fine; will Ginny prepare them for H. Zucker to sign, or what **is the procedure? Regarding Claire's replacement, Cl'Ten and I are m** meeting this week to develop a strategy. We are also meeting with the field researchers, although Claire will miss the meeting because her father just passed away in Phoenix.

Best to all,
Adam

P. 001

[illegible]

Peabody College
VANDERBILT UNIVERSITY
NASHVILLE, TENNESSEE 3[illegible]

Department of Educational Leadership • Box 514 • [illegible]

To: Annette Hochstein and Geymour Fox

From: Ellen Goldring

Re: Request for Use of Educator Survey

Date: June 28, 1003

CC: Ginny Levi

In a recent conversation with Shulamith, she informed me that Mark Gurvis from Cleveland will be contacting me regarding using the Educator Survey in Cleveland. He asked shulamith about data analysis, processing and other issues.

In addition, when Milwaukee was signing their contract regarding the data analysis, questions were raised about who "owned" the data, and who would have access to it for additional analyses, report writing, and information releases.

These questions bring to my attention an issue that CIJE may want to address regarding the use of the Educator Survey and other instruments that are developed. Do we want to have some type of process or procedure to monitor and approve the use of the questionnaires? Do we want some type of quality control over the usage and reporting of data, etc?

As CIJE begins to develop more instruments how do we want to promote the dissemination of the availability to other communities? Do we want to have some type of comparative research data base? Do we want to promote or suggest people to conduct analyses?

There are many questions to be discussed in this regard. In the short term, I would appreciate it if you would advise me as I respond to immediate requests from Mark and others.

I hope you are having a pleasant summer. I am off to Madison tomorrow and I am sure Adam and I will be in touch with a more detailed memo in response to my recent visit with you in Jerusalem within a week or so.

Warmest Regards!

Post-it™ brand fax transmittal memo 7671 | # of pages ▸ 1

To [illegible]	From [illegible]
Co.	Co.
Dept.	Phone #
Fax # [illegible]	Fax # [illegible]

FAX SENT
DATE: 28/6/93

Mandel Institute מכון מנדל

Tel. 972-2-617 418; 618 728
Fax: 972-2-619 951

Facsimile Transmission

To: Pr Adam Gamoran
Date: June 28th 1993
From: Shmuel Wygoda
No. Pages: 1
Fax Number: 001 608 263-6448

Dear Adam,

I hope this fax finds you and yours in good spirit and health, after a safe return to the US.

We went over your proposed contracts for Julie and Roberta and they both look fine.

Any news with regards to a replacement for Claire in Atlanta?

Best regards,

Shmuel

[illegible]

Received: from RL.IB by UK.AC.RL.IB (Mailer R2.07) with BSMTP id 6720; Tue, 08 Jun 93 12:29:03 BST
Via: UK.AC.ED.ERCVAX; 8 JUN 93 12:28:50 BST
Date: Tue, 8 JUN 93 12:26:22
From: EKJC68@ERCVAX.EDINBURGH.AC.UK
To: MANDEL@HUJIVMS
Subject: next message
Sender: JANET "EKJC68@UK.AC.EDINBURGH.ERCVAX"
<EKJC68@ERCVAX.EDINBURGH.AC.UK>

The next message contains my proposed contracts for Julie Tammivaara and Roberta Goodman. I did not write one for Claire Rottenberg because she has decided not to continue with the project.

[illegible]

FAX COVER SHEET

Council for Initiatives in Jewish Education

Date sent: 6/23 Time sent: 8:30 No. of Pages (incl. cover): 18

To: ARH From:

Organization:

Phone Number: Phone Number:

Fax Number: Fax Number:

Comments:

Shulamith would like your comments by the end of the day on Friday.

MEB

27/6 - Shmuel - Was this taken care of? O.

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

COUNCIL FOR INITIATIVES IN JEWISH EDUCATION

Dear Educational Leader,

As an educational leader in one of the three communities in North America selected to participate in the Council for Initiatives in Jewish Education Lead Communities Project, we appreciate your participation in this Educators Survey.

By completing this survey, you and your colleagues can provide valuable information about the professional lives, interests and needs of Jewish educators. The information collected through this survey will be used to make recommendations for the improvement of Jewish education in your community.

On the pages that follow you will find many different questions about your work. There are specific instructions for each question. Please answer each frankly. If you do not find the exact answer that describes your situation or views, please select the one that comes closest to it. Please feel free to add comments and explanations.

The results will appear only in summary of statistical form so that individuals cannot be identified. The findings will be presented to the Principals Council during the 1993-94 academic year.

Thank you very much for your participation and cooperation.

Lead Communities Project

Council for Initiatives in Jewish Education
Lead Communities Project
EDUCATIONAL LEADERS SURVEY

I. ATTITUDES

This first group of questions asks about your perceptions of Jewish education.

1. People become Jewish educators for a variety of reasons. To what extent were the following reasons important to you when you first assumed your leadership position.

(Check one response for each item)	Very important	Somewhat important	Somewhat unimportant	Very unimportant
a. Service to the Jewish community	☐	☐	3	☐
b. Teaching about Judaism	☐	☐	☐	☐
c. Learning more about Judaism	☐	☐	☐	☐
d. Level of income	☐	☐	☐	☐
e. Working with teachers	☐	☐	☐	☐
f. Working with children	☐	☐	☐	☐
g. Full-time nature of the profession	☐	☐	☐	☐
h. Status	☐	☐	☐	☐
i. Opportunity for career advancement	☐	☐	☐	☐
j. Other, specify ____________	☐	☐	☐	☐

2. Would you describe yourself as having a career in Jewish education?

Yes ☐ No ☐

3. The following items deal with your perceptions of teacher / staff involvement in Jewish education. To what extent do you agree or disagree with each of the following statements?

(Check one response for each item)	Agree Strongly	Agree	Disagree strongly	Disagree
a. Staff members / teachers should have an opportunity to participate in defining school / program goals and priorities.	☐	☐	☐	☐
b. Staff members / teachers generally do have an opportunity to participate in defining school / program goals and priorities.	☐	☐	☐	☐
c. Decision-makers should ask for teachers / staff advice before making a decision about a critical issue.	☐	☐	☐	☐
d. Decision-makers generally do ask for teachers / staff advice before making a decision about a critical issue.	☐	☐	☐	☐

4. The following items deal with your perceptions of lay leadership involvement in Jewish education in your setting. To what extent do you agree or disagree with each of the following statements?

(Check one response for each item)	Agree strongly	Agree	Disagree strongly	Disagree
a. Lay leaders should have an opportunity to participate in defining school goals, objectives and priorities.	☐	☐	☐	☐
b. Lay leaders generally do have an opportunity to participate in defining school goals, objectives and priorities.	☐	☐	☐	☐
c. Lay leaders should have an opportunity to participate in discussions regarding curriculum / programs.	☐	☐	☐	☐
d. Lay leaders generally do participate in discussions regarding curriculum / programs.	☐	☐	☐	☐
* Lay leaders should be actively involved in every aspect of the educational curriculum / program.	1	2	☐	4
f. Lay leaders are generally actively involved in every aspect of the curriculum / program.	1	☐	3	☐

5. Below is a list of individuals with whom you are in contact, in your opinion, how is Jewish education regarded by each?

(Check one response for each item)	Very important	Somewhat Important	Somewhat unimportant	Very unimportant
a. Rabbi(s) or your supervisor(s)	☐	☐	☐	☐
b. Most teachers	☐	☐	☐	☐
c. Most parents	☐	☐	☐	☐
Lay leaders	☐	☐	☐	☐
e. Your family	☐	☐	☐	☐
f. Your friends	☐	☐	☐	☐
g. Your colleagues	☐	☐	☐	☐

[illegible] various aspects of the life of a Jewish educator, please indicate how satisfied you are with each of the following:

(Check one response for each item)	Very satisfied	Somewhat satisfied	Somewhat dissatisfied	Very dissatisfied
a. Student attitudes toward Jewish education	☐	☐	☐	☐
b. Student behavior	☐	☐	☐	☐
c. Feeling part of a community of educators	☐	☐	☐	☐
d. Respect accorded you as an educator	☐	☐	☐	☐
e. Being part of the Jewish community	☐	☐	☐	☐
f. Support from the rabbi(s) or supervisor(s)	☐	☐	☐	☐
g. Support from the lay leadership	☐	☐	☐	☐
h. Number of hours of employment	☐	☐	☐	☐
i. Salary	☐	☐	☐	☐
j. Physical setting and facilities	☐	☐	☐	☐
k. Resources available to you	☐	☐	☐	☐
l. Benefits	☐	☐	☐	☐
m. Other, specify	☐	☐	☐	☐

The following set of items asks about your current and prior experience in *Jewish education*:

7. For each of the following Jewish settings check the positions you have held and indicate the total number of years in each.

Setting		Postion	Number of years
SUPPLEMENTARY SCHOOLS	☐	Aide	
	☐	Teacher	
	☐	Supervisor	
	☐	Specialist	
	☐	Principal	
	☐	Other	
DAY SCHOOLS	☐	Aide	
	☐	Teacher	
	☐	Supervisor	
	☐	Specialist	
	☐	Principal	
	☐	Other	
DAY / RESIDENTIAL CAMP	☐	Counselor	
	☐	Specialist	
	☐	Unit leader	
	☐	Division head	
	☐	Director	
	☐	Other	
JCC	☐	Group worker - Teacher	
	☐	Program Director	
	☐	Department head	
	☐	Director	
	☐	Other	
PRESCHOOL	☐	Assistant teacher	
	☐	Teacher	
	☐	Director	
	☐	Other	
INFORMAL EDUCATION YOUTH WORK	☐	Group Advisor	
	☐	Youth Director	
	☐	Other	
ADULT EDUCATION	☐	Teacher	
	☐	Program Director	
	☐	Other	

8. Do you tutor students in Hebrew or Judaica?

Yes (1)	No (2)
☐	☐

If yes, how many?________

9. Have you ever worked in general education?

Yes (1)	No (2)
☐	☐

If yes, how many years?

10. Please indicate how many years you have been in your CURRENT setting, including this year.____________

11. How many years have you been working in:

a. Jewish education in this community, including this year?____________

12. How many years IN TOTAL have you been working in the field of Jewish education? __________

III. TRAINING AND STAFF DEVELOPMENT

The next set of questions asks about your training and staff development experiences.

13 Did you attend any workshops or seminars in the past two years?

Yes (1)	No (2)
☐	☐

If yes, how many did you attend in town ?________

If yes, how many out-of-town?________

14. The following are reasons educational leaders participate in professional development activities. Rank only the three most important by writing 1, 2, 3, next to your choice where 1 is the most important.

a. Required by contract ________

b. Desire to improve administrative skills ________

c. Desire to improve knowledge of Judaica ________

d. Desire to learn about new teaching methods and materials ________

e. Desire to learn about new curriculum / programs and resources ________

f. Offered at convenient time and location ________

g. Subsidy available for participation ________

h. Leadership / Administrative skills ________

i. Other, please specify ________________

115. During the past twelve months did you:
(Check one response for each item)

	Yes (1)	No (2)
a. Attend a formal course in Hebrew or Judaica?	☐ 1	[✓ 2]
b. Participate in a private Hebrew or Judaica study group?	☐ 1	☐ 2
c. Study Hebrew or Judaica on your own?	☐ 1	☐ 2
d. Participate in some other on-going form of Jewish study?	☐ 1	☐ 2

116. In which of the following areas do you feel you would like to develop your skills further?
(Check all that apply)

a. School management	☐ 1
b. Child and adult development	[✓ 2]
c. Strategic planning and development	☐ 3
d. Curriculum and program development	☐ 4
e. Staff supervision and professional development	☐ 5
f. Communication skills	[✓ 6]
g. Working with parents and volunteers	☐ 7
h. Leadership	☐ 8
i. Other ____________________	☐ 9

117. In which of the following would you like to increase your knowledge?
(Check all that apply)

a. Hebrew language	[✓ 1]
b. Customs and ceremonies	☐ 2
c. Israel and Zionism	☐ 3
d. Jewish history	☐ 4
e. Bible	☐ 5
f. Synagogue skills / prayer	☐ 6
g. Rabbinic literature	☐ 7
h. Other______[b]______________	☐ 8

vue 7yr each category)

	Speaking	Reading	Writing
a. Fluent	☐ 1	☐ 1	☐ 1
b. Moderate	☐ 2	☐ 2	☐ 2
c. Limited	☐ 3	☐ 3	☐ 3
d. Not at all	☐ 4	☐ 4	☐ 4

19. Overall, how adequate are the opportunities for teacher professional growth and development in your community? (Check one)

a. Very adequate ☐ 1

b. Somewhat adequate ☐ 2

c. Somewhat inadequate ☐ 3

d. Very inadequate ☐ 4

20. Overall, how adequate are the opportunities for your professional growth and development in your community? (Check one)

a. Very adequate ☐ 1

b. Somewhat adequate ☐ 2

c. Somewhat inadequate ☐ 3

d. Very inadequate ☐ 4

IV. SETTINGS

The next set of questions asks you about the schools in which you work.

; How many paid positions in Jewish education do you hold? ____________

22. If you work in more than one setting in Jewish education, do you do so to earn a suitable wage?

Yes (1)	No (2)
☐	☐

If you work in more than one setting, how many hours per week do you work at each?

First ______ Second ____

The following questions refer to the setting in which you hold an educational leadership position.

23. What is the affiliation of the school or agency where you are an educational leader?
(Check the appropriate response)

a. Reform [1]

b. Conservative [2]

c. Traditional [3]

d. Orthodox [4]

e. Reconstructionist [5]

f. Community [6]

g. Jewish Community Center [7]

h. Other, specify ______________________ [8]

24. How many students are in your school/agency? ____

25. Which of the following best describes your leadership role?
(Check the one appropriate response)

a. Head of day school ☐

b. Department head or chairman at day school ☐

c. Educational director ☐

d. Division head of congregational school ☐

e. Preschool Director ☐

f. Program Director: Adult Education ☐

g. Program Director: Special Education ☐

h. Central Agency Director ☐

i. Central Agency Administrative Staff ☐

j. Other, please specify ________________ ☐

26. How did you find your present primary administrative position?
(Check the one that best applies)

a. Central agency or bureau ☐

b. Graduate school placement ☐

c. National professional association ☐

d. Through a friend or mentor ☐

e. Recruited or approached by institution ☐

f. [illegible] ☐

g. Other ________________ [illegible]

27. The following items deal with the extent to which rabbi(s) or supervisor(s) are involved in your setting.

(Check one response for each item)	None	Somewhat	A Great Deal
a. In defining school / program goals, objectives and priorities.	☐	☐	☐
b. In discussions regarding curriculum / program.	☐	☐	☐
c. In every aspect of educational program / programs	☐	☐	☐

28. Did you move to this community to take this job?

Yes (1)	No (2)
☐	☐

29. To what extent do you receive help and support from the following?
(Check one response for each)

	Frequently	Occasionally	Seldom	Never
a. Other colleagues in community	☐	☐	☐	☐
b. Other colleagues outside the community	☐	☐	☐	☐
c. Local university	☐	☐	☐	☐
d. Central agency staff	☐	☐	☐	☐
e. National movement	☐	☐	☐	☐
f. Professional organization	☐	☐	☐	☐
g. Other, please specify ______________	☐	☐	☐	☐

30. How important were the following factors affect your decision to work where you are presently employed?

	Very Important	Somewhat Important	Somewhat unimportant	Very unimportant
a. Hours	☐	☐	☐ 3	☐ 4
b. Salary	☐	☐ 2	☐ 3	☐ 4
c. Community	☐	☐	☐ 3	☐ 4
d. Rabbi(s) or supervisor(s)	☐	☐ 2	☐ 3	☐ 4
e. Reputation of the school or program	☐ 1	☐ 2	☐ 3	☐ 4
f. Religious affiliation	☐	☐	☐ 3	☐ 4
g. Career advancement	☐	☐	☐	☐
h. Spouse's work	☐	☐	☐	☐
i. Other, specify __________	☐	☐	☐	☐

Which of the following benefits which are available to you and which do you receive? (Check all that apply).

	Available	Receive	
a. Free or reduced tuition for your children at your school or program	☐	☐	
b. Free or reduced tuition for yourself and adult family member	☐	☐	f z |
c. Free or reduced membership in a synagogue or JCC	☐	☐	
d. Synagogue privileges such as High Holiday tickets	☐	☐	J ^ j
e. Day/child care	☐	☐	(T]
f. Money to attend conferences, continuing education	☐	☐	Q Q
g. Sabbatical leave (full or partial compensation)	☐	☐	pjTj
h. Employer contribution to a health plan	☐	☐	|⁻γ*|
i. Pension benefits	☐	☐	Q fj
k. Other, specify________________________	☐	☐	jT j

2. Please indicate the degree to which you are satisfied with the amount of time you spend on each of the following activities!

	Very Dissatisfied	Dissatisfied	Satisfied	Very Satisfied
a. Curriculum / program development	☐	☐	☐	☐
b. Public relations / markeing	☐	☐	☐	☐
c. Parent/ constituent relations	☐	☐	☐	☐
d. Teacher / staff supervision	☐	☐	☐	☐
e. Training and staff development	☐	☐	☐	☐
f. Recruiting staff	☐	☐	☐	☐
g. Overall school management, including budget	☐	☐	☐	☐
Fund raising or resource development	☐	☐	☐	☐

33. Of the following which one would "enhance" your effectiveness as an educational leader?
(Check only one))

a. Additional support staff / clerical	☐
b. Additional funding for programs	☐
c. Additional funding for resources / materials	☐ 3
d. Additional professional staff	☐
e. Availability of consultants	☐
f. Attendance / participation in workshops or Seminars	☐
g. Other please specify ________________________	☐ 7

[illegible] full-time educator?

(Check one)

Yes (1) ☐ 1   No (2) ☐ 2

If yes, please continue with Section V.

35. If you are not a full-time educator and had the opportunity to work full-time, would you? (Check One)

Yes (1) ☐ 1   No (2) ☐ 2

36. What sorts of things would encourage you to consider full-time employment in Jewish education. Rank only the three most important by writing 1, 2, 3, next to your choice where one is the most important.

a. Salary _____

b. Benefits _____

Job security, tenure _____

d. Career development _____

e. Job opportunities _____

f. Greater background in Judaica and Hebrew _____

g. Greater educational background _____

h. Presence of colleagues and opportunities to work with them _____

i. Change in family status _____

j. Availability of training opportunities _____

k. More resources at work _____

V. BACKGROUND

Next we are going to ask you about yourself.

---

37. Are you Jewish?

Yes (1) ☐ 1   No (2) ☐ 2

38. At the present time, which of the following best describes your Jewish affiliation?

☐ Orthodox
☐ Traditional
☐ Conservative
☐ Reform
☐ Reconstructionist
☐ Unaffiliated
☐ Other (specify)________________________

39. Are you currently a member of a synagogue?

Yes (1) ☐ No (2) ☐ 2

0. Are you an educator in the synagogue where you are a member?

Yes (1) ☐ No (2) ☐ 2

41. Which of the following, do you usually observe? (Check all that apply.)

☐ Light candles on Friday evening
☐ Attend a seder in your home or somewhere else
☐ Keep Kosher at home
☐ Light Hanukkah candles
☐ Fast on Yom Kippur
☐ Observe Sabbath
☐ Build a Sukkah
☐ Fast on Tisha B'Av and minor fasts such as Ta'anit Esther
☐ Celebrate Israel Independence Day

42. During the past year, did you:

	Yes (1)	No (2)
a. Attend synagogue on the High Holidays	☐ 1	☐ 2
b. Attend synagogue at least twice a month on Shabbat	☐ 1	☐ 2
c. Attend synagogue on holidays such as Sukkot, Passover or Shavuot	☐ 1	☐ 2
d. Attend synagogue daily	☐ 1	☐ 2

43. Have you ever been to Israel?

Yes (1) ☐ 1 No (2) ☐ 2

If, yes, did you ever live in Israel for three months or longer?

Yes (1) ☐ 1 No (2) ☐ 2

44. What kind of Jewish school did you attend before you were thirteen? (Check all that apply.)

☐ 1 Sunday school
☐ 2 Supplementary school or Talmud Torah
☐ 3 Day school
☐ 4 School in Israel
☐ 5 None
☐ 6 Other (specify) ______________________

45. Did you attend a Jewish summer camp with mainly Jewish content or program?

Yes (1) ☐ 1 No (2) ☐ 2

If Yes, how many summers? __________

46. What kind of Jewish school, if any, did you attend after your were thirteen? (Check all that apply.)

☐ 1 One day/week confirmation class
☐ 2 Two or more days/week Hebrew high school high Bchool
☐ 3 Day school
☐ 4 School in Israel
☐ 5 None
☐ 6 Other (specify) ______________________

47. Age ______

48. Sex Male ☐ Female ☐

49. Where were you born?

USA ☐

Other, please specify country ____________________

50. Marital status

[1] Single, never married

[2] Married

[3] Separated

[4] Divorced

[5] Widowed

51. If you are married, is your spouse Jewish?

Yes (1) ☐ No (2) ☐

52. What is your total family from work in Jewish education?

☐ below $10,000

☐ $20,000 - $29,999

☐ $30,000 - $39,999

☐ $40,000 - $49,999

☐ $50,000 - $59,999

☐ $60,000 - $69,999

☐ $70,000 - $79,999

☐ over $80,000

53. What is your total family income?

☐ 1 below $30,000

[✓ 2] $30,000 - $40,999

☐ 3 $50,000 - $69,999

☐ 4 $70,000 - $79,999

☐ 5 $80,000 - $89,000

☐ 6 $90,000 and above

54. What is the highest level of education that you have completed? (Check one)

☐ 1 High school graduate

☐ 2 Some college

[✓ 3] College graduate

☐ 4 Some graduate courses

☐ 5 Graduate or professional degree

☐ 6 Teacher-training Institute

55. What degrees do you hold? Please list)

Degree	Major

55. Do you have undergraduate or graduate credits in any of the following?

	Undergraduate		Graduate	
	Yes	No	Yes	No
a. Judaica or Jewish Studies	☐	☐	☐	☐
b. Hebrew language	☐	☐	☐	☐
c. Education	☐	☐	☐	2
d. Jewish communal service	☐	2	☐	2
e. School Administration	☐	☐	☐	☐
f. Teaching	☐	☐	☐	☐
g. Jewish education	☐	☐	☐	☐

55, Do you hold a professional license or certification in :

	Yes (1)	No (2)
a. Jewish education	☐	☐
b. General education	☐	☐
c. Administration	☐	☐
d. Other (please specify) ______________	1	☐

57. Which of the following best describes your career plans over the next three years?

(Choose one)

- ☐ I plan to continue what I am doing.
- ☐ I plan to be an administrator or supervisor in this Jewish school / program in this community.
- ☐ I plan to be an administrator or supervisor in another Jewish school / program in this Community.
- ☐ I plan to be an administrator or supervisor in a Jewish school.
- ☐ I plan to have a position in Jewish education other that in a school / (such as a central agency or other administrative setting.
- ☐ I plan to be involved in Jewish education in Israel, or in some other country.
- ☐ I plan to seek a position outside of Jewish education.
- ☐ I plan not to work.
- ☐ I plan to retire.
- na I don't know. I am uncertain.
- ff Other, please specify ______________________

Thank you very much for your cooperation!

0 1 2 0 1 1 !

CENTRE *for* EDUCATIONAL SOCIOLOGY
Department of Sociology

The University of Edinburgh
7 Buccleuch Place
Edinburgh EH8 9LW
Scotland

Fax UK (0)31 668 3263
Email CES@uk.ac.edinburgh
Telephone UK (0)31 650 1000
or direct dial UK (0)31 650 4186/4187

June 2, 1993

Ms. Annette Hochstein
Mandel Institute of Jerusalem
22a Hatzfira Street
Jerusalem 93102 ISRAEL

Dear Annette,

Roberta Goodman and Julie Tammivaara are presenting the enclosed paper at the Jewish Education Research Network conference later this month. It is conceptual and methodological, and does not refer to their work as field researchers or to lead communities in any way. Consequently, I have informed them that it does not fall under the jurisdiction of our advisory committee. However, I thought I'd send it along to you just so you could make the same judgment. I've also enclosed my comments on the paper.

Yours,

Adam

Adam

CENTRE *for* EDUCATIONAL SOCIOLOGY
Department of Sociology

The University of Edinburgh
7 Buccleuch Place
Edinburgh EH8 9LW
Scotland

Fax UK (0)31 668 3263
Email CES@uk.ac.edinburgh
Telephone UK (0)31 650 1000
or direct dial UK (0)31 650 4186/4187

May 28, 1993

Ms. Roberta Goodman
Dr. Julie Tammivaara
Council for Initiatives in Jewish Education

Dear Roberta and Julie,

Thanks for sharing with me your paper, "The use of narrative in Jewish educational research." As a methodological paper which does not specifically draw on or refer to your work in lead communities, I agree with you that it falls outside the jurisdiction of our advisory committee, so I have not submitted it to them. Still, I feel much better having had the chance to review it. If you intend to submit it for publication, I'd like to send the paper to Annette first so that she can have the same opportunity as I did.

Having read the paper, I thought I'd share a few reactions. I am convinced by the paper that narrative is a useful approach for relating research, and I particularly liked the way you show its special value for research in a Jewish context. Despite my own interest in hypothesis-testing, I think there's a lot we can learn from a narrative approach. For me, the narrative approach would serve the hypothesis-testing approach --it would set the stage for hypotheses, or elaborate on the findings of hypothesis-testing research. But that reflects my own interests, and I accept that the narrative approach can stand on its own as well.

I think it is important to cast the references to literary methods as metaphoric rather than literal. Otherwise, despite assurances to the contrary, it may appear that you would permit the researcher to use what the subjects say to fit the researcher's point of view. The author of a novel can make up the story, after all, but the researcher must allow the story to emerge from his/her subjects.

Finally, I would add that hypothesis-testing research also makes use of a narrative approach in an important way. There is a craft to reporting research findings, which makes use of plot, setting, point of view, and theme, at least. (Character seems often to be ignored.) The plot is critical to engaging the reader; this usually means asking a question and getting the reader interested in finding out the answer (i.e., testing the hypothesis.) The major difference, I think, is that in a hypothesis-testing project, the plot, setting, point of view, and theme are explicity established by the researcher, and thus we are not iterested in whether they are "true" or "false"; only the climax and denouement determined by the subjects, and that's where the issue of "truth" (or validity) comes in. In the qualitative approach you advocate, the plot, point of view, theme, and character emerge from the subjects, so the question of "truth" or "validity" is essential at every step.

Yours,

Adam

Adam

P.S. Dan Lortie goes by Dan, not Daniel (p.9).

The Use of Narrative in Jewish Educational Research

Julie Tammivaara

Roberta Goodman

May 1993

> The wind was flapping a temple flag, and two monks were having an argument about it. One said the flag was moving, the other that the wind was moving; and they could come to no agreement on the matter. They argued back and forth. Eno the Patriarch said, "It is not that the wind is moving; it is not that the flag is moving; it is that your honorable minds are moving."
>
> Platform Sutra

For those of us nurtured in societies dominated by ideas from the enlightenment, that is, that the world is rational, that time is linear, and that things happen for reasons that precede their effects, the idea of a life as an unfolding and continuous process is compelling. We need only look to the great biographies of our own time to get see this pattern. They begin with the "early years," progress to the "middle years," and, for those subjects blessed with a long life, end with the "later years." Modern social science is a child of the enlightenment, and we are familiar with the sociological and psychological explanations that point to early circumstances and experiences as shapers of the human condition. We see this view reflected in the structure of the many surveys with which we are familiar. If they are done well, they have a shape easily detectable to those who would look. Survey makers define their topic, theoretically conceptualize it, generate relevant categories, and then structure items that ask the respondents to situate themselves within the researcher's notion of the topic. By filling in the boxes, we give the surveyors the information they need to describe our lives or parts of it, after, of course, the data have been coded and analyzed. There is a tendency to think about the descriptions thus elicited as relatively neutral and unproblematic even if the methods we use to generate them are not always without their challenges.

Today, we would like to discuss another way of thinking about and investigating lives, a way that is not accommodated by the scientific view. This way directs us to consider lives not as a cumulative result of a series of chronologically determined experiences but as a function of personal narratives made and re-made throughout one's life.

What is a narrative?

The idea of narrative takes many of us back to high school or college English classes and to the idea of stories. Indeed, the word "narrative" derives partly from the Sanskrit *narro* meaning to "relate" or "tell," but it also derives from the Latin *gnarus* meaning "knowing," "acquainted with," and "expert" among other things[1]. Hayden White suggests that narrative addresses the problem of how to translate knowing into telling.[2] The problem of translating knowing into telling is confronted by many of us here today whether we be researchers or teachers. As teachers, we want and need to know what students know, as researchers, we want and need to know what those we study know. Both teachers and researchers are discovering a richness in the stories being told that is proving illuminating.

Traditionally, stories or narratives consist of five elements: plot, setting, character, point of view, and theme.[3] *Plot* refers to a sequence of events that form the action or movement of the story. A story's *setting* is the context within which the events occur, for example, the place, the time, the social, political, and religious milieu, and so forth. *Character* refers to the person to persons included in the telling of the story. The perspective from which a story is told is called its *point of view*. This may be the narrator of the story or may arise from the voice or voices of the characters. Finally, stories have a *theme* that reveals the underlying meanings intended by the teller or extracted by the reader. Today, we shall discuss in some detail two of these narrative features: plot and point of view. We are making this choice because they are most problematic for social researchers and distinguish the method we are discussing most sharply from traditional educational research.

Without a plot there is no story. Narratives progress because events happen by virtue of a character acting to make them, by a character reacting to externally imposed events that may be human or otherwise inspired, or by some combination of the two. What we shall call a story for our purpose here does not necessarily, in fact, usually does not, entail the dramatic sequence suggested by Freitag of exposition, climax, and denouement.[4] Nevertheless, a story must consist of events connected in some minimal manner, what Kermode refers to as "connexity."[5] Causality is the shadow of event sequences. If a story possesses action, it is presumed there are actors who are acting for some reason. In his *Poetics*, Aristotle suggested two causes of action: *dianoia* and *ethos* or thought and character [in the sense of dispositions or attitudes of persons in the story].[6] If we understand him correctly, people act because they have reasoned a particular course is sensible or because some inherent trait drives them to do so. Usually stories possess this quality of causation: I did this, so, of course, that happened. As Connelly and Clandenin note: "a sequence of events looked at backward has the appearance of causal necessity and, looked at forward, has the sense of a teleological, intentional pull of the future"[7], their articulation of Crites' reference to the "topsy turvy hermeneutical principle" characteristic of narratives.[8] Where cause is left ambiguous or is apparently absent, the listener or reader of a story will work all the harder to impose one, for action without cause is pointless. [Purposeless action is, however, the point for some adherents of existentialism, but that belongs to another conversation.]

As we can see, narrative causality is not the same as scientific causality in that it is not subject to hypothesis testing aimed at probing the validity of theories to discover necessary antecedents for particular consequences. Thus, while humans seem driven to think in terms of purpose, whether it be their own or outside themselves, they do not necessarily or even usually, define causality in the same way as do scientists trained in the hypothetico-deductive method. To be able to explain why we did what we did or arrived at the place where we are and so forth allows us to believe that there is an order to the world and we can purposefully act within it. It is much less important to us that this understanding constitutes an ultimate and perfect understanding than that it be sufficiently persuasive such that we can carry on with our daily lives.

While we insist on imposing order on our lives, most of us do not insist that a particular order or meaning is not open to challenge. Given a particular traumatic event, we may explain it at one point as having occurred as a result of some defect in our character, at another point as a consequence of unreasonable social demands emanating from magazine advertisements or cinematic images of people like us, for example. Thus, our stories are made and re-made throughout our lives.[9]

Stories are told from a point of view. We take this to mean that stones arise from [and are heard with] a meaning structure within which the story makes sense. Accounts of stories, if written by someone other than the teller, for example a researcher, are told from a joint point of view, the teller and the renderer. Written stories engage yet a third party, the reader. The seemingly simple act of reading a story entails a complex adventure in meaning making involving the creative skill of the teller to compose the story, the social context of its reception by the researcher and the multiple social contexts of the many readers of the story.

If this line of thinking is plausible, then what happens to any notion of "truth?" On the one hand, we can say that truth possesses a flexibility that is altered as our experience and conceptual skills advance; on the other, we must recognize that people can sequence events and attribute causation in a way that knowingly or unknowingly are not truthful. An individual may tell you he met a celebrated woman three years after her well-documented demise, for example, or an account may point a finger at a given individual out of spite rather than out of respect for veracity. [The idea of a particular telling deriving from a vested interest in that particular version was explored by Josephine Tey in *The Daughter of Time.*] This phenomenon relates to the rhetorical notion of "narrator reliability," that is the assessment of the account rests on the hearer or reader's faith in the teller He may be unreliable due to naivete as in Bret Harte's *The Haircut,* unreliable due to impure motives as in Agatha Christie's *The Murder of Roger Ackroyd,* or initially unreliable then progressively more reliable as in Isaac Bashvis Singer's *Gimpel the Fool.* Thus, as in art, researchers must consider narrators' veracity problematic.

In the research encounter that employs face-to-face conversations between an informant and a researcher, informants often remark that they surprise themselves in what they say. This observation, we believe, stems from a recognition that in being asked to contemplate some topic or other, the teller is actively imagining events in a way that would not occur had the encounter not taken place.

In hearing narratives from those one is studying, the researcher attempts to hear them with the ears of the teller, that is, from their perspective. To do this perfectly, of course, is impossible. When it comes to re-telling a story in written form, the author must make decisions, most of which concern the audience to whom such she is writing. Without further contemplation of this complex phenomenon, we wish to make the point that meaning is not frozen in a story at the moment of telling, at the moment of its writing, nor at the moment of its reading. In our practical lives, this point is self-evident to anyone who has been misunderstood within a conversation or who has had the crushing experience of having his text critically panned. In much educational research however, this point is elided, particularly when numbers are involved. Somehow, against all logic, we approach the most de-contextualized, thinnest summaries of people's lives as if they were closer to truth than accounts that are drenched in the nuanced meanings of the researched and the researcher. Reducing the lives of the researched to categories--numerical or otherwise--privileges the author whose interpretation becomes the only one available to the reader.

Narrative as a Jewish Way of Knowing

Storytelling and narrative interpretation are two methods by which Jews are socialized to become Jews. Through stories, Jews teach and are taught the principles of Judaism and its values. This Jewish approach to socialization parallels the role of narrative in character or faith formation touched upon by human developmentalists. In addition, outsiders can come to understand Jews and Judaism through narratives of the Jewish people.

"Jews are a storytelling people. We cherish our memories and celebrate them through our stories."[10] As a storytelling people, Jews have created narratives manifold both in variety and quantity. Types of Jewish narratives include: Biblical, halachic, and aggadic midrash stories; Chassidic tales, folk tales, and fairy tales. Jews have used the short story, novel and biography genres to convey their narratives. A narrative form that is particularly poignant and familiar to us in the post-Holocaust era is oral history: individual accounts of life experiences. Through their narratives Jews both remember and celebrate. Their stories provide a vehicle for generational enculturation and Judaic continuity.

Narrative is a Jewish way of knowing. Stories are an encounter between text and reader or a teller and a listener. Stories demand interpretation. Through narratives, we learn what the text has to say and explore what it has to say to us.[11] The historical texts of the Jewish people can speak personally to our lives.[12] The act of interpreting text, of both understanding what the text is saying and then making the connection between a narrative and one's own existence, is a Jewish way of knowing. Through this interpretive act, both the text and oneself come alive and are filled with meaning. The stories of the Jewish people become integrated into individual personal stories.

When we read or hear a story, we are simultaneously understanding and interpreting the story and our own lives. We construct meaning through the narratives we create and tell about ourselves. Narrative is a form of human knowing, of understanding ourselves. Being human involves being a hermaneut, a myth-maker, an interpreter of experience.[13] The narratives we construct are a way of giving order and sense to our experiences. They guide our actions, relationships and choices, reflect our values and world view; and define who we are and what we want to be. We are known through our stories.

Through Judaism's stories, the Jewish people are shaped. Wiesel writes of Jewish tales as showing that the road to God is through human beings.[14] More specifically, Alter views Biblical narrative as giving rise to moral, spiritual and historical knowledge.[15] The Torah is a record of a formative encounter between God and the Jewish people. This encounter is re-lived through the weekly Torah reading as it engages people in an ongoing dialogue centuries old. The role of midrash is the act of interpreting the Torah. Participating in this process connects the realities, visions, values and existence of present-day Jews to the Jews of the past. As Holtz has noted, "Learning and reflection, in other words, must point in two directions--toward the past, toward the values at the source of what one is as part of a people, but also toward the here and now, toward the 'design' of our lives today."[16] Interpretation entails active listening to the voices of the past while giving rise to the creation of meanings for today's Jews.

The Jewish people are known to others as well as to themselves through their stories. As noted earlier, all stories share the five elements of plot, theme, character, setting, and point of view. What distinguishes the stories of one people from another are the particularities, the content of the people's stories. Stories are filled with values. Many Jewish stories deal with ethical and spiritual concerns. From the story of Abraham's treatment of the three strangers in which he washes their feet and serves them food, we learn the value of *hachnasat orchim*, which exemplifies the value of hospitality. These values inform our behavior.

Stories reveal a people's orientation. Certain stories appear in different cultures in altered forms. Those deviations in plot, point of view, or character are precisely what identifies them as belonging to a people and distinguishes them from other people's stories. Syd Lieberman, a storyteller, relates an incident illustrating this point. One evening, Mr. Lieberman told a particular story where Jewish wit, determination, and action get the Jews in the tale out of a dilemma. Upon completing the tale, he noticed a woman with a puzzled look. "Why is this woman puzzled?" he wondered. She explained that in her culture, the characters in the story would have waited for fate to take its course. Stories are culture or people specific.

Recurring themes reveal a people's history and identity. Every Pesach, we retell the Exodus story from the perspective of having been slaves in Egypt. Redemption--being rescued--and freedom are key themes that reappear with the Maccabees, Jews in medieval times, and the deliverance of Soviet and Ethiopian Jews in modern times. The Jewish experiences of redemption, slavery, and freedom are often connected with our dedication to social justice, for example, in the U. S. civil rights movement. Our actions reflect our connection to these narrative themes that are part of our collective memory and our treasure chest of stories.

To summarize, narrative is a way of knowing as Judaism is textually based and narratively oriented. Stories are a mode for shaping and creating meaning in the lives of Jews. Conversely, narrative is a way that Jews become known to others. Through the stories that Jews tell about themselves, they reveal to others their values, perspectives, orientation, concerns, history, rituals, and traditions.

Why Narrative?

One reason often given for doing social or educational research is that what one learns can inform institutional policy decisions. If, for example, we learn through a survey that good supplementary teachers are more Judaically knowledgeable, a Board of Jewish Education might plausibly conclude that increased workshop offerings in Judaic studies and required attendance by a community's teachers would be a good thing. A community's BJE might develop a series of workshops, offer incentives for teachers to attend, and even require they come to some minimal number of offerings. Over the years, observers might conclude, as one rabbi recently told us, that this remedy hasn't worked; that, in fact, "Some of the worst teachers attend the most classes and workshops." What went wrong in this apparently logical application of a research finding?

To begin our analysis, let us assume that better teachers are more Judaically knowledgeable. The solution of more workshops, based as it is on a reduced conception of a complex problem, cannot fully respond to the problem of enhancing teacher performance. Even if they do increase teachers' knowledge [and this cannot be assured], they are unlikely in and of themselves enhance teaching if this is their only goal. Workshops designed on such limited understanding of teachers cannot anticipate the situation of teachers' students, the reasons why some teachers are more Judaically knowledgeable, what those teachers do in the classroom that makes them better or worse teachers, what meanings teachers give for wanting to become more knowledgeable, what they do with the knowledge once they get it, and so on. One analogy for this solution is an engine and gasoline: engines run better when they are fueled than when they are not fueled; they run better when a higher grade of fuel is used. People, however, are not engines and knowledge is not fuel. What matters in the teaching encounter as in any human encounter is what sense is being made of that encounter independently and jointly by the parties involved. Without the type of understanding [*verstehen*] one can gain through narrative inquiry, we cannot fully inform policy decisions.

Previously, we mentioned our informants' observation that they are surprised by what they say in the research encounter. We took this to mean that in the act of telling stories, participants are making their stories. By entering into a conversation with us, they are provided an opportunity to tell certain stories for the first time. They are surprised on three levels: they have a story to tell, their story has a particular shape and point, and someone else--that is the researcher--is interested in hearing their stories. By asking teachers to tell us about their teaching lives, we are providing an occasion for them to actively reflect upon those lives. As a rule, teachers have few opportunities to share what they do with interested listeners and, we may suppose, for many this failure can stifle the richness of meaning making that can occur jointly with others. When we are left alone to ponder our lives, two not so positive things can happen. First, we can avoid thinking about our professional lives as fluid and problematic [the robotic worker], and second if we do engage in meaning making, we can choose explanations that seem to make sense from our own perspective but do not connect well with the meaning structures of those around us [the pathologic worker]. The very act of sharing and jointly producing meanings can help us integrate meanings that will serve us professionally. As Philip Jackson in *Life in Classrooms* and Daniel Lortie in *Schoolteacher* among scores of others have documented, the work of teachers is labor intensive. Yet, given the opportunity to speak of their lives as we have tried to do for many years, we find very few if any who are not willing to do so and who do not feel energized by having done so. For example, a group of teachers in central Philadelphia have been meeting monthly for the last ten years to do just this. Originally inspired by sharing their lives with researchers at the University of Pennsylvania, they continued the conversations begun in the research setting on their own. They have broken the barriers of solitude that typically enclose teachers and draw strength from listening and sharing with one another. They are engaged in an ongoing dialogue about things that matter to them and to their profession. Because they understand one another and the contexts in which they work, they are able to confront the challenges of their work in a connected and sensible way. They are able to incorporate new ideas in a manner that makes sense and connects sensibly with their everyday teaching situations. For them as with the monks in the quotation at the beginning of this treatise, the important thing is that their honorable minds are moving.

We have seen that narrative inquiry can inform institutional policy and individual practice; it can also provide an opportunity for the story tellers to find their voice as they are asked to reflect, imagine, and envision aspects of their lives. When teachers reflect, imagine, and envision their lives, they are prepared to share their lives in a concrete way. Through sharing, they find their voices and can become a powerful force in matters that are important to them, their students and their schools. Today there is much talk of institutional and systemic change in schools. We believe it is important to allow teachers opportunities to influence policy decisions in their schools; however, if teachers do not have an opportunity to find their voices and have places to give voice to their concerns, different institutional arrangements will make little difference.

Finding One's Voice: Two examples

As researchers in the field of Jewish education, we are interested in how people came to choose careers in Jewish communal service. We have asked many people to share their stories with us, and we have selected two to share with you today. Both are young women who work full time; one is married with children, one is single. In responding to the same question [Of all the careers you could have chosen, how did you come to choose one in Jewish communal service] Miriam and Susan gave brief accounts. Their stories are similar in that both acknowledge that they have always felt most comfortable in explicitly Jewish settings. Both recalled the pleasure they felt in participating in Jewish youth activities and both went to Israel as teenagers, and both expressed that their chosen lines of work fit their value structures. For both, then, working within a Jewish context is both comfortable and a logical extension of lifeways begun in childhood. Their stories are not exactly the same, however. We see in Miriam's story a relatively smooth transition from a Jewish home to a Jewish professional life with a possible small detour as she pursued to doctorate in American literature. But even here, "Most of the readings I was doing . . . were Jewish authors, so I always imposed the Jewish world upon whatever I was doing anyway." Susan's path was not so seamless. As an undergraduate she pursued an education degree with an eye toward a teaching degree in secular education. [Elsewhere in the interview we learn that she taught for several years while her husband pursued his graduate degree, but she was always the last hired and first to receive a pink slip.] When Susan's husband secured a position several hundred miles from where they were living, she viewed the move as an opportunity to "make a clean break" with a profession she was being shut out of. She briefly considered an MBA degree, before being encouraged by a friend to enter Jewish communal life. The chance remark by a friend at a wedding led to a decision that at the time "made a lot of sense" to her. She pursued graduate work and has been employed in a Jewish institution for eight years.

Neither story employs time in a linear way. Miriam begins with an image of a beloved grandfather whose lapel pins symbolize her joint Israeli and American identities. She is locating us in her childhood to express values she holds today. She skips ahead to her years as a graduate student, goes back to recall her grandfather and then concludes in the present with a hope for the future. Susan structures her story time a little differently. She begins with her undergraduate years, moves to her early work years, her husband's relocation, and her new beginning. She then moves back in time to her youth to explain the sense of a career in Jewish communal life and concludes back at the time of the fateful wedding and repeats the sensibleness of such a career choice.

While time does not permit us to consider these stories in greater detail nor share with you the many other, sometimes very different stories we have heard, we are beginning to see in these stories both connections and differences. These stories will be valuable in helping Jewish communities develop plans for recruiting talented people into Jewish institutions and for understanding why they want to stay and what would motivate them to leave. In becoming aware of their own stories, we can hope that they will be re-told and inspire others.

References

1. Eric Partridge, *Origins. A short etymological dictionary of modern English* (New York: Greenwich Press, 1983).

2. Haydon White, The Value of Narrativity in the Representation of Reality. In W. J. T. Mitchell, Ed., *On Narrative*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1981. 1-23.

3. David H. Richter, The Borzoi Book of Short Fiction. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1983, 1-13.

4 Ibid.

5. Frank Kermode, Secrets and Narrative Sequence. In W. J. T. Mitchell, *On Narrative*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1981, 79-97.

6. Aristotle, Poetics. In Richard McKeon, Ed., *Introduction to Aristotle*. New York: Modern Library, 1947, 624-667.

7. F. Michael Connelly and D. Jean Clandinin, Stories of Experience and Narrative Inquiry, *Educational Researcher*, 22:3:2-14.

8. S. Crites, Storytime: Recollecting the past and projecting the future. In T. R. Sarbin, Ed., *The Storied Nature of Human Conduct*. New York: Praeger, 1986.

9.

10. Peninnah Schram, *Jewish Stories One Generation Tells Another*. Northvale, NJ: Jason Aronson, 1987, xxv.

11. Michael Goldberg, *Jews and Christians Getting Our Stories Straight: The Exodus and the Passion-Resurrection*. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1985.

12 Barry Holtz, *Finding Our Way: Jewish texts and the lives we lead today*. New York: Schocken Books, 1990.

13 Charles V. Gerkin, *The Living Human Document: Re-visioning pastoral counseling in a hermeneutical mode*. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1984.

14, Elie Wiesel, The Storyteller's Prayer. Foreword to P. Schram, *Jewish Stories One Generation Tells Another*. Northvale, NJ. Jason Aronson, 1987, xi-xvii.

15. Robert Alter, *The Art of Biblical Narrative*. New York: Basic Books, 1981.

16. Barry Holtz, *Finding Our Way: Jewish texts and the lives we lead today*. New York: Schocken Books, 1990, 13.

Choosing to Work in a Jewish Communal Setting: Miriam and Susan's stories

Miriam's Story

I always have a vision in my mind of my grandfather sitting on his front porch. He was an immigrant to this country from Russia, and I have a very strong vision of him smoking his cigar and sitting on his front porch in the rocking chair with two pins in his lapel that he wore always. One of the American flag and one of the Israeli flag. I think that dualism has been imprinted in my life since I was a young child. I did attend a Jewish elementary school. It was an Orthodox elementary school here [in this town].

Whatever happens to you in those formative years stays with you, whether good or bad, it stays with you. I think as a teenager a visit to Israel really cemented for me the idea that this was a part of me and would become a part of my career. I went into the field of education almost secondhand. I went through completing everything but my dissertation in American literature and then started all over again through the field of education with the realization that everything is based in education and Jewish education in particular.

[While majoring in American literature] I felt out of my element. I've always felt so comfortable in any field that has to do, where I could put Judaism into it. That is where I am most comfortable. It is a knowledge base that I have and, again, I have this image of that grandfather with the two flags, they are not separate lives, but one complete package.

Most of the readings I was doing in my Ph.D. program in literature were Jewish authors, so I always imposed the Jewish world upon whatever I was doing anyway. Education was always a love for me, because I am convinced that educators are some of the most important people in the world. I used to say that in my lifetime, educators would be paid the salaries of the physicians. I no longer say in my lifetime, but one day this country is going to realize the resource it has in its teachers. It may not be in my lifetime.

Susan's Story

I was actually trained as a teacher. My original degree or my undergraduate degree was a Bachelor of Science in Education, and I graduated and started teaching in junior high school and high school [I taught] English. I enjoyed it, I really did, but it was not a great time to be teaching. My husband was just about finishing his work at the university, and a job brought him here. I started looking into teaching and was pretty much hearing the same thing. There were [hiring] freezes. There were just no openings, and I said, "This is it. I have to re-do a career and I am going to start from scratch." It was really good. [Since we had just moved,] I felt so new. I said, "This is a great time to make a clean break." It wasn't like I didn't have time to go back to graduate school. I didn't have any kids, didn't have any friends, didn't have anything to do. How long can you go to the mall? So I thought, "I'll go back to grad school."

What happened was really sort of what we call B'sharet, fated, sort of right in the process of moving. I was at a wedding. It was the month we were moving, and I ran into an old friend who happened to be working at the federation and she said, "You really ought to go into Jewish communal work." She know my background, she knew what my interests were and she said there was a program [I] ought to look into [here in the community]. It was all completely new to me. It made a lot of sense.

[At the beginning] I was thinking maybe I'll get my MBA, not that I knew what that was either. It was, "Let's try something different." It made a lot of sense because everything I had been doing up until that point in my spare time was always related to something Jewish. I mean, everything I was doing on a volunteer basis or on a part-time basis. My husband and I were youth group leaders [when we were going to school]. We taught Hebrew Sunday School for high school kids. Everything that was probably meaningful to me as a teenager related to the youth group, the Jewish youth group I was a member of on my trips to Israel. I was a big part of my life so I thought, "This sounds really good." It sounds like a good match.

Peabody College
VANDERBILT UNIVERSITY
NASHVILLE, TENNESSEE 37203 Telephone (615) 322-7311

Department

Post-It™ brand fax transmittal memo 7671	# of pages ▸ 10
To Annette Hochstein	From Ellen Goldring
Co. Mandel Institute	Co. Vanderbilt
Dept.	Phone # 615-322-8000
Fax # 972-2-619951	Fax # 615-343-7096

To: Annette, Seymour, and Shmuel

From: Ellen and Adam

Subject: Notes for Upcoming Meeting with Ellen

Date: June 7, 1993

We have suggested a number of issues to discuss when we meet on June 13:

1) Updates since the Cleveland meetings
2) Update regarding the Educator Survey, and
3) Next steps for year two of MFE Project (including Claire's resignation).

Year two of the MFE project should continue to monitor community mobilization, visioning, and the professional lives of educators. (per the project outline). We should continue to improve upon our feedback loops both doe the communities and CIJE. It is clear, however, that the project must continue beyond these crucial areas.

The next logical step is to begin to collect baseline data in each community so it will be possible to ascertain outcomes as the lead community project proceeds. This make take several forms:

1) If the communities articulate specific goals, we can begin to collect process and outcome data that pertain to specific programs initiated as part of the lead community effort. This evaluation would entail both observations of specific programs, interviews of participants and personnel, and quantitative outcome measures. Similarly, the field researchers would aid the communities in developing evaluation components for each initiative and monitor the process by which scope, content, and quality become part of the Lead Community concept.

2)It is crucial to put on the agenda for all the lead communities their self studies for the fall. Like the educator survey, a common approach should be taken to the self study. The information from the self study will be crucial for measuring outcomes both in, and across communities. To the extent that the self-study involves educational outcomes, such as participation rates, teacher turnover rates, and so on, we are interested in contributing to the design of the self-study.

3)Considerable attention must be given to the measurement of outcomes. We will need to educate ourselves about available tests, surveys, and questionnaires pertaining to Judaica and Hebrew and get access to experts to help with the development of such measurements for Jewish education. Surveys and other "tests" will need to be developed. We may want to begin the process of commissioning papers to address the concrete outcomes of Jewish education and their measurement.

Given these suggestions we propose that Claire's replacement have skills in qualitative research methodology, as did Claire, but also have a strong background in evaluation and quantitative measurement. This new field researcher could then play an important role, under out guidance, in contributing to the self-study and developing the quantitative parts of the evaluation project. This is consistent with the team approach to the project.

I look forward to seeing you on the 13th of June!

Peabody College
VANDERBILT UNIVERSITY
NASHVILLE, TENNESSEE 37203
Telephone [illegible] 322-7311
Department of Educational Leadership • Box [illegible] • [illegible]

3

To: Annette, Seymour, and Shmuel

From: Ellen

Subject: More Notes for our upcoming meeting

Date: June 7, 1993

I am forwarding to you brief memos written by the Field Researchers.

As you read these memos you will see that virtually no movement has been made in <u>Atlanta</u> and <u>Baltimore</u> since the Cleveland meetings.

To the best of our Knowledge in <u>Atlanta</u>, Lauren has not talked to anyone or met with anyone except Michael Hillman, from the Jewish Educational Services. This meeting took place at the request of Michael. There are no meetings planned for CJC until after the summer.

In <u>Baltimore</u> the general feeling is that many issues have been settled. Beyond that, there has been little movement in the community as the memo indicates. Marty Dickman met with Chaim, and she met with a group of Reform Educators and Rabbis. Beyond that group there has been minimal formal presentation of the Lead Community concept since May.

In contrast, <u>Milwaukee</u> is proceeding along. The memo indicates the types of activities Milwaukee is engaging in.

We will discuss these in more detail when I see you.

Memorandum

To: Lauren Azoulai, Chaim Botwinick, Ruth Cohen

From: Roberta Goodman
Claire Rottenberg
Julie Tammivaara
Adam Gamoran
Ellen Goldring

Date: May 26, 1993

Subject: Reports on the professional lives of Jewish educators

---

CC: Annette Hochstein

The purpose of this memorandum is to note the issues we expect to address in the qualitative component of our forthcoming reports on educators' professional lives in Atlanta, Baltimore, and Milwaukee. We would appreciate any feedback you can provide that would help guide the reports.

Coordination and Schedule of Reports

Each community will receive its own report. The reports will have three components: [1] a qualitative component based on interviews conducted by the field researchers [this component is the focus of the present memorandum], [2] a preliminary account of the survey of educators, and [3] a component that integrates the findings of the first two components and addresses policy questions.

In Milwaukee, both the interviews with educators and the educator survey are being conducted this spring. The first two pieces of the report will be delivered this summer, and the integrated component will come late in the summer. In Atlanta, we have been conducting interviews and will release the qualitative piece this summer. In Baltimore, interviews with educators will not begin until June, so all three components of the report will be delivered in the fall.

Issues for the Qualitative Component

A Time to Act lists six concrete elements of personnel development, and we are taking them as our starting point [see pages 55-63]. The qualitative data [interviews with teachers and educational directors of supplementary, day and pre-schools and informal educators] will not provide all the information needed for policy decisions. Of the six elements, four are most completely addressed in the interviews: training, improvement of salaries and benefits, career track development, and empowerment of teachers. Since recruitment and development of new sources of personnel can only be effectively articulated by talking with or surveying people who are not currently active Jewish educators, these elements will be less well covered. We will offer an analysis of how people are presently being recruited into the field, why they remain, and what circumstances would lead them to consider leaving their current positions.

Training

A policy outcome for this area would presumably include a plan to strengthen existing and develop new opportunities for training. Such a plan might enlarge training programs, expand in-service education, provide training in specialty areas, for example, family education, and so on. We have spoken with educators about the training they have received, both pre- and in-service, and our reports will describe the extent and nature of their training. We will also document their perceptions of opportunities for training, reasons for taking advantage of or ignoring such opportunities, and their desires for professional development. We shall seek evidence of educators functioning as "reflective practitioners," meaning their professional growth through reflection on their own practices, as well as growth through support from administrators and informal contact with colleagues.

Salaries and Benefits

Important questions exist about the extent to which salaries and benefits constitute a motivating factor for Jewish educators. It is possible, for example, that financial rewards are more central in some segments of the Jewish educational community than in others. This information can help guide policy. Our reports will address the extent to which educators are motivated by salaries and benefits, as well as administrators' perceptions of the impact of extending benefits and how educators think about issues of part-time versus full-time work.

Career Track Development

Information we provide on this topic should help inform decisions about developing career tracks for teachers, administrators, and informal educators. Our data will describe educators' perceptions of existing opportunities, the connection between training and opportunities, career changes seen as desirable by educators, and the circumstances that constrain or enable their taking advantage of career opportunities. To what extent do career opportunities motivate Jewish educators? Have they encouraged educators to enter or remain in their profession? Are they a major source of dissatisfaction?

Empowerment of Educators

A policy outcome in this area would include a plan to assist educators to participate in decision making and to gain access to resources needed to implement their decisions. In our reports, we intend to discuss the nature of educators' perceived autonomy: Do they truly have discretion or are they autonomous only in the sense that no one pays attention to them? We will also describe the types of issues educators say they would like to affect, how educators are judged and would like to be evaluated, how they think others view them, and their self-images. Teacher accountability is another topic that is relevant for this policy area.

Please review the interview protocols and survey along in light of this memorandum. We would like your ideas on additions to them and what policy issues you deem critical but not covered above. The field researcher in your community will be in touch to arrange a time for this feedback.

CENTRE *for* EDUCATIONAL SOCIOLOGY
Department of Sociology

The University of Edinburgh
7 Buccleuch Place
Edinburgh EH8 9LW
Scotland

Fax UK (0)31 668 3263
Email CES@uk.ac.edinburgh
Telephone UK (0)31 650 1000
or direct dial UK (0)31 650 4186/4187

June 2, 1993

Ms. Annette Hochstein
Mandel Institute of Jerusalem
22a Hatzfira Street
Jerusalem 93102 ISRAEL

Dear Annette,

Roberta Goodman and Julie Tammivaara are presenting the enclosed paper at the Jewish Education Research Network conference later this month. It is conceptual and methodological, and does not refer to their work as field researchers or to lead communities in any way. Consequently, I have informed them that it does not fall under the jurisdiction of our advisory committee. However, I thought I'd send it along to you just so you could make the same judgment. I've also enclosed my comments on the paper.

Yours,

Adam

Adam

CENTRE *for* EDUCATIONAL SOCIOLOGY
Department of Sociology

The University of Edinburgh
7 Buccleuch Place
Edinburgh EH8 9LW
Scotland

Fax UK (0)31 668 3263
Email CES@uk.ac.edinburgh
Telephone UK (0)31 650 1000
or direct dial UK (0)31 650 4186/4187

May 28, 1993

Ms. Roberta Goodman
Dr. Julie Tammivaara
Council for Initiatives in Jewish Education

Dear Roberta and Julie,

Thanks for sharing with me your paper, "The use of narrative in Jewish educational research." As a methodological paper which does not specifically draw on or refer to your work in lead communities, I agree with you that it falls outside the jurisdiction of our advisory committee, so I have not submitted it to them. Still, I feel much better having had the chance to review it. If you intend to submit it for publication, I'd like to send the paper to Annette first so that she can have the same opportunity as I did.

Having read the paper, I thought I'd share a few reactions. I am convinced by the paper that narrative is a useful approach for relating research, and I particularly liked the way you show its special value for research in a Jewish context. Despite my own interest in hypothesis-testing, I think there's a lot we can learn from a narrative approach. For me, the narrative approach would serve the hypothesis-testing approach --it would set the stage for hypotheses, or elaborate on the findings of hypothesis-testing research. But that reflects my own interests, and I accept that the narrative approach can stand on its own as well.

I think it is important to cast the references to literary methods as metaphoric rather than literal. Otherwise, despite assurances to the contrary, it may appear that you would permit the researcher to use what the subjects say to fit the researcher's point of view. The author of a novel can make up the story, after all, but the researcher must allow the story to emerge from his/her subjects.

Finally, I would add that hypothesis-testing research also makes use of a narrative approach in an important way. There is a craft to reporting research findings, which makes use of plot, setting, point of view, and theme, at least. (Character seems often to be ignored.) The plot is critical to engaging the reader; this usually means asking a question and getting the reader interested in finding out the answer (i.e., testing the hypothesis.) The major difference, I think, is that in a hypothesis-testing project, the plot, setting, point of view, and theme are explicity established by the researcher, and thus we are not iterested in whether they are "true" or "false"; only the climax and denouement determined by the subjects, and that's where the issue of "truth" (or validity) comes in. In the qualitative approach you advocate, the plot, point of view, theme, and character emerge from the subjects, so the question of "truth" or "validity" is essential at every step.

Yours,

Adam

Adam

P.S. Dan Lortie goes by Dan, not Daniel (p.9).

The Use of Narrative in Jewish Educational Research

Julie Tammivaara

Roberta Goodman

May 1993

> The wind was flapping a temple flag, and two monks were having an argument about it. One said the flag was moving, the other that the wind was moving; and they could come to no agreement on the matter. They argued back and forth. Eno the Patriarch said, "It is not that the wind is moving; it is not that the flag is moving; it is that your honorable minds are moving."
>
> Platform Sutra

For those of us nurtured in societies dominated by ideas from the enlightenment, that is, that the world is rational, that time is linear, and that things happen for reasons that precede their effects, the idea of a life as an unfolding and continuous process is compelling. We need only look to the great biographies of our own time to get see this pattern. They begin with the "early years," progress to the "middle years," and, for those subjects blessed with a long life, end with the "later years." Modern social science is a child of the enlightenment, and we are familiar with the sociological and psychological explanations that point to early circumstances and experiences as shapers of the human condition. We see this view reflected in the structure of the many surveys with which we are familiar. If they are done well, they have a shape easily detectable to those who would look. Survey makers define their topic, theoretically conceptualize it, generate relevant categories, and then structure items that ask the respondents to situate themselves within the researcher's notion of the topic. By filling in the boxes, we give the surveyors the information they need to describe our lives or parts of it, after, of course, the data have been coded and analyzed. There is a tendency to think about the descriptions thus elicited as relatively neutral and unproblematic even if the methods we use to generate them are not always without their challenges.

Today, we would like to discuss another way of thinking about and investigating lives, a way that is not accommodated by the scientific view. This way directs us to consider lives not as a cumulative result of a series of chronologically determined experiences but as a function of personal narratives made and re-made throughout one's life.

What is a narrative?

The idea of narrative takes many of us back to high school or college English classes and to the idea of stories. Indeed, the word "narrative" derives partly from the Sanskrit *narro* meaning to "relate" or "tell," but it also derives from the Latin *gnarus* meaning "knowing," "acquainted with," and "expert" among other things.[1] Hayden White suggests that narrative addresses the problem of how to translate knowing into telling.[2] The problem of translating knowing into telling is confronted by many of us here today whether we be researchers or teachers. As teachers, we want and need to know what students know, as researchers, we want and need to know what those we study know. Both teachers and researchers are discovering a richness in the stories being told that is proving illuminating.

Traditionally, stories or narratives consist of five elements: plot, setting, character, point of view, and theme.[3] *Plot* refers to a sequence of events that form the action or movement of the story. A story's *setting* is the context within which the events occur, for example, the place, the time, the social, political, and religious milieu, and so forth. *Character* refers to the person to persons included in the telling of the story The perspective from which a story is told is called its *point of view*. This may be the narrator of the story or may arise from the voice or voices of the characters Finally, stories have a *theme* that reveals the underlying meanings intended by the teller or extracted by the reader. Today, we shall discuss in some detail two of these narrative features: plot and point of view. We are making this choice because they are most problematic for social researchers and distinguish the method we are discussing most sharply from traditional educational research.

Without a plot there is no story. Narratives progress because events happen by virtue of a character acting to make them, by a character reacting to externally imposed events that may be human or otherwise inspired, or by some combination of the two. What we shall call a story for our purpose here does not necessarily, in fact, usually does not, entail the dramatic sequence suggested by Freitag of exposition, climax, and denouement.[4] Nevertheless, a story must consist of events connected in some minimal manner, what Kermode refers to as "connexity."[5] Causality is the shadow of event sequences. If a story possesses action, it is presumed there are actors who are acting for some reason. In his *Poetics*, Aristotle suggested two causes of action: *dianoia* and *ethos* or thought and character [in the sense of dispositions or attitudes of persons in the story].[6] If we understand him correctly, people act because they have reasoned a particular course is sensible or because some inherent trait drives them to do so. Usually stories possess this quality of causation: I did this, so, of course, that happened. As Connelly and Clandenin note: "a sequence of events looked at backward has the appearance of causal necessity and, looked at forward, has the sense of a teleological, intentional pull of the future,"[7] their articulation of Crites' reference to the "topsy turvy hermeneutical principle" characteristic of narratives.[8] Where cause is left ambiguous or is apparently absent, the listener or reader of a story will work all the harder to impose one, for action without cause is pointless. [Purposeless action is, however, the point for some adherents of existentialism, but that belongs to another conversation.]

As we can see, narrative causality is not the same as scientific causality in that it is not subject to hypothesis testing aimed at probing the validity of theories to discover necessary antecedents for particular consequences. Thus, while humans seem driven to think in terms of purpose, whether it be their own or outside themselves, they do not necessarily or even usually, define causality in the same way as do scientists trained in the hypothetico-deductive method. To be able to explain why we did what we did or arrived at the place where we are and so forth allows us to believe that there is an order to the world and we can purposefully act within it. It is much less important to us that this understanding constitutes an ultimate and perfect understanding than that it be sufficiently persuasive such that we can carry on with our daily lives.

While we insist on imposing order on our lives, most of us do not insist that a particular order or meaning is not open to challenge. Given a particular traumatic event, we may explain it at one point as having occurred as a result of some defect in our character, at another point as a consequence of unreasonable social demands emanating from magazine advertisements or cinematic images of people like us, for example. Thus, our stories are made and re-made throughout our lives.[9]

Stories are told from a point of view. We take this to mean that stones arise from [and are heard with] a meaning structure within which the story makes sense. Accounts of stories, if written by someone other than the teller, for example a researcher, are told from a joint point of view, the teller and the renderer. Written stories engage yet a third party, the reader. The seemingly simple act of reading a story entails a complex adventure in meaning making involving the creative skill of the teller to compose the story, the social context of its reception by the researcher and the multiple social contexts of the many readers of the story.

If this line of thinking is plausible, then what happens to any notion of "truth?" On the one hand, we can say that truth possesses a flexibility that is altered as our experience and conceptual skills advance; on the other, we must recognize that people can sequence events and attribute causation in a way that knowingly or unknowingly are not truthful. An individual may tell you he met a celebrated woman three years after her well-documented demise, for example, or an account may point a finger at a given individual out of spite rather than out of respect for veracity. [The idea of a particular telling deriving from a vested interest in that particular version was explored by Josephine Tey in *The Daughter of Time.*] This phenomenon relates to the rhetorical notion of "narrator reliability," that is the assessment of the account rests on the hearer or reader's faith in the teller. He may be unreliable due to naivete as in Bret Harte's *The Haircut,* unreliable due to impure motives as in Agatha Christie's *The Murder of Roger Ackroyd,* or initially unreliable then progressively more reliable as in Isaac Bashvis Singer's *Gimpel the Fool.* Thus, as in art, researchers must consider narrators' veracity problematic.

In the research encounter that employs face-to-face conversations between an informant and a researcher, informants often remark that they surprise themselves in what they say. This observation, we believe, stems from a recognition that in being asked to contemplate some topic or other, the teller is actively imagining events in a way that would not occur had the encounter not taken place.

In hearing narratives from those one is studying, the researcher attempts to hear them with the ears of the teller, that is, from their perspective. To do this perfectly, of course, is impossible. When it comes to re-telling a story in written form, the author must make decisions, most of which concern the audience to whom such she is writing. Without further contemplation of this complex phenomenon, we wish to make the point that meaning is not frozen in a story at the moment of telling, at the moment of its writing, nor at the moment of its reading. In our practical lives, this point is self-evident to anyone who has been misunderstood within a conversation or who has had the crushing experience of having his text critically panned. In much educational research however, this point is elided, particularly when numbers are involved. Somehow, against all logic, we approach the most de-contextualized, thinnest summaries of people's lives as if they were closer to truth than accounts that are drenched in the nuanced meanings of the researched and the researcher. Reducing the lives of the researched to categories--numerical or otherwise--privileges the author whose interpretation becomes the only one available to the reader.

Narrative as a Jewish Way of Knowing

Storytelling and narrative interpretation are two methods by which Jews are socialized to become Jews. Through stories, Jews teach and are taught the principles of Judaism and its values. This Jewish approach to socialization parallels the role of narrative in character or faith formation touched upon by human developmentalists. In addition, outsiders can come to understand Jews and Judaism through narratives of the Jewish people.

"Jews are a storytelling people. We cherish our memories and celebrate them through our stories."[10] As a storytelling people, Jews have created narratives manifold both in variety and quantity. Types of Jewish narratives include: Biblical, halachic, and aggadic midrash stories; Chassidic tales, folk tales, and fairy tales. Jews have used the short story, novel and biography genres to convey their narratives. A narrative form that is particularly poignant and familiar to us in the post-Holocaust era is oral history: individual accounts of life experiences. Through their narratives Jews both remember and celebrate. Their stories provide a vehicle for generational enculturation and Judaic continuity.

Narrative is a Jewish way of knowing. Stories are an encounter between text and reader or a teller and a listener. Stories demand interpretation. Through narratives, we learn what the text has to say and explore what it has to say to us.[11] The historical texts of the Jewish people can speak personally to our lives.[12] The act of interpreting text, of both understanding what the text is saying and then making the connection between a narrative and one's own existence, is a Jewish way of knowing. Through this interpretive act, both the text and oneself come alive and are filled with meaning. The stories of the Jewish people become integrated into individual personal stories.

When we read or hear a story, we are simultaneously understanding and interpreting the story and our own lives. We construct meaning through the narratives we create and tell about ourselves. Narrative is a form of human knowing, of understanding ourselves. Being human involves being a hermaneut, a myth-maker, an interpreter of experience.[13] The narratives we construct are a way of giving order and sense to our experiences. They guide our actions, relationships and choices, reflect our values and world view; and define who we are and what we want to be. We are known through our stories.

Through Judaism's stories, the Jewish people are shaped. Wiesel writes of Jewish tales as showing that the road to God is through human beings.[14] More specifically, Alter views Biblical narrative as giving rise to moral, spiritual and historical knowledge.[15] The Torah is a record of a formative encounter between God and the Jewish people. This encounter is re-lived through the weekly Torah reading as it engages people in an ongoing dialogue centuries old. The role of midrash is the act of interpreting the Torah. Participating in this process connects the realities, visions, values and existence of present-day Jews to the Jews of the past. As Holtz has noted, "Learning and reflection, in other words, must point in two directions--toward the past, toward the values at the source of what one is as part of a people, but also toward the here and now, toward the 'design' of our lives today."[16] Interpretation entails active listening to the voices of the past while giving rise to the creation of meanings for today's Jews.

The Jewish people are known to others as well as to themselves through their stories. As noted earlier, all stories share the five elements of plot, theme, character, setting, and point of view. What distinguishes the stories of one people from another are the particularities, the content of the people's stories. Stories are filled with values. Many Jewish stories deal with ethical and spiritual concerns. From the story of Abraham's treatment of the three strangers in which he washes their feet and serves them food, we learn the value of *hachnasat orchim*, which exemplifies the value of hospitality. These values inform our behavior.

Stories reveal a people's orientation. Certain stories appear in different cultures in altered forms. Those deviations in plot, point of view, or character are precisely what identifies them as belonging to a people and distinguishes them from other people's stories. Syd Lieberman, a storyteller, relates an incident illustrating this point. One evening, Mr. Lieberman told a particular story where Jewish wit, determination, and action get the Jews in the tale out of a dilemma. Upon completing the tale, he noticed a woman with a puzzled look. "Why is this woman puzzled?" he wondered. She explained that in her culture, the characters in the story would have waited for fate to take its course. Stories are culture or people specific.

Recurring themes reveal a people's history and identity. Every Pesach, we retell the Exodus story from the perspective of having been slaves in Egypt. Redemption--being rescued--and freedom are key themes that reappear with the Maccabees, Jews in medieval times, and the deliverance of Soviet and Ethiopian Jews in modern times. The Jewish experiences of redemption, slavery, and freedom are often connected with our dedication to social justice, for example, in the U. S. civil rights movement. Our actions reflect our connection to these narrative themes that are part of our collective memory and our treasure chest of stories.

To summarize, narrative is a way of knowing as Judaism is textually based and narratively oriented. Stories are a mode for shaping and creating meaning in the lives of Jews. Conversely, narrative is a way that Jews become known to others. Through the stories that Jews tell about themselves, they reveal to others their values, perspectives, orientation, concerns, history, rituals, and traditions.

Why Narrative?

One reason often given for doing social or educational research is that what one learns can inform institutional policy decisions. If, for example, we learn through a survey that good supplementary teachers are more Judaically knowledgeable, a Board of Jewish Education might plausibly conclude that increased workshop offerings in Judaic studies and required attendance by a community's teachers would be a good thing. A community's BJE might develop a series of workshops, offer incentives for teachers to attend, and even require they come to some minimal number of offerings. Over the years, observers might conclude, as one rabbi recently told us, that this remedy hasn't worked; that, in fact, "Some of the worst teachers attend the most classes and workshops." What went wrong in this apparently logical application of a research finding?

To begin our analysis, let us assume that better teachers are more Judaically knowledgeable. The solution of more workshops, based as it is on a reduced conception of a complex problem, cannot fully respond to the problem of enhancing teacher performance. Even if they do increase teachers' knowledge [and this cannot be assured], they are unlikely in and of themselves enhance teaching if this is their only goal. Workshops designed on such limited understanding of teachers cannot anticipate the situation of teachers' students, the reasons why some teachers are more Judaically knowledgeable, what those teachers do in the classroom that makes them better or worse teachers, what meanings teachers give for wanting to become more knowledgeable, what they do with the knowledge once they get it, and so on. One analogy for this solution is an engine and gasoline: engines run better when they are fueled than when they are not fueled, they run better when a higher grade of fuel is used. People, however, are not engines and knowledge is not fuel. What matters in the teaching encounter as in any human encounter is what sense is being made of that encounter independently and jointly by the parties involved. Without the type of understanding [*verstehen*] one can gain through narrative inquiry, we cannot fully inform policy decisions.

Previously, we mentioned our informants' observation that they are surprised by what they say in the research encounter. We took this to mean that in the act of telling stories, participants are making their stories. By entering into a conversation with us, they are provided an opportunity to tell certain stories for the first time. They are surprised on three levels: they have a story to tell, their story has a particular shape and point, and someone else--that is the researcher--is interested in hearing their stories By asking teachers to tell us about their teaching lives, we are providing an occasion for them to actively reflect upon those lives. As a rule, teachers have few opportunities to share what they do with interested listeners and, we may suppose, for many this failure can stifle the richness of meaning making that can occur jointly with others. When we are left alone to ponder our lives, two not so positive things can happen. First, we can avoid thinking about our professional lives as fluid and problematic [the robotic worker], and second if we do engage in meaning making, we can choose explanations that seem to make sense from our own perspective but do not connect well with the meaning structures of those around us [the pathologic worker]. The very act of sharing and jointly producing meanings can help us integrate meanings that will serve us professionally. As Philip Jackson in *Life in Classrooms* and Daniel Lortie in *Schoolteacher* among scores of others have documented, the work of teachers is labor intensive. Yet, given the opportunity to speak of their lives as we have tried to do for many years, we find very few if any who are not willing to do so and who do not feel energized by having done so. For example, a group of teachers in central Philadelphia have been meeting monthly for the last ten years to do just this. Originally inspired by sharing their lives with researchers at the University of Pennsylvania, they continued the conversations begun in the research setting on their own. They have broken the barriers of solitude that typically enclose teachers and draw strength from listening and sharing with one another. They are engaged in an ongoing dialogue about things that matter to them and to their profession. Because they understand one another and the contexts in which they work, they are able to confront the challenges of their work in a connected and sensible way. They are able to incorporate new ideas in a manner that makes sense and connects sensibly with their everyday teaching situations. For them as with the monks in the quotation at the beginning of this treatise, the important thing is that their honorable minds are moving.

We have seen that narrative inquiry can inform institutional policy and individual practice; it can also provide an opportunity for the story tellers to find their voice as they are asked to reflect, imagine, and envision aspects of their lives. When teachers reflect, imagine, and envision their lives, they are prepared to share their lives in a concrete way. Through sharing, they find their voices and can become a powerful force in matters that are important to them, their students and their schools. Today there is much talk of institutional and systemic change in schools. We believe it is important to allow teachers opportunities to influence policy decisions in their schools; however, if teachers do not have an opportunity to find their voices and have places to give voice to their concerns, different institutional arrangements will make little difference.

Finding One's Voice: Two examples

As researchers in the field of Jewish education, we are interested in how people came to choose careers in Jewish communal service. We have asked many people to share their stories with us, and we have selected two to share with you today. Both are young women who work full time; one is married with children, one is single. In responding to the same question [Of all the careers you could have chosen, how did you come to choose one in Jewish communal service)] Minam and Susan gave brief accounts. Their stories are similar in that both acknowledge that they have always felt most comfortable in explicitly Jewish settings. Both recalled the pleasure they felt in participating in Jewish youth activities and both went to Israel as teenagers, and both expressed that their chosen lines of work fit their value structures. For both, then, working within a Jewish context is both comfortable and a logical extension of lifeways begun in childhood. Their stories are not exactly the same, however. We see in Minam's story a relatively smooth transition from a Jewish home to a Jewish professional life with a possible small detour as she pursued to doctorate in American literature. But even here, "Most of the readings I was doing . . . were Jewish authors, so I always imposed the Jewish world upon whatever I was doing anyway." Susan's path was not so seamless. As an undergraduate she pursued an education degree with an eye toward a teaching degree in secular education. [Elsewhere in the interview we learn that she taught for several years while her husband pursued his graduate degree, but she was always the last hired and first to receive a pink slip.] When Susan's husband secured a position several hundred miles from where they were living, she viewed the move as an opportunity to "make a clean break" with a profession she was being shut out of. She briefly considered an MBA degree, before being encouraged by a friend to enter Jewish communal life. The chance remark by a friend at a wedding led to a decision that at the time "made a lot of sense" to her. She pursued graduate work and has been employed in a Jewish institution for eight years.

Neither story employs time in a linear way. Miriam begins with an image of a beloved grandfather whose lapel pins symbolize her joint Israeli and American identities. She is locating us in her childhood to express values she holds today. She skips ahead to her years as a graduate student, goes back to recall her grandfather and then concludes in the present with a hope for the future. Susan structures her story time a little differently. She begins with her undergraduate years, moves to her early work years, her husband's relocation, and her new beginning She then moves back in time to her youth to explain the sense of a career in Jewish communal life and concludes back at the time of the fateful wedding and repeats the sensibleness of such a career choice

While time does not permit us to consider these stories in greater detail nor share with you the many other, sometimes very different stones we have heard, we are beginning to see in these stories both connections and differences. These stories will be valuable in helping Jewish communities develop plans for recruiting talented people into Jewish institutions and for understanding why they want to stay and what would motivate them to leave. In becoming aware of their own stones, we can hope that they will be re-told and inspire others.

References

1. Eric Partridge, *Origins: A short etymological dictionary of modern English* (New York: Greenwich Press, 1983).

2. Haydon White, The Value of Narrativity in the Representation of Reality. In W. J. T. Mitchell, Ed., *On Narrative*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1981, 1-23.

3. David H. Richter, The Borzoi Book of Short Fiction. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1983, 1-13.

4 Ibid.

5. Frank Kermode, Secrets and Narrative Sequence. In W. J. T. Mitchell, *On Narrative*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1981, 79-97.

6. Aristotle, Poetics. In Richard McKeon, Ed., *Introduction to Aristotle*. New York: Modern Library, 1947, 624-667.

7. F. Michael Connelly and D. Jean Clandinin, Stories of Experience and Narrative Inquiry, *Educational Researcher*, 22:3:2-14.

8. S. Crites, Storytime: Recollecting the past and projecting the future. In T. R. Sarbin, Ed., *The Storied Nature of Human Conduct*. New York: Praeger, 1986.

9.

10. Peninnah Schram, *Jewish Stories One Generation Tells Another*. Northvale, NJ: Jason Aronson, 1987, xxv.

11. Michael Goldberg, *Jews and Christians Getting Our Stories Straight: The Exodus and the Passion-Resurrection*. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1985.

12. Barry Holtz, *Finding Our Way: Jewish texts and the lives we lead today*. New York: Schocken Books, 1990.

13. Charles V. Gerkin, *The Living Human Document: Re-visioning pastoral counseling in a hermeneutical mode*. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1984.

14. Elie Wiesel, The Storyteller's Prayer. Foreword to P. Schram, *Jewish Stories One Generation Tells Another*. Northvale, NJ. Jason Aronson, 1987, xi-xvii.

15. Robert Alter, *The Art of Biblical Narrative*. New York: Basic Books, 1981.

16. Barry Holtz, *Finding Our Way: Jewish texts and the lives we lead today*. New York Schocken Books, 1990, 13.

Choosing to Work in a Jewish Communal Setting: Miriam and Susan's stories

Miriam's Story

I always have a vision in my mind of my grandfather sitting on his front porch. He was an immigrant to this country from Russia, and I have a very strong vision of him smoking his cigar and sitting on his front porch in the rocking chair with two pins in his lapel that he wore always. One of the American flag and one of the Israeli flag. I think that dualism has been imprinted in my life since I was a young child. I did attend a Jewish elementary school. It was an Orthodox elementary school here [in this town].

Whatever happens to you in those formative years stays with you, whether good or bad, it stays with you. I think as a teenager a visit to Israel really cemented for me the idea that this was a part of me and would become a part of my career. I went into the field of education almost secondhand, I went through completing everything but my dissertation in American literature and then started all over again through the field of education with the realization that everything is based in education and Jewish education in particular.

[While majoring in American literature] I felt out of my element. I've always felt so comfortable in any field that has to do, where I could put Judaism into it. That is where I am most comfortable. It is a knowledge base that I have and, again, I have this image of that grandfather with the two flags, they are not separate lives, but one complete package.

Most of the readings I was doing in my Ph.D. program in literature were Jewish authors, so I always imposed the Jewish world upon whatever I was doing anyway. Education was always a love for me, because I am convinced that educators are some of the most important people in the world. I used to say that in my lifetime, educators would be paid the salaries of the physicians. I no longer say in my lifetime, but one day this country is going to realize the resource it has in its teachers It may not be in my lifetime.

Susan's Story

I was actually trained as a teacher. My original degree or my undergraduate degree was a Bachelor of Science in Education, and I graduated and started teaching in junior high school and high school [I taught] English. I enjoyed it, I really did, but it was not a great time to be teaching. My husband was just about finishing his work at the university, and a job brought him here. I started looking into teaching and was pretty much hearing the same thing. There were [hiring] freezes. There were just no openings, and I said, "This is it. I have to re-do a career and I am going to start from scratch." It was really good. [Since we had just moved,] I felt so new. I said, "This is a great time to make a clean break." It wasn't like I didn't have time to go back to graduate school I didn't have any kids, didn't have any friends, didn't have anything to do. How long can you go to the mall? So I thought, "I'll go back to grad school."

What happened was really sort of what we call B'sharet, fated, sort of right in the process of moving. I was at a wedding. It was the month we were moving, and I ran into an old friend who happened to be working at the federation and she said, 'You really ought to go into Jewish communal work." She know my background, she knew what my interests were and she said there was a program [I] ought to look into [here in the community]. It was all completely new to me. It made a lot of sense.

[At the beginning] I was thinking maybe I'll get my MBA, not that I knew what that was either. It was, "Let's try something different." It made a lot of sense because everything I had been doing up until that point in my spare time was always related to something Jewish. I mean, everything I was doing on a volunteer basis or on a part-time basis My husband and I were youth group leaders [when we were going to school]. We taught Hebrew Sunday School for high school kids. Everything that was probably meaningful to me as a teenager related to the youth group, the Jewish youth group I was a member of on my trips to Israel. I was a big part of my life so I thought, "This sounds really good." It sounds like a good match.

CENTRE *for* EDUCATIONAL SOCIOLOGY
Department of Sociology

The University of Edinburgh
7 Buccleuch Place
Edinburgh EH8 9LW
Scotland

fax UK (0)31 668 3263
Email CES@uk.ac.edinburgh
Telephone UK (0)31 650 1000
or direct dial UK (0)31 650 4186/4187

FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION

TO : Annette Hochstein

FAX NO : 010 9722 619951

FROM : Adam Gamoran

DATE : June 1, 1993

PAGES : (Including top sheet) 8

NOTES :

I'm sending this material to Barry Ro[illegible] in response to a request from Ginny.

Adam

FAX NUMBER FOR REPLY +31 668 3263.

PLEASE TELEPHONE +31 650 4186/4187 IF THERE ARE ANY PROBLEMS WITH THE RECEIPT OF THIS DOCUMENT.

CENTRE *for* EDUCATIONAL SOCIOLOGY
Department of Sociology

The University of Edinburgh
7 Buccleuch Place
Edinburgh EH8 9LW
Scotland

Fax UK (0)31 668 3263
Email CES@uk.ac.edinburgh
Telephone UK (0)31 650 1000
or direct dial UK (0)31 650 4186/4187

FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION

TO : Annette H.

FAX NO : 010 972 2 6617 951

FROM : Adam G

DATE : May 96

PAGES : (including top sheet) 35

NOTES :

Also sent by e-mail

FAX NUMBER FOR REPLY +31 668 3263.

PLEASE TELEPHONE +31 650 4186/4187 IF THERE ARE ANY PROBLEMS WITH THE RECEIPT OF THIS DOCUMENT.

May 30, 1993

Dear Annette,

If I remember correctly, I am supposed to draft the 1993-94 contracts for the field researchers, and send them to you. Is that correct? I will be proposing a salary increase of 3%, keeping pace with inflation, rather than the 5% allowed in our budget. I will make a few revisions in the description of job responsibilities, in line with changes in the project over the last year.

We have one major issue to deal with: Claire has informed me that she does NOT intend to continue with the project next year, i.e. she is resigning as of July 31. After several discussions with her, it is clear that this decision is firm. We have not yet informed the rest of our team or anyone in Atlanta, but Claire would like to begin telling people this Thursday, June 3. Her explanation will be that she has decided to return to classroom teaching.

On balance I am disappointed about this, but it is not all bad; it gives us an opportunity to rethink the needs of the project in light of unanticipated changes in the way CIJE and the communities have moved.

Claire will write the report on educators in June and she will finalize it in July. She'll prepare a draft of the report on visions and mobilization in July and the rest of the team will edit it for submission in September as scheduled. She will be turning over all her notes to us. So I don't think we'll lose out in terms of products. The major loss to us will be in the excellent rapport that Claire has established with Lauren, and the time she has spent becoming acquainted with the Atlanta Jewish community.

(As an aside, you may be interested in knowing that the job has had a transformative effect on Claire. She has become an observant Jew (from being totally secular in the past) and she has found a home for herself in Atlanta.)

Do we need a replacement? Ellen and I have thought about this, and we are firmly convinced that a replacement is necessary (assuming Atlanta remains as a lead community). After September, we will not be able to provide more than minimal coverage of Atlanta without a field researcher in place. I propose that we start in July to search for Claire's replacement.

What qualities will we look for in a replacement? The unique strengths Claire brought to our team were experience in classroom observation and knowledge of emergent literacy (which we thought we could apply to Jewish literacy). It has become clear, however, that our project has a greater need for someone with experience in educational measurement and evaluation. This person would need to be an experienced interviewer and observer, as Claire was, but would also have expertise in quantitative measurement. Ideally this person would be familiar with Jewish education, but we view that as less critical at this time.

Finally, if Atlanta remains as a lead community, we would conduct a local search prior to a national search. We would avoid candidates with close ties to the major Atlanta Jewish institutions (because we need an "outsider"), but would be open to other Atlanta residents.

Would you like to discuss these issues with Ellen in June? Or do you want to have a conference call? Please let me know how you wish to proceed.

Yours,

Adam

cc: Ellen

Peabody College
VANDERBILT UNIVERSITY
NASHVILLE, TENNESSEE 37203
TELEPHONE (615) [illegible]
Department of Educational Leadership • Box 514 • Direct phone 322-[illegible]

Post-it™ brand fax transmittal memo 7671	# of pages ▸ 2
To Ann H. Hochstein	From Ellen Goldring
Co. [illegible]	Co. Vanderbilt
Dept.	Phone # [illegible]
Fax # 011-972-2-619951	Fax # [illegible]

TO: Annette Hochstein

FROM: Ellen Goldring

RE: Update: Educator Survey

Date: May 5, 1993

In preparation for our upcoming meeting, where I hope we will have time to discuss the next steps for the educator survey, I want to bring to your attention some of the issues we are confronting now.

I know I was to bring some estimates about the cost of data entry, data analysis and report writing. However, due to some of the unresolved issues, this is a difficult task. I suggest that it would be best to clarify some of these other issues before we begin to discuss cost so I will have a better understanding of the nature of the tasks we are contracting for.

1) one issue is the different schedules of the communities. Milwaukee will be ready to analyze the data in June, while Baltimore and Atlanta will begin collecting data in the fall. It is not clear if Baltimore and Atlanta will begin and end the process at the same time.

2) All communities had equal opportunities for input into the development of the survey. It appears that Steve G. has mentioned to Shulamith that he would like to change the survey. (We should discuss the many possible interpretations to his request). His understanding is that he could learn from the Milwaukee experience. I think we (CIJE) need to decide how we want to proceed with this issue. from a brief discussion with Ruth, it is clear that it is very important to her that Milwaukee not be viewed in this light. At considerable risk, time and energy, Milwaukee put forth the effort to administer the survey and look forward to using the information for planning. They want to be included in community comparisons of their data and do not want to be penalized for "going first". In addition, if Atlanta changes the survey they cannot be compared with the other communities. (My understanding from Baltimore is that will use the same version that Milwaukee is using.) Lastly, if Atlanta changes the survey it will involve additional cost both in terms of the development of the changes, and the analyses and data entry, which will be different from the other communities.

Issues to be raised in terms of next steps are:

1) Do we assume that all communities will be using the same survey? Do we take a position on that issue or leave it to the discretion of the communities? (How will this impact inter-community relations and future LC-CIJE projects?)

2) Do we proceed with Milwaukee in the meantime, and get an estimate for their data entry and analysis and leave Baltimore and Atlanta until the fall?

By way of clarification: I will not be available to write the reports of educator surveys. In my contacts to find the suitable person to work with on this project, I have included report writing in their tasks. I will work with the contracted person to ensure a quality product, and will broker between the LC and the person as needed, and Adam or I will make all presentations regarding the data and its implications.

I look forward to seeing you on Monday.

Fax Memorandum

TO: CIJE Staff and Consultants
FROM: Shulamith Elster
RE: The Educators Survey
DATE: May 2, 1993

By the time this memorandum reaches you, you will have received a copy of the Educators Survey in its final form. Ellen assumed responsibility for the content and organization of the effort and I assisted her in the administration of the project.

The purpose of this memorandum is to review the activities related to the development of the survey and to bring you up-to-date.

First Steps

With Isa's assistance we collected the existing instruments and reports from the major surveys to date- the Los Angeles study (Isa and Bruce Philips), the Philadelphia and Miami studies. These materials were distributed to the key persons in each community (Lauren in Atlanta, Chaim in Baltimore and Ruth in Milwaukee) and to the field researchers. A date was set for a meeting in Baltimore to review the existing instruments and to "develop" the CIJE instrument keeping in mind the nature of the LC project and the specific information that would be helpful in the development of local (national, continental) plans/initiatives in the personnel area. This meeting took place on March 29th, the week before Pesach. The field researchers, Chaim Botwinick and Ruth Cohen attended the day long meeting held on Baltimore.

April 1993

The "76 individual items" selected by the participants in the consultation formed the basis of the first draft of the questionnaire which we worked on during Pesach week.

Several drafts were circulated to the communities and field researchers. Comments were solicited from Israel, from Adam and from the professional advisory group members (through Ellen and Shmuel) and these incorporated into successive drafts of the survey.

We were very concerned with the length of the survey and with the "ultimate" value of each individual question for planning purposes.

The survey was printed on the 23rd of April and shipped to Milwaukee for administration on the 25th.

Status Report from the Communities:

The Survey was administered first on April 25th in Milwaukee to the educators in several schools and will be given to all school educators by the close of this current academic year.

In Baltimore the survey will not be administered until the Fall and that is to insure the widest possible participation and the "buy-in" of all of the key educators in the community. This decision was made by Chaim as he felt that it was too late in the school year to ask principals to incorporate the administration of the survey into the end-of-the-year school activities. Better results, he said, would be achieved by doing it at the beginning of the school year.

In Atlanta the Jewish Educational Services lay leadership would like to have it administered before July when the new staff director arrives so that it can be used as the basis for her planning. However, practical considerations such as the lack of designated staff for the project and no staff in the educational arenas may delay it until the Fall as well.

Peabody College
VANDERBILT UNIVERSITY
NASHVILLE, TENNESSEE 37203

Department of Educational Leadership [illegible] *phone 322-*[illegible]

TO: Annette Hochstein

FROM: Ellen Goldring

DATE: April 19, 1993

RE: Educator Survey

Post-it™ brand fax transmittal memo 7671 | # of pages ▸ 1

To Annette Hochstein	From Ellen Goldring
Co. [illegible]	Co. [illegible]
Dept.	Phone # [illegible]
Fax # [illegible]	Fax # [illegible]

As I prepare for my trip to Atlanta tomorrow, I wanted to know from you where we stand on the Educator Survey since I have not heard anything nor received any feedback.

We have comments from the Field Researchers and the LC Planners which we will incorporate in the final version when I meet with Shulamith tomorrow in Atlanta.

We need to make a decision by Wednesday if Milwaukee can go ahead and begin to distribute the survey in schools next week. My feeling is that since Ruth has set up appointments in the schools and has recruited the help of lay leaders to administer the survey, we should go ahead with this version. Although there are always improvements that can be made, I feel that this version will supply valuable information.

We still can meet this deadline and incorporate your comments and changes if we receive them on Wednesday.

Please advise. I will be in my office all day today, and at home in the evening.

Warmest regards to all over there!

[illegible]

Wording

[illegible]

SUMMARY OF MEETING WITH ADAM GAMORAN

APRIL 8, 1993

Discussion and criticism of the January reports to the CIJE.

Reconsider Evaluation project

1. Interview samples do not adequately represent the populations they purport to represent
    - e.g. rabbis in Baltimore
    - because too much led by who planners wanted them to see

2. Insufficient skepticism about veracity of interview responses — how do we know they are telling what is so? Insufficient cross-validation within communities
    - example of Baltimore Hebrew University

3. Naive understanding of politics of the three communities. Example:
    - feedback loops of May 1993

Discussion that perhaps LC's should pay for the field researchers.

I. To CIJE

A. Monthly updates to SF, AH, BH, SE, SH
- either written, face-to-face, or telecon
- to begin ASAP
- would be nice to begin with face-to-face in May

B. Report on lives of educators
- must get access
- or must know when not getting access
- and must be skeptical about what they're being told, and cross-validate from varied sources

II. To Communities

A. Milwaukee

1. Oral report on 2 topics:

a. What has been happening, organizationally
- Milwaukee's (successful) launching of the LC process

b. How Ruth has been doing
- Are meetings run effectively? Are people getting involved? Do people feel ownership? How is the community coming along?

SW will prepare triggers and danger points based on chronology, minutes from meetings

SF and AH will review outline of report prior to presentation

2. Request permission to share (1) with Baltimore and Atlanta
    - AG will have to write up the report to send them? or do it orally?

B. Baltimore

1. Assuming permission is granted, tell them Milwaukee report is coming - and send it to them
2. After June kickoff - establish commission subcommittee
3. Provide feedback on what's happened in Baltimore - as in Milwaukee earlier.

We need a more regular and sustained dialogue between the field researchers, AG, EG, and CIJE.

AH or SF will have to take initiative to introduce AG to CIJE Steering Committee

Mandel Institute will rank the success of the field researchers. We need to find out what the lay leaders expect at this point from MI and from the project. What do they expect to happen "tomorrow" in a series of areas.

Fax Memorandum

TO: Annette Hochstein and Shmuel Wygoda
FROM: Shulamith Elster/Ellen Goldring
RE: Educator Survey
DATE: April 23, 1993

This is the latest-to-final version of the Educator Survey. We will be making some changes during the day on Friday and welcome your comments even as we work to make our deadline for administration of the survey in Milwaukee.

We think that we have made good use of the many suggestions, comments and recommendations of the field researchers, our key staff people in the three communities and a representative group of educators in the communities. Claire was especially helpful in working with three prominent educators in Atlanta on specific aspects of the survey.

The comments relayed by Shmuel to Ellen in Atlanta were incorporated into this version.

Best regards,

21 pages —

COUNCIL FOR INITIATIVES IN JEWISH EDUCATION

Dear Educator,

As an educator in one of the three communities in North America selected to participate in the Council for Initiatives in Jewish Educatio Lead Communities Project, we appreciate your participation in this Educators Survey.

By completing this survey, you and your colleagues can provide valuable information about the professional lives, interests and needs of Jewish educators. The information collected through this survey will be used to make recommendations for the improvement of Jewish education in your community.

We expect that this process will directly benefit you, your colleagues in Jewish education in your community, and the Jewish community as whole.

On the pages that follow you will find many different questions about your work. There are specific instructions for each question. Please answer each frankly. If you do not find the exact answer that describes your situation or views, please select the one that comes closest to it. Please feel free to add comments and explanations.

Your responses are confidential. The results will appear only in summary or statistical form so that individuals cannot be identified.

Thank you very much for your participation and cooperation.

Lead Communities Project

Council for Initiatives in Jewish Education
Lead Communities Project
EDUCATORS SURVEY

I. ATTITUDES

This first group of questions asks about your perceptions of Jewish education.

1. People become Jewish educators for a variety of reasons. To what extent were the following reasons important to you when you first made a decision to enter the field of Jewish education?

(Check one response for each item)	Very Important	Somewhat Important	Somewhat unimportant	Very unimportant
a. Service to the Jewish community	☐1	☐2	☐3	☐4
Teaching about Judaism	☐1	☐2	☐3	☐4
c. Learning more about Judaism	☐1	☐2	☐3	☐4
d. Supplementary income	☐1	☐2	☐3	☐4
e. Part-time nature of the profession	☐1	☐2	☐3	☐4
f. Working with children	☐1	☐2	☐3	☐4
g. Recognition as a teacher	☐1	☐2	☐3	☐4
h. Opportunity for career advancement	☐1	☐2	☐3	☐4
i. Love for Judaism	☐1	☐2	☐3	☐4
* Other, specify________________	☐1	☐2	☐3	☐4

2. Would you describe yourself as having a career in Jewish education?

Yes ☐1 No ☐2

3. The following items deal with teacher involvement in Jewish education. To what extent do you agree or disagree with each of the following statements:

(Check one response for each item)	Agree strongly	Agree	Disagree strongly	Disagree
a. Teachers should have an opportunity to participate in defining school goals, objectives and priorities.	☐1	☐2	☐3	☐4
b. Teachers generally have an opportunity to participate in curriculum planning.	☐1	☐2	☐3	☐4
c. Decision-makers may ask for teachers' advice before they make a decision, but they do not seem to give teachers' recommendation serious consideration.	☐1	☐2	☐3	☐4
d. Teachers already have enough work to do, without getting involved in policy making.	☐1	☐2	☐3	☐4

4. Below is a list of individuals with whom you are in contact. In your opinion how is Jewish education regarded by each:

(Check one response for each item)	Great respect	Some respect	Little respect	No respect
a. Most rabbis	☐1	☐2	☐3	☐4
b. Most of your students	☐1	☐2	☐3	☐4
c. Most parents of the children you teach	☐1	☐2	☐3	☐4
d. Lay leaders of your school	☐1	☐2	☐3	☐4
e. Most other Jews	☐1	☐2	☐3	☐4
f. Your family	☐1	☐2	☐3	☐4
g. Your friends	☐1	☐2	☐3	☐4

5. The following items deal with different aspects of the life of a Jewish educator, please indicate how satisfied you are with each of the following:

(Check one response for each item)	Very satisfied	Somewhat satisfied	Somewhat dissatisfied	Very dissatisfied
a. Student attitudes toward Jewish education	☐1	☐2	☐3	☐4
b. Student behavior	☐1	☐2	☐3	☐4
c. Feeling part of a community of fellow teachers	☐1	☐2	☐3	☐4
d. Respect accorded you as a teacher	☐1	☐2	☐3	☐4
e. Being part of a larger Jewish community, such as a synagogue	☐1	☐2	☐3	☐4
f. Support from the principal or supervisor	☐1	☐2	☐3	☐4
g. Number of hours of teaching available	☐1	☐2	☐3	☐4
h. Salary	☐1	☐2	☐3	☐4
i. Physical setting and facilities	☐1	☐2	☐3	☐4
j. Resources available to you	☐1	☐2	☐3	☐4
k. Benefits	☐1	☐2	☐3	☐4
l. Other (specify) ______________________	☐1	☐2	☐3	☐4

6. What positions have you held in general education?
(Check all that apply)

Position	Total number of years
☐ Never worked in general education	
☐ Aide	________
☐ Teacher	________
☐ Librarian	________
☐ Specialist	________
☐ Guidance Counselor	________
☐ Supervisor	________
☐ Principal	________
☐ Camp Counselor	________
☐ Youth worker	________
☐ Other________________________________	________

7. Please indicate how many years have you been in your CURRENT setting, including this year.______________

8. How many years you have been working in this Jewish community, including this year?______________

9. How many years IN TOTAL have you been working in the field of Jewish education?___________

II. EXPERIENCE

The following set of items asks about your current and prior experience in Jewish education;

10. For each of the following Jewish settings check the positions you have held and indicate the total number of years in each,

Setting	Postion	Number of years
SUPPLEMENTARY SCHOOLS	☐ Aide	
	☐ Teacher	
	☐ Supervisor	
	☐ Specialist	
	☐ Principal	
	☐ Other	
DAY SCHOOLS	☐ Aide	
	☐ Teacher	
	☐ Supervisor	
	☐ Specialist	
	☐ Principal	
	☐ Other	
DAY / RESIDENTIAL CAMP	☐ Counselor	
	☐ Specialist	
	☐ Unit leader	
	☐ Division head	
	☐ Director	
	☐ Other	
JCC	☐ Group worker - Teacher	
	☐ Program Director	
	☐ Department head	
	☐ Director	
	☐ Other	
PRESCHOOL	☐ Assistant teacher	
	☐ Teacher	
	☐ Director	
	☐ Other	
INFORMAL EDUCATION YOUTH WORK	☐ Group Advisor	
	☐ Youth Director	
	☐ Other	
ADULT EDUCATION	☐ Teacher	
	☐ Program Director	
	☐ Other	

III. TRAINING AND STAFF DEVELOPMENT

The next set of questions asks about your training and staff development experience.

11. In your first position as a Jewish educator how helpful and supportive did you find the following:

(Check one response for each item)	Very much	Some-what	Not very much	Not at all
a. Colleagues	☐ 1	☐ 2	☐ 3	☐ 4
b. Supervisors	☐ 1	☐ 2	☐ 3	☐ 4
c. Principal	☐ 1	☐ 2	☐ 3	☐ 4
d. Rabbi(s)	☐ 1	☐ 2	☐ 3	☐ 4
e. Parents	☐ 1	☐ 2	☐ 3	☐ 4
f. Lay leadership	☐ 1	☐ 2	☐ 3	☐ 4
g. Central agency	☐ 1	☐ 2	☐ 3	☐ 4
h. Professional organization(s)	☐ 1	☐ 2	☐ 3	☐ 4
i. Textbooks	☐ 1	☐ 2	☐ 3	☐ 4
j. Curriculum guides	☐ 1	☐ 2	☐ 3	☐ 4
k. Workshops / in-service programs	☐ 1	☐ 2	☐ 3	☐ 4
l. Other published materials	☐ 1	☐ 2	☐ 3	☐ 4
m. Conferences	☐ 1	☐ 2	☐ 3	☐ 4
n. Formal coursework	☐ 1	☐ 2	☐ 3	☐ 4

12. How proficient are you in Hebrew?
(Check one for each category)

	Speaking	Reading	Writing
1. Fluent	☐ 1	☐ 1	☐ 1
2. Moderate	☐ 2	☐ 2	☐ 2
3. Limited	☐ 3	☐ 3	☐ 3
4. Not at all	☐ 4	☐ 4	☐ 4

13. In the last two years have been required to attend in-service workshops?

Yes (1)	No (2)
☐ 1	☐ 2

If yes, how many?__________

14. In the last two years have you attended local workshops in any of the following areas:
(Check one response for each item)

	Yes (1)	No (2)
a. Judaic subject matter (e.g. Bible, history)	☐ 1	☐ 2
b. Hebrew language	☐ 1	☐ 2
c. Teaching methods	☐ 1	☐ 2
.Classroom management	☐ 1	☐ 2
e. Curriculum development	☐ 1	☐ 2
f. Art/drama/music	☐ 1	☐ 2
g. Other (specify)______________	☐ 1	☐ 2

15. How useful were the workshops that you attended in the past two years in each of the following areas:

(Check one response for each item)	Very helpful	Somewhat helpful	Not helpful	Did not attend
a. Judaic subject matter	☐ 1	☐ 2	☐ 3	☐ 4
b. Hebrew language	☐ 1	☐ 2	☐ 3	☐ 4
c. Teaching methods	☐ 1	☐ 2	☐ 3	☐ 4
d. Classroom management	☐	☐ 2	☐ 3	☐ 4
e. New curricula	☐ 1	☐ 2	☐ 3	☐ 4
f. Art/drama/music	☐ 1	☐ 2	☐ 3	☐ 4
g. Other (specify)__________	☐ 1	☐ 2	☐ 3	☐ 4

16. Beyond those required during the past twelve months did you:

	Yes (1)	No (2)
a. Attend a course in Judaica or Hebrew at a university, community center or synagogue?	☐ 1	☐ 2
b. Participate in a private Judaica or Hebrew study group?	☐ 1	☐ 2
c. Study Judaica or Hebrew on your own?	☐ 1	☐ 2
d. Participate in some other on-going form of Jewish study? (e.g., year-long seminar) (Specify)__________________	☐ 1	☐ 2

17. Overall, how adequate are the opportunities for professional growth and development in your community?

(Check one)

1. Very adequate ☐
2. Somewhat adequate ☐
3. Somewhat inadequate ☐
4. Very inadequate ☐

18. During the past twelve months did you:

	Yes (1)	No (2)
a. Participate in an Israel experience	☐	☐
b. Attend a retreat	☐	☐
c. Attend a national conference	☐	☐
d. Participate in other Jewish growth experience	☐	☐

e. Other, please specify ____

19. In which of the following areas do you feel you would like to develop your skills further?
(Check all that apply)

a. Classroom management ☐
b. Child development ☐
c. Lesson planning ☐
d. Curriculum development ☐
e. Creating materials ☐
f. Communication skills ☐
g. Parental involvement ☐
h. Motivating children to learn ☐
i. Other__________________________ ☐

20. In which of the following would you like to increase your knowledge?

a. Hebrew language ☐ 1
b. Customs and ceremonies ☐ 2
c. Israel and Zionism ☐ 3
d. Jewish history ☑ 4
e. Bible ☐ 5
f. Synagogue skills / prayer ☐ 6
g. Rabbinic literature ☐ 7
h. Other____________ ☐ 8

IV. SETTINGS

The next set of questions asks you about the schools in which you work.

---

21. In how many Jewish schools do you work? __________

For the following set of questions, answer in regard to the two schools where you work the most hours. (If you work in more than two schools.)

22. How many hours per week do you work at each school?

First school __________ Second school __________ Third school __________ Fourth school __________

3. How many miles do you travel from your home to the school?

First school (one way) ______ Second school ______

24. What is the affiliation of each school?
(Check the appropriate response)

	First school	Second school
a. Reform	☐ 1	☐ 2
b. Conservative	☐ 1	☐ 2
c. Traditional	☐ 1	☐ 2
d. Orthodox	☐ 1	☐ 2
e. Reconstructionist	☐ 1	☐ 2
f. Community	☐ 1	☐ 2
g. Jewish Community Center	☐ 1	☐ 2

25. How many students are in your school?

______ First school ___________Second school

26. In what type of program do you work?
(Check all that apply)

	First school	Second school
a. Day School	☐1	☐2
b. One day Supplementary school	☐1	☐2
c. Two or more days Supplementary school	☐1	☐2
d. Preschool	☐1	☐2
e. Adult education	☐1	☐2
f. Special education	☐1	☐2
g. Other (specify)________________	☐1	☐2

27. What subjects do you primarily teach this year?
(check all that apply):

	First school	Second school
a. Hebrew language	☐1	☐2
b. Judaica (e.g., Bible, history, holidays) In Hebrew	☐1	☐2
c. Judaica (e.g., Bible, history, holidays) In English	☐1	☐2
i. Bar/Bat Mitzvah preparation	☐1	☐2
e. Secular subjects (e.g., math, reading, science)	☐1	☐2
f. Other (specify)______________________	☐1	☐2

28. In what grade levels are your primary assignments?

First school	Second school
_________	_________
_________	_________

29. Do you tutor students in Hebrew or Judaica?

Yes (1) No (2)

How many?__________

30. If you are a part-time Jewish educator, what sorts of things would encourage you to consider full-time employment in Jewish education. Rank only the <u>three most important</u> by writing 1,2,3, next to your choice where 1 is the most important.

a. Salary ______

b. Benefits ______

c. Job security, tenure ______

d. Career development ______

e. More job opportunities ______

f. Greater background in Judaica and Hebrew ______

g. Greater educational background ______

h. Presence of colleagues and opportunities to work with them ______

i. Change in family status ______

j. Availability of training opportunities ______

k. More resources at work ______

31. How did you find your teaching position? (Check the one that best applies to you for each school)

	First school	Second school
a. Central Agency for Jewish Education	☐ 1	☐ 2
b. Graduate school placement	☐ 1	☐ 2
c. National professional association	☐ 1	☐ 2
d. Through a friend or mentor	☐ 1	☐ 2
e. Recruited by the School	☐ 1	☐ 2
f. Approaching the school directly	☐ 1	☐ 2
g. Newspaper advertisement	☐ 1	☐ 2
h. Other (specify)______________________	☐ 1	☐ 2

32. To what extent do you receive help and support from the following in the first school.

(Check one response for each)	Frequently	Occasionally	Seldom	Never
a. Principal or supervisor	☐	☐	☐	☐
b, Mentor teachers	☐	☐	☐	☐
c, Other teachers	☐	☐	☐	☐
d. Faculty members at a local university	☐	☐	☐	☐
e. Central agency consultants	☐	☐	☐	☐
f. Teacher resource center	☐	☐	☐	☐
h. Other (specify)______________________	☐	☐	☐	☐

33. To what extent do you receive help and support from the following in the second school.

(Check one response for each)	Froquently	Occasionally	Seldom	Never
a. Principal or supervisor	☐	☐	☐	☐
b. Mentor teachers	☐	☐	☐	☐
a. Other teachers	☐	☐	☐	☐
d. Faculty members at a local university	☐	☐	☐	☐
6. Central agency consultants	☐	☐	☐	☐
f. Teacher resource center	☐	☐	☐	☐
t. Other (specify)______________________	☐	☐	☐	☐

34, Did each of the following factors affect your decision to work in the schools where you presently work?

(Check one response for each item)	First School		Second School	
	Yes (1)	No (2)	Yes (1)	No (2)
a. Hours available for teaching	☐	☐	☐	☐
b. Days available for teaching	☐	☐	☐	☐
c. Salary	☐	☐	☐	☐
d. Convenient location	☐	☐	☐	☐
e. Friends who teach there	☐	☐	☐	☐
f. Wanted to work with principal or rabbi	☐	☐	☐	☐
g. Reputation of the school	☐	☐	☐	☐
h. Quality of the students	☐	☐	☐	☐
i. Religious orientation	☐	☐	☐	☐
j. My own synagogue	☐	☐	☐	☐
k. Effort to recruit me	☐	☐	☐	☐
l. Other (specify)________________	☐	☐	☐	☐

35, Which of the following benefits are available to you as a teacher in the first school in which you work?

(Check all that apply)	(1) Available	(2) Receive
a. Free or reduced tuition for your children at your school	☐	☐
b. Day care	☐	☐
c. Free or reduced membership in a synagogue or JCC	☐	☐
d. Synagogue privileges such as High Holiday tickets	☐	☐
e. Money to attend conferences, continuing education courses	☐	☐
f. Sabbatical leave (full or partial pay)	☐	☐
g. Disability benefits	☐	☐
h. Employer contributions to a health plan	☐	☐
i. Day care	☐	☐
j. Pension benefits	☐	☐
k. Other, specify________ ______________________________	☐	☐

36. Which of the following benefits are available to you as a teacher in the second school in which you work?

Omit if you teach in only one school.

(Check all that apply)	(1) Available	(2) Receive
a. Free or reduced tuition	☐1	☐2
b. Day care	☐1	☐2
c. Free or reduced membership in a synagogue or JCC	☐1	☐2
d. Synagogue privileges such as High Holiday tickets	☐1	☐2
e. Money to attend conferences, continuing education courses	☐1	☐2
f. Sabbatical leave (full or partial pay)	☐1	☐2
g. Disability benefits	☐1	☐2
Employer contributions to a health plan	☐1	☐2
i. Day care	☐1	☐2
j. Pension benefits	☐1	☐2
k. Other, specify____	☐1	☐2

37. Do you teach in more than one setting to earn a suitable wage?

Yes (1) ☐1 No (2) ☐2

you teach in more than one school please answer the next two questions.

if not please go to section V.

38. To what extent is each of the following an advantage or disadvantage:

(Check one response for each item)	Definite advantage	Somewhat an advantage	Somewhat disadvantage	Definite disadvantage
a. Distance between settings	☐1	☐2	☐3	☐4
b. Scheduled faculty meetings	☐1	☐2	☐3	☐4
c. Scheduled faculty in-service	☐1	☐2	☐3	☐4
d. Preparation time	☐1	☐2	☐3	☐4
e. Classroom autonomy	☐1	☐2	☐3	☐4
f. Adjustments to different expectations	☐1	☐2	☐3	☐4
g. Variety of programs	☐1	☐2	☐3	☐4

56. What is your annual salary from your teaching?

	First school	Second school
Under $1,000	☐	☐
$1,000 - $4,999	☐	☐
$5,000 - $9,999	☐	☐
$10,000 - $14,999	☐	☐
$15,000 - $19,999	☐	☐
$20,000 - $24,999	☐	☐
$25,000 - $30,000	☐	☐
over $30,000	☐	☐

57. What is your total family income?

☐ $30,000 or below
☐ $31,000 - $45,000
☐ $46,000 - $60,000
☐ $61,000 - $75,000
☐ over $75,000

58. How important to your household is the income you receive from Jewish education? (Check one)

☐ The main source of income
☐ One of our/my main sources
☐ An important source of additional income
☐ Significant to our/my total income
☐ I do not earn an income from Jewish teaching

59. What is the highest level of education that you have completed? (Check one)

☐ Some high school
☐ High school graduate
☐ Some college
☐ College graduate
☐ Some post-graduate courses
☐ Graduate or professional degree
☐ Technical school
☐ Teacher-training institute

60. What degrees do you hold? Please list:

Degree	Major
______________	______________________
______________	______________________
______________	______________________

61. How many college or graduate credits do you have in each of the following:

	number of credits
a. Judaica or Jewish studies	________
b. Hebrew language	________
Education	________
d. Jewish communal service	________

62. Do you hold a professional license or certification in :

	Yes (1)	No (2)
a. Jewish education	☐	☐
b. General education	☐	☐
c. Other (please specify)____________________	☐	☐

____

63. Which of the following best describes your career plans over the next three years?

(Choose one)

☐ I plan to continue what I am doing.

☐ I plan to teach in a different supplementary school.

☐ I plan to teach in a day school (or different day school).

☐ I plan to be an administrator or supervisor in a Jewish school.

☐ I plan to have a position in Jewish education other than in a school (such as central agency).

☐ I plan to be involved in Jewish education in Israel, or in some other country.

☐ I plan to seek a position outside of Jewish education.

☐ I plan not to work.

☐ I plan to retire.

☐ I don't know. I am uncertain.

☐ Other, please specify____________________________ ____

Thank you very much for your cooperation!

0	1																		

39. If you had the opportunity to work full-time, would you prefer to teach... (Check one).

☐ 1 in one school

☐ 2 in several schools

☐ 3 I don't want to work full-time

V. BACKGROUND

Next we are going to ask you about yourself.

---

40. Are you Jewish?

Yes (1) ☐ 1 No (2) ☐ 2 ש

41. Are you a convert to Judaism?

Yes (1) ש 1 No (2) ☐ 2 ש

42. At the present time, which of the following best describes your Jewish affiliation?

ש 1 Orthodox

ש 2 Traditional

ש 3 Conservative

ש 4 Reform

ש 5 Reconstructionist

ש 6 Secular

ש 7 Other (specify)____________________________

43. Are you currently a member of a synagogue?

Yes (1) ☐ 1 No (2) ☐ 2

44. Are you a teacher in the synagogue where you are a member?

Yes (1) ש No (2) ש

45. Which of the following, do you usually observe in your home? (Check all that apply.)

- ☐ Light candles on Friday evening
- ☐ Attend a seder in your home or somewhere else
- ☐ Keep Kosher at home
- ☐ Light Hanukkah candles
- ☐ Fast on Yom Kippur
- ☐ Observe Sabbath
- ☐ Build a Sukkah
- ☐ Fast on Tisha B'Av and minor fasts such as Ta'anit Esther

46. During the past year, did you...

	Yes (1)	No (2)
a. Attend synagogue on the High Holidays	☐	☐
b. Attend synagogue at least twice a month on Shabbat	☐	☐
c. Attend synagogue on holidays such as Sukkot, Passover or Shavuot	☐	☐
d. Attend synagogue daily	☐	☐

47. Have you ever been to Israel?

Yes (1) ☐ No (2) ☐

If, yes , did you ever live in Israel for three months or longer?

Yes (1) ☐ No (2) ☐

48. What kind of Jewish school did you attend before you were thirteen? (Check all that apply.)

- ☐ One a day week or 'Sunday' school
- ☐ Two or three day/week supplementary school
- ☐ Four or five day/week Talmud Torah
- ☐ Day school
- ☐ None
- ☐ School in Israel
- ☐ Other (specify)____________________________

49. Did you attend a Jewish summer camp with mainly Jewish content or program?

Yes (1) ☐ No (2) ☐

If Yes, how many summers?______________

50. What kind of Jewish school, if any, did you attend after your were thirteen? (Check all that apply.)

- ☐ One day/week confirmation class
- ☐ Two or more days/week Hebrew high school
- ☐ Day school
- ☐ None
- ☐ School in Israel
- ☐ Other (specify)________________________________

51. Age________

52. Sex Male ☐ Female ☐

53. Where were you born?

USA ☐

Other, please specify country________________________

54. Marital status

- ☐ Single, never married
- ☐ Married
- ☐ Separated
- ☐ Divorced
- ☐ Widowed

55. If you are married, is your spouse Jewish?

Yes (1) ☐ No (2) ☐

Fax Memorandum

FROM: Shulamith
RE: Draft of Educator Survey
DATE: April 14, 1993

Total: 22 pages including this note

Ellen wanted you to see this draft of the survey. It is the one that is going today to the three communities, the field researchers and to Ellen herself.

She reminded me that you were to contact Coleman before she called as a follow-up to her note with the original draft. Also are there others who you think should see it?

Do you have any reactions?

S.

EDUCATORS SURVEY

Lead Communities Project

ATTITUDES

This group of questions ask about your perceptions of Jewish education.

74. People become Jewish educators for a variety of reasons. To what extent were the following reasons important to you when you first made a decision to enter the field of Jewish education?

(1) very important (2) somewhat important (3) somewhat unimportant (4) very unimportant

(Check One)	(1) very important	(2) somewhat important	(3) somewhat unimportant	(4) very unimportant
a. service to the Jewish community	☐ 1	☐ 2	☐ 3	☐ 4
supplementary income	☐ 1	☐ 2	☐ 3	☐ 4
c. part-time nature of the profession	☐ 1	☐ 2	☐ 3	☐ 4
d. working with children	☐ 1	☐ 2	☐ 3	☐ 4
e. teaching about Judaism	☐ 1	☐ 2	☐ 3	☐ 4
f. learning more about Judaism	☐ 1	☐ 2	☐ 3	☐ 4
g. recognition as a teacher	☐ 1	☐ 2	☐ 3	☐ 4
h. opportunity for career advancement	☐ 1	☐ 2	☐ 3	☐ 4

5. The following items deal with the policy-making processes in Jewish education. Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with each of the following statements:

(1) Agree strongly (2) Agree (3) Disagree (4) Disagree strongly

(Check One)	(1) Agree strongly	(2) Agree	(3) Disagree	(4) Disagree strongly
a. Teachers should have a greater say in the way things are done in their schools.	☐ 1	☐ 2	☐ 3	☐ 4
b. Teachers should have an opportunity to participate in defining school goals, objectives and priorities.	☐ 1	☐ 2	☐ 3	☐ 4
c. Teachers generally have an opportunity to participate in curriculum planning.	☐ 1	☐ 2	☐ 3	☐ 4
d. Decision-makers may ask for teachers' advice before they make a decision, but they do not seem to give teachers' recommendation serious consideration.	☐ 1	☐ 2	☐ 3	☐ 4
e. Teachers already have enough work to do, without getting involved in policy making.	☐ 1	☐ 2	☐ 3	☐ 4

1. Would you describe yourself as having a career in Jewish education?

Yes ☐ 1 No ☐ 2

3. Below is a list of individuals with whom you interact. In your opinion how is Jewish education regarded by each of the following?

(1) with great respect (2) with some respect (3) with little respect (4) with no respect

(Check One)	(1) with great respect	(2) with some respect	(3) with little respect	(4) with no respect
a. Most other Jews	☐	☐	☐	☐
b. Most rabbis	☐	☐	☐	☐
c. Most of your students	☐	☐	☐	☐
d. Most parents of the children you teach	☐	☐	☐	☐
e. Lay leaders of your school	☐	☐	☐	☐

32. The following items deal with different aspects of the life of a Jewish educator, please indicate how satisfied you are with each of the following:

(1) very satisfied (2) somewhat satisfied (3) somewhat dissatisfied (4) very dissatisfied

(Check One)	(1) very satisfied	(2) somewhat satisfied	(3) somewhat dissatisfied	(4) very dissatisfied
a. student attitudes toward Jewish education	☐	☐	☐	☐
b. student behavior	☐	☐	☐	☐
c. feeling part of a community of follow teachers	☐	☐	☐	☐
d. being part of a larger Jewish community, such as a synagogue	☐	☐	☐	☐
e. Support from the principal or supervisor	☐	☐	☐	☐
f. number of hours of teaching available	☐	☐	☐	☐
g. salary	☐	☐	☐	☐
h. status accorded to you as a teacher by parents and students	☐	☐	☐	☐
i. ysical plant and facilities	☐	☐	☐	☐
j. serving as a mentor	☐	☐	☐	☐
k. being a protege	☐	☐	☐	☐
l. availability of resources	☐	☐	☐	☐
m. benefits	☐	☐	☐	☐
n. status accorded you as a teacher	☐	☐	☐	☐
o. other (specify)________________________ ________________________	☐	☐	☐	☐

EXPERIENCE

The following set of items ask about your current and prior experience in Jewish education:

---

66. For each of the following settings indicate all positions you have held in that setting and the total number of years in each position.

Setting	Postion	Number of years
SUPPLEMENTARY SCHOOLS	Aide	
	Teacher	
	Supervisor	
	Specialist	
	Principal	
	Other	
DAY SCHOOLS	Aide	
	Teacher	
	Supervisor	
	Specialist	
	Principal	
	Other	
DAY or Residential Camp	Counselor	
	Specialist	
	Unit leader	
	Division head	
	Director	
	Other	
JCC	Group worker	
	Program Director	
	Department head	
	Director	
	Other	
Preschool	Assistant teacher	
	Teacher	
	Director	
informal education Youth work	Group Advisor	
	Youth Director	
Adult education	Teacher	
	Program Director	

6. What positions have you held in general education?
(Check all that apply)

Position	Total number of years
☐ Never worked in general education	
☐ Aide	______
☐ Teacher	______
☐ Librarian	______
☐ Specialist	______
☐ Counselor	______
☐ Supervisor	______
☐ Principal	______
☐ Other ______________________________	______

15. Please indicate how many years of total work experience you have had in each of the following areas of Jewish education.

	Number of years
a. Supplementary (afternoon or Sunday) schools	______
b. Day School	______
3. Jewish camps	______
1. Jewish pre-schools	______
Adult education	______
Informal Jewish education/youth groups	______
her Jewish education (specify) ______________________________	______

8. Please indicate how many years you have been in your CURRENT setting, including this year.______________

9. How many years you have been working in this community, including this year?______________

). How many years IN TOTAL have you been working in this community, including this year? ___________

RAINING AND STAFF DEVELOPMENT

e next set of questions asks about your training and staff development experience.

75 A In your first position as a new education Jewish education did you receive any of the following kind of support:

	Yes (1)	No (2)
a. lesson planning skills	☐ 1	☐ 2
b. classroom management skills	☐ 1	☑ 2
c. feedback from the principal / supervisor	☐ 1	☑ 2
d. In-service training in content areas	☐ 1	☑ 2
e. Interactions with other teachers	☐ 1	☑ 2
f. staff development	☐ 1	☑ 2
g. clear articulation of school goals / objectives	☑	☑

75.B. As a new educator in Jewish education to what extent did you receive help from the following:

(1) Never (2) Seldom (3) Occasionally (4) Frequently

(Check One)

	(1) Never	(2) Seldom	(3) Occasionally	(4) Frequently
a. colleagues	☑	☑	☑	☑
b. supervisors	☑	☑	☑	☑
c. principal	☑	☑	☑	☑
d. rabbi(s)	☑	☑	☑	☑
e. parents	☑	☑	☑	☑
f. lay leadership	☑	☑	☑	☑
g. central agency	☑	☑	☑	☑
h. professional organization	☑	☑	☑	☑
i. textbooks	☑	☑	☑	☑
j. curriculum guides	☑	☑	☑	☑
k. workshops	☑	☑	☑	☑
other published materials	☑	☑	☑	☑
n. conferences	☑	☑	☑	☑
formal coursework	☑	☑	☑	☑

3. How proficient are you in Hebrew?
(Check One)

fluent	☑
moderate comprehension	☑
limited comprehension	☑
not at all	☑

9. In a typical year are you required to attend in-service workshops?

Yes (1)	No (2)
☐	☐

How many? ____________

10. In the last two years have you attended local workshops beyond the required ones in any of the following areas:

	Yes (1)	No (2)
a. Judaic subject matter	☐	☐
b. Hebrew language	☐	☐
c. Teaching methods	☐	☐
d. Classroom management	☐	☐
e. New curricula	☐	☐
f. Art/drama/music workshops	☐	☐
g. Other (specify)____________	☐	☐

____

11. How useful were the workshops in helping you perform your job?

(Check One)

(1) Very helpful (2) Helpful (3) Somewhat helpful (4) Did not attend

	(1) Very helpful	(2) Helpful	(3) Somewhat helpful	(4) Did not attend
a. Judaic subject matter	☐	☐	☐	☐
b. Hebrew language	☐	☐	☐	☐
c. Teaching methods	☐	☐	☐	☐
d. Classroom management	☐	☐	☐	☐
e. New curricula	☐	☐	☐	☐
f. Art/drama/music workshops	☐	☐	☐	☐
g. Other (specify)____________	☐	☐	☐	☐

____

12. During the past twelve months did you:

	Yes (1)	No (2)
a. Attend a course in Judaica or Hebrew at a university, community center or synagogue	☐	☐
b. Participate in a private Judaica or Hebrew study group	☐	☐
c. Study Judaica or Hebrew on your own	☐	☐
d. Participate in some other on-going form of Jewish study (Specify)______________________________.	☐	☐

13. Overall, how adequate are the opportunities for professional growth and development offered in your community?

(Check One)

1. Very adequate ☐ 1
2. Somewhat adequate ☐ 2
3. Somewhat inadequate ☐ 3
4. Very inadequate ☐ 4

14. During the past twelve months did you:

	Yes (1)	No (2)
a. participate in an Israel experience	☐ 1	☐ 2
b. attend a retreat	☐ 1	☐ 2
c. attend a national conference	☐ 1	☐ 2
d. other Jewish growth experience	☐ 1	☐ 2

16. In which of the following areas would you like to develop your skills?

(1) Do not need (2) Need somewhat (3) Need very much

	(1) Do not need	(2) Need somewhat	(3) Need very much
a. Classroom management	☐ 1	☐ 2	☐ 3
b. Child development	☐ 1	☐ 2	☐ 3
c. Lesson planning	☐ 1	☐ 2	☐ 3
d. Devising creative activities	☐ 1	☐ 2	☐ 3
e. Creating materials	☐ 1	☐ 2	☐ 3
f. Communication skills	☐ 1	☐ 2	☐ 3
g. ..arental involvement	☐ 1	☐ 2	☐ 3
h. Motivating children to learn	☐ 1	☐ 2	☐ 3

17. In which of the following do you feel you need to increase you knowledge of subject matter?

(1) Do not need (2) Need somewhat (3) Need very much

	(1) Do not need	(2) Need somewhat	(3) Need very much
Hebrew language	☐ 1	☐ 2	☐ 3
Customs and ceremonies	☐ 1	☐ 2	☐ 3
Israel and Zionism	☐ 1	☐ 2	☐ 3
Jewish history	☐ 1	☐ 2	☐ 3
Bible	☐ 1	☐ 2	☐ 3
Synagogue skills	☐ 1	☐ 2	☐ 3
Rabbinic literature	☐ 1	☐ 2	☐ 3
Other ____________________	☐ 1	☐ 2	☐ 3

SETTINGS

The next set of questions asks you about the schools in which you work.

---

20. Do you tutor students in Hebrew or Judaica?

Yes (1)	No (2)
☐ 1	☐ 2

How many? ______

21. In how many Jewish schools do you teach? ______

22. What is the affiliation of each school you work in?
(Check the appropriate response)

	First school	Second school
a. Reform	☐ 1	☐ 2
b. Conservative	☐ 1	☐ 2
c. Orthodox	☐ 1	☐ 2
d. Reconstructionist	☐ 1	☐ 2
e. Community	☐ 1	☐ 2
f. Jewish Community Center	☐ 1	☐ 2

23. In what type of program do you work?
(Check all that apply)

	First school	Second school
a. Day School	☐ 1	☐ 2
b. One day only	☐ 1	☐ 2
c. Two or more days	☐ 1	☐ 2
d. Preschool	☐ 1	☐ 2
e. Adult education	☐ 1	☐ 2
f. Other (specify) ______	☐ 1	☐ 2

24. How many hours per week do you work at each school?

______ First school ______ Second school

25. What grade levels did you teach or work with this year (check all that apply):

	First school	Second school
1. Pre School	☐ 1	☐ 2
K - 2	☐ 1	☐ 2
3 - 6	☐ 1	☐ 2
7 and 8	☐ 1	☐ 2
9 - 12	☐ 1	☐ 2
Adult Education	☐ 1	☐ 2
Other (specify) ______	☐ 1	☐ 2

26. What subjects do you teach this year (check all that apply):

	First school	Second school
a. Hebrew language	☐ 1	☐ 2
b. Judaica (e.g., Bible, history, holidays) in Hebrew	☐ 1	☐ 2
c. Judaica (e.g., Bible, history, holidays) in English	☐ 1	☐ 2
d. Bar/Bat Mitzvah Preparation	☐ 1	☐ 2
a. Secular subjects (e.g., math, reading, science)	☐ 1	☐ 2
f. Other (specify)_______________________	☐ 1	☐ 2

27. How many students are in your school?

__________ First school __________ Second school

28. How many students are in your smallest class this year?

__________ First school __________ Second school

29. How many students are in your largest class this year?

__________ First school __________ Second school

30. How many miles do you travel from your home to the school?

First school: (one way) __________

Second school: (one way) __________

31. How did you find this teaching position? (Check the one that best applies to you)

	First school	Second school
a. Central Agency for Jewish Education	☐ 1	☐ 2
b. Graduate school placement	☐ 1	☐ 2
c. Through a friend or mentor	☐ 1	☐ 2
d. Recruited by the School	☐ 1	☐ 2
e. Approaching the school directly	☐ 1	☐ 2
f. Newspaper advertisement	☐ 1	☐ 2
g. National professional association	☐ 1	☐ 2
h. Other (specify)_______________________	☐ 1	☐ 2

03. Which of the following kinds of help and support do you currently receive?

(1) Never (2) Seldom (3) Occasionally (4) Frequently

(Check One)

	(1) Never	(2) Seldom	(3) Occasionally	(4) Frequently
a. Guidance from your principal or supervisor	☐ 1	☑	☑	☑
b. An opportunity to work with other teachers	☑	☑	☑	☑
c. Supervision from a mentor teacher	☐ 1	☑	☑	☑
d. Consultation from a faculty member at a local university	☐ 1	☑	☑	☑
e. Consultation from a central agency consultant	☐	☑	☑	☑
f. Access to a teach resource center	☐ 1	☑	☑	☑
g. Other areas of support	☐ 1	☑	☑	☑
h. Other (specify) ______________	☐ 1	☑	☑	☑

(Repeat for second school)

(1) Never (2) Seldom (3) Occasionally (4) Frequently

(Check One)

	(1) Never	(2) Seldom	(3) Occasionally	(4) Frequently
a. Guidance from your principal or supervisor	☐ 1	☑	☑	☑
b. An opportunity to work with other teachers	☑	☑	☑	☑
c. Supervision from a mentor teacher	☑	☑	☑	☑
d. Consultation from a faculty member at a local university	☑	☑	☑	☑
e. Consultation from a central agency consultant	☑	☑	☑	☑
f. Access to a teach resource center	☑	☑	☑	☑
g. Other areas of support	☑	☑	☑	☑
h. Other (specify) ______________	☑	☑	☑	☑

34. To what extent did each of the following factors affect your decision to become a Jewish educator where you are presently working?

(1) Definitely affected (2) Somewhat affected (3) Definitely did not affect

(Check One)

	(1) Definitely affected	(2) Somewhat affected	(3) Definitely did not affect
a. hours available for teaching	☐ 1	☐ 2	☐ 3
b. salary	☐ 1	☐ 2	☐ 3
c. convenient location	☐ 1	☐ 2	☐ 3
d. friends who teach there	☐ 1	☐ 2	☐ 3
e. wanted to work with principal or rabbi	☐ 1	☐ 2	☐ 3
f. reputation of the school	☐ 1	☐ 2	☐ 3
g. quality of the students	☐ 1	☐ 2	☐ 3
religious orientation	☐ 1	☐ 2	☐ 3
i. my own synagogue	☐ 1	☐ 2	☐ 3
j. effort to recruit me	☐ 1	☐ 2	☐ 3
k. other (specify) ____________________ ________________________________	☐ 1	☐ 2	☐ 3

(Repeat for second school)

(1) Definitely affected (2) Somewhat affected (3) Definitely did not affect

(Check One)

	(1) Definitely affected	(2) Somewhat affected	(3) Definitely did not affect
a. hours available for teaching	☐ 1	☐ 2	☐ 3
salary	☐ 1	☐ 2	☐ 3
c. convenient location	☐ 1	☐ 2	☐ 3
d. friends who teach there	☐ 1	☐ 2	☐ 3
e. wanted to work with principal or rabbi	☐ 1	☐ 2	☐ 3
f. reputation of the school	☐ 1	☐ 2	☐ 3
g. quality of the students	☐ 1	☐ 2	☐ 3
h. religious orientation	☐ 1	☐ 2	☐ 3
i. my own synagogue	☐ 1	☐ 2	☐ 3
effort to recruit me	☐ 1	☐ 2	☐ 3
other (specify) ____________________ ________________________________	☐ 1	☐ 2	☐ 3

36. A. Which of the following benefits are available to you as a teacher in the first school in which you work?

(Check all that apply)	(1) Available	(2) Receive
a. free or reduced tuition for your children	☐ 1	☐ 2
b. day are for your children	☐ 1	☐ 2
c. free or reduced membership in a synagogue or JCC	☐ 1	☐ 2
d. synagogue membership privileges such as High Holiday tickets	☐ 1	☑ 2
e. money to attend conferences	☐ 1	☑ 2
f. full or partial subsidy for continuing educational courses or in-service training	☐ 1	☐ 2
g. sabbatical leave (full or partial pay)	☐ 1	☑ 2
h. disability benefits	☐ 1	☑ 2
i. employer contributions to a health plan	☐ 1	☑ 2
j. pension benefits	☐ 1	☐ 2

36. B. Which of the following benefits are available to you as a teacher in the second school in which you work?

(Check all that apply)	(1) Available	(2) Receive
a. free or reduced tuition for your children	☐ 1	☐ 2
b. day are for your children	☐ 1	☐ 2
c. free or reduced membership in a synagogue or JCC	☐ 1	☑ 2
d. synagogue membership privileges such as High Holiday tickets	☐ 1	☑ 2
e. money to attend conferences	☐ 1	☑ 2
f. full or partial subsidy for continuing educational courses in-service training	☐ 1	☐ 2
g. sabbatical leave (full or partial pay)	☐ 1	☑ 2
h. disability benefits	☐ 1	☑ 2
i. employer contributions to a health plan	☐ 1	☑ 2
j. pension benefits	☐ 1	☑ 2

76. The following questions concern the goals, objectives and priorities of schools in which you teach. For each of the schools you teach in, check the response that best describes your school.

(1) Agree strongly (2) Agree (3) Disagree (4) Disagree strongly

(Check One)

A. <u>FIRST school in which I work</u>

	(1) Agree strongly	(2) Agree	(3) Disagree	(4) Disagree strongly
a. The school goals and objectives are clearly communicated	☐ 1	☐ 2	☐ 3	☐ 4
b. My school has a set of objectives that indicate what students are expected to attain over a specified period of time.	☐ 1	☐ 2	☐ 3	☐ 4
c. I know what my school's goals are	☐ 1	☐ 2	☐ 3	☐ 4
d. I generally agree with my school's goals	☐ 1	☐ 2	☐ 3	☐ 4
e. The teachers in my school have a common set of priorities indicating which goals and objectives take precedence when two or more come into conflict.	☐ 1	☐ 2	☐ 3	☐ 4
f. Priorities change too frequently and are sometimes hard to keep track of	☐ 1	☐ 2	☐ 3	☐ 4

A. <u>SECOND school in which I work</u>

a. The school goals and objectives are clearly communicated	☐ 1	☐ 2	☐ 3	☐ 4
b. My school has a set of objectives that indicate what students are expected to attain over a specified period of time.	☐ 1	☐ 2	☐ 3	☐ 4
c. I know what my school's goals are	☐ 1	☐ 2	☐ 3	☐ 4
d. I generally agree with my school's goals	☐ 1	☐ 2	☐ 3	☐ 4
e. The teachers in my school have a common set of priorities indicating which goals and objectives take precedence when two or more come into conflict.	☐ 1	☐ 2	☐ 3	☐ 4
f. Priorities change too frequently and are sometimes hard to keep track of	☐ 1	☐ 2	☐ 3	☐ 4

FUTURE

The next set of questions ask about your future plans in the field of Jewish education

89. In which of the following do you have knowledge and skills which you would be interested in utilizing to enhance Jewish education in your community?
(Check all that apply)

☐ Hebrew
☐ Bible
☐ Customs and Ceremonies
☐ Rabbinic literature
☐ Jewish history
☐ Israel and Zionism
☐ Skills and special talents
☐ Family education
☐ Special education
☐ Library
☐ Gifted and talent
☐ Technology / computers / media
☐ Counseling
☐ Parent education
☐ Teacher training
☐ Curriculm development
☐ Music
☐ Drama
☐ Art
☐ Youth work
☐ None
☐ Other________________________

5. Three years from now, do think you will be working in the field of Jewish educatio?

Yes (1) ☐ No (2) ☐

6. Do you think you will be working in the SAME setting or school?

Yes (1) ☐ No (2) ☐

8. Which of the following best describos your career plans over the nexe five years?

(Choose one)

- ☐ plan to continue what I am doing
- ☐ plan to teach in a different supplementary school
- ☐ plan to teach in a day school (or difforont day school)
- ☐ plan to be an administrator or supervisor in a Jewish school
- ☐ plan to have a position in Jewish education other than in a school (such as JCC, Jewish library, or camp)
- ☐ plan to be involved in Jewish education in Israel or in some other country
- ☐ plan to seek permanent position outside of Jewish education
- ☐ to resign from employment
- ☐ plan to retire
- ☐ don't know / uncertain

FULL TIME / PART-TIME

The following items concern the full-time / part-time nature of Jewish education

---

73. Do have to teach in more than one setting in order to earn a suitable wage?

Yes (1) ☐ NO (2) ☐

71. To what extent are each of the following advantages or disadvantages of teaching in more that one school:

(1) definite advantage (2) somewhat an advantage (3) somewhat a disadvantage (4) definite a disadvantage
(Check One)

	(1) definite advantage	(2) somewhat an advantage	(3) somewhat a disadvantage	(4) definite a disadvantage
a. Distance between settings	☐	☐	☐	☐
b. Scheduled faculty meetings	☐	☐	☐	☐
c. Scheduled faculty in-service	☐	☐	☐	☐
d. Preparation time	☐	☐	☐	☐
e. Classroom autonomy	☐	☐	☐	☐
f. Adjustments to different expectations	☐	☐	☐	☐
g. Variety of programs	☐	☐	☐	☐

70. If you had the opportunity to work full-time, would you prefer to teach...check one.

- ☐ In one school
- ☐ In several schools
- ☐ I don't want to work full-time

2. If you are a part-time Jewish educator, what sorts of things would encourage you to consider full-time employment in Jewsih educaion. Rank the three most important by writing 1,2,3, next to your choice where 1 is the most important.

a. salary ________

b. benefits ________

c. job security ________

d. career development ________

e. greater background in Judaica and Hebrew ________

f. greater educational background ________

g. presence of colleagues and opportunities to work with them ________

h. change in family status ________

i. availability of training opportunities ________

j. job security, tenure ________

k. more resources at work ________

4. Are you a full-time or part-time Jewsih educator? (Check one)

full-time ☐ 1 part-time ☐ 2

AFFILIATION

Next we are going to ask you about your Jewish affiliations.

---

38. At the present time, which of the following best describes your Jewish affiliation.

- ☐ 1 Orthodox
- ☐ 2 Conservative
- ☐ 3 Reform
- ☐ 4 Reconstructionist
- ☐ 5 Secular
- ☐ 6 Other (specify)________________________

40. Are you currently a member of a synagogue?

Yes (1) ☐ 1 No (2) ☐ 2

41. What denomination is the synagogue of which you are a member?

☐ 1 Orthodox
☐ 2 Conservative
☐ 3 Reform
☐ 4 Reconstructionist
☐ 5 Secular
☐ 6 Other (specify)____________________

42. Are you a teacher in the synagogue where you are a member?

Yes (1) ☐ 1   No (2) ☐ 2

40. Which of the following, if any, do you usually observe in your home? (check all that apply)

☐ light candles on Friday evening
☐ attend a seder in your home or somewhere else
☐ buy Kosher meat for home use
☐ use separate dishes for meat and dairy
☐ light Hanukkah candles
☐ have a Christmas treat
☐ fast on Yom Kippur
☐ refrain from handling money on the Sabbath
☐ refrain from riding on the Sabbath
☐ build a Sukkah
☐ fast on Tisha B'Av
☐ fast on minor fasts such as Ta'anit Esther

44. During the past year, did you..,

	Yes (1)	No (2)
a. attend synagogue on the High Holidays	☐ 1	☑ 2
b. attend synagogue at least twice a month on Shabbat	☐ 1	☑ 2
c. attend synagogue on holidays such as Sukkot, Passover or Shavuot	☐ 1	☑ 2
d. attend synagogue daily	☑ 1	☑ 2

45. To which of the following Jewish organizations do you belong:

	Yes (1)	No (2)
a. local Jewish social service organizations or auxiliaries- e.g., Home for the Aged, Child and Family service	☐ 1	☐ 2
b. Sisterhood or Men's Club	☑ 1	☑ 2
c. Zionist organization	☑ 1	☑ 2
d. ”nai Birth / ADL	☑ 1	☑ 2
e. Jewish Community Center	☑ 1	☑ 2
f. Other (specify)________________	☑ 1	☑ 2

46. Have you ever been to Israel?

Yes (1) ☐ 1 [✓ No (2) ☐ 2]

47. If, yes , did you ever live in Israel for three months or longer?

Yes (1) ☐ 1 No (2) ☐ 2

48. As a member of the Jewish community in which of the following do you actlively participate.

	Yes (1)	No (2)
a. volunteer on behalf of Jewish organizations	☐ 1	☐ 2
b. contribute to load Jewish federation campaign	☑ 1	☑ 2
c. contribute to Jewish causes	☑ 1	☑ 2
d. support causes by attendance at public gatherles such as rallied	☑ 1	☑ 2

49. My children are enrolled in (check all that apply)

- ☑ Jewish day school
- ☑ supplementary synagogue school
- ☑ Jewish pre-school
- ☑ public school
- ☑ other private / Independent school
- ☑ I have no school age children

56. What kind of Jewish school did you attend before you were thirteen? (check all that apply)

- ☐ one // day week or "Sunday" school
- ☐ two or three day/week supplementary school
- ☐ four or five day/week Talmud Torah
- ☐ day school
- ☐ none
- ☐ other (specify)____

57. Did you attend a Jewish summer camp with mainly Jewish content or Program?

Yes (1) ☐   No (2) ☐

If Yes, how many Summers?^____________

56. What kind of Jewish school, if any, did you attend after your were thirteen? (check all that apply)

- ☐ one day/week confirmation class
- ☐ two of more days/week Hebrew high school
- ☐ day school
- ☐ none
- ☐ other (specify)____

DEMOGRAPHICS

Lastly, we want to ask you some questions about yourself

---

35. What is your annual salary from your teaching?

	First school	Second School
Under $1,000	☐	☐
$1,000 - $2,999	☐	☐
$3,000 - $4,999	☐	☐
$5,000 - $6,999	☐	☐
$7,000 - $9,999	☐	☐
$10,000 - $14,999	☐	☐
$15,000 - $19,999	☐	☐
$20,000 - $24,000	☐	☐
$25,000 - $30,000	☐	☐
over $30,000	☐	☐

65. What is your total family income?

- ☐ 1 $30,000 or below
- ☐ 2 $31,000 - $45,000
- ☐ 3 $46,000 - $60,000
- ☐ 4 $61,000 - $75,000
- ☐ 5 over $75,000

37. Are you Jewish?

Yes (1) ☐ 1 No (2) ☐ 2

39. Are you a convert to Judaism?

Yes (1) ☐ 1 No (2) ☐ 2

50. Age________

51. Sex Male ☐ 1 Female ☐ 2

52. Where were you born?

USA ☐ 1

Other, please specify________________________________

54. What is the highest level of education that you have completed? (Choose one)

- ☐ 1 some high school
- ☐ 2 graduated high school
- ☐ 3 some college
- ☐ 4 graduate college
- ☐ 5 some post-graduate courses
- ☐ 6 graduate or professional degree
- ☐ 7 technical school
- ☐ 8 teacher-training Institute

55. What degrees do you hold? Please list:

Degree	Major

59. How many college or graduate credits do you have in each of the following

	number of credits
a. Judaica or Jewish studies	______
b. Hebrew language	______
c. education	______
d. Jewish communal service	______

60. Do you hold a professional license or certification in :

	Yes (1)	No (2)
a. Jewish education	☐ 1	☐ 2
b. general education	☐ 1	☐ 2
other (please specify)________________	☐ 1	☐ 2

61. Marital status

☐ 1 Single, never married
☐ 2 Married
☐ 3 Separated
☐ 4 Divorced
☐ 5 Widowed

62. Is your spouse Jewish?

Yes (1) ☐ 1 No (2) ☐ 2

63. Is your spouse also a Jewish educator?

Yes (1) ☐ 1 No (2) ☐ 2

64. How important to your household is the income you receive from Jewish education? Choose one of the following:

☐ 1 the main source of income
☐ 2 one of our/my main sources
☐ 3 an important source of additional income
☐ 4 significant to our/my total income
☐ 5 I do not earn an income in Jewish teaching

Thank you very much for your cooperation!

Memorandum

TO: Seymour Fox and Annette Hochstein
From: Ellen Goldring and Shulamith Elster
RE: Educator Survey: DRAFT
DATE: April 8, 1993

Here is the first draft of the Educator's" Survey. Please note the following as your review.

1. There are eight topics included in the survey. The placement of the topics as well as the individual items within these topics will be carefully considered and we welcome your suggestions.

NOTE: Disregard the numbering of the individual questions they are for our reference as we work and all questions will, obviously, be renumbered.

2. This is NOT in final survey form. There needs work to have consistent response modes, graphic work etc. We solicit your comments and suggestions.

3. A uniform cover letter needs to be drafted and it must include an explanation of the project.

4. On item # 2 under the part-time/full-time section we did not know if we should rank or scale. What do you think?

5. Likewise in the setting section, do you think teachers should refer to their first and second schools separately? In LA 30% of the teachers taught in more than one school and we know that in Baltimore there are many who do work in more than one setting.

We will speak with you soon.

S.

EDUCATORS SURVEY: LEAD COMMUNITIES PROJECT

ATTITUDES

This group of questions ask about your perceptions of Jewish education.

74. People become Jewish educators for a variety of reasons. To what extent were the following reasons important to you when you first made a decision to enter the field of Jewish education?

(1) very important (2) somewhat important
(3) somewhat unimportant (4) very unimportant

a.	service to the Jewish community	1	2	3	4
b.	supplementary income	1	2	3	4
c.	part-time nature of the profession	1	2	3	4
d.	working with children	1	2	3	4
e.	teaching about Judaism	1	2	3	4
f.	learning more about Judaism	1	2	3	4
g.	recognition as a teacher	1	2	3	4
h.	opportunity for career advancement	1	2	3	4

5. The following items deal with the policy-making processes in Jewish education. Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with each of the following statements.

(1) Agree strongly (2) Agree
(3) Disagree (4) Disagree Strongly

a.	Teachers should have a greater say in the way things are done in their schools.	1	2	3	4
b.	Teachers should have an opportunity to participate in defining school goals, objectives and priorities.	1	2	3	4
c.	Teachers generally have an opportunity to participate in curriculum planning.	1	2	3	4
d.	Decision-makers may ask for teachers' advise before they make a decision, but they do not seem to give teachers' recommendations serious consideration.	1	2	3	4
e.	Teachers already have enough work to do, without getting involved in policy-making.	1	2	3	4

1. Would you describe yourself as having a career in Jewish education?

Yes 1 No 2

a

3. Below is a list of individuals with whom you interact, In your opinion how is Jewish education regarded by each of the following?
(1) with great respect (2) with some respect
(3) with little respect (4) with no respect

a. Most other Jews	1	2	3	4
b. Most rabbis	1	2	3	4
c. Most of your students	1	3	3	4
d. Most parents of the children you teach	1	2	3	4
e. Lay leaders of your school	1	2	3	4
f. Your family	T	2	3	4

32. The following items deal with different aspects of the life of a Jewish educator, please indicate how satisfied you are with each of the following:
(1) very satisfied (2) somewhat satisfied (3) somewhat dissatisfied (4) very dissatisfied

a. student attitudes towards Jewish education	1	2	3	4
b. student behavior	1	2	3	4
c. feeling part of a community of fellow teachers	1	2	3	4
d. being part of a larger Jewish community, such as a synagogue	1	2	3	4
e. support from the principal or supervisor	1	2	3	4
f. number of hours of teaching available	1	2	3	4
g. salary	1	2	3	4
h. status accorded to you as a teacher by parents and students	1	2	3	4
i. physical plant and facilities	1	2	3	4
j. serving as a mentor	1	2	3	4
k. being a protege	1	2	3	4
l. availability of resources	1	2	3	4
m. benefits	1	2	3	4
n. status accorded you as a teacher	X	2	3	4
o. other (specify)________________________				

EXPERIENCE

The following set of items ask about your current and prior experience in Jewish education:

66. For each of the following settings indicate all positions you have hwld in that setting and the total number ot years in each position:

Setting Position Number of years

SUPPLEMENTARY SCHOOLS

Aide

	Teacher Supervisor Specialist Principal Other
DAY SCHOOLS	Aide Teacher Supervisor Specialist Principal Other
Day or Residential Camp	Counselor Specialist Unit leader Division head Director Other
JCC	Group worker Program Director Department head Director
PreSchool	Assistant teacher Teacher Director
Informal education Youth work	group adviser youth director
Adult education	Teacher Program Director

68. What positions have you held in general education?
(Circle all that apply)

Position	Total number of years
1. Never worked in general education	
2. Aide	________

A

3. Teacher ______________
4. Librarian ______________
5. Specialist ______________
6. Counselor ______________
7. Supervisor ______________
8. Principal ______________
9. Other ____

15. Please indicate how many years of total work experience you have had in each of the following areas of Jewish education.

	No. of Years
a. Supplementary (afternoon or Sunday) schools	_____
b. Day School	_____
c. Jewish camps	_____
d. Jewish pre-schools	_____
e. Adult education	_____
f. Informal Jewish education/youth groups	_____
g. Other Jewish education (specify) ______	_____

18. Please indicate how many years you have been in your CURRENT setting, including this year. ______________

19. How many years have you been working in this community, including this year? ______________

20. How many years IN TOTAL have you been working in the field of Jewish education, including this year? ______________

TRAINING AND STAFF DEVELOPMENT

The next set of questions asks about your training and staff development experience.

75.A. In your first position as a new educator in Jewish education did you receive any of the following kind of support:

	Yes (1)	No (2)
a. lesson planning skills	1	2
b. classroom management skills	1	2
c. feedback from the principal/ supervisor	1	2
d. in-service training in content areas	1	2
e. interactions with other teachers	1	2
f. staff development	1	2
g. clear articulation of school goals/objectives	1	2

75.B. As a new educator in Jewish education to what extent did you receive help from the following:

(1) Never (2) Seldom (3) Occasionally (4) Frequently

a. colleagues	1	2	3	4
b. supervisors	1	2	3	4
c. principal	1	2	3	4
d. rabbi(s)	1	2	3	4
e. parents	1	2	3	4
f. lay leadership	1	2	3	4
g. central agency	1	2	3	4
h. professional organisation	1	3	3	4
i. textbooks	1	2	3	4
j. curriculum guides	1	2	3	4
k. workshops	1	2	3	4
l. other published materials	1	2	3	4
m. conferences	1	2	3	4
n. formal coursework	1	2	3	4

8. How proficient are you in Hebrew?
Circle one.

1 fluent
2 moderate comprehension
3 limited comprehension
4 not at all

9. In a typical year are you required to attend in-service workshops?

Yes 1 No 2
How many?_____

10. In the last two years have you attended local workshops beyond the required ones in any of the following areas?

	Yes (1)	No (2)
a. Judaic subject matter	1	2
b. Hebrew language	1	2
c. Teaching methods	1	2
d. Classroom management	1	2
e. New curricula	1	2
f. Art/Drama/music workshops	1	2
g. Other (specify) ____________________________		

11. How useful were the workshops in helping you perform your job?

1. Very helpful
2. Helpful
3. Somewhat helpful
4. Did not attend

a. Judaic subject matter	1	2	3	4
b. Hebrew language	1	2	3	4
c. Teaching methods	1	2	3	4
d. Classroom management	1	2	3	4
e. New curricula	1	2	3	4
f. Art/drama/music workshops				
Other (specify) ________________________________				

12. During the past twelve months did you:

	Yes (1)	No (2)
a. Attend a course in Judaica or Hebrew at a university, community center or synagogue	1	2
b. Participate in a private Judaica or Hebrew study group	1	2
c. Study Judaica or Hebrew on your own	1	2
d. Participate in some other on-going form of Jewish study (Specify) __________________________	1	2

13. Overall, how adequate are the opportunities for professional growth and development offered in your community?

1. Very adequate
2. Somewhat adequate
3. Somewhat inadequate
4. Very inadequate

14. During the past twelve months did you:

	Yes (1)	No (2)
a. participate in an Israel experience	1	2
b. attend a retreat	1	2
c. attend a national conference	1	2
d. other Jewish growth experience	1	2

16. In which of the following areas would you like to develop your skills?

Do not need (1) Need somewhat (2) Need very much (3)

a. Classroom management	1	2	3
b. Child development	1	2	3
c. Lesson planning	1	2	3
d. Devising creative activities	1	2	3
e. Creating materials	1	2	3
f. Communication skills	1	2	3
g. Parental involvement	1	2	3
h. Motivating children to learn	1	2	3

17. In which of the following do you feel you need to increase your knowledge of subject matter?

(1) Do not need (2) Need somewhat (3) Need very much

a. Hebrew language	1	2	3
b. Customs and ceremonies	1	2	3
c. Israel and Zionism	1	2	3
d. Jewish history	1	2	3
e. Bible	1	2	3
f. Synagogue skills	1	2	3
g. Rabbinic literature	1	2	3
h. Other ____________			

SETTING

The next set of questions asks you about the schools in which you work.

72. Do you tutor students in Hebrew or Judaica?

Yes No

How many?____

21. In how many Jewish schools do you teach? ________________

22. What is the affiliation of each school you work in? Check appropriate response.

	First school	Second school
a. Reform	( )	( )
b. Conservative	( )	( )
c. Orthodox	( )	( )
d. Reconstructionist	( )	( )
e. Community	( )	( )
f. Jewish Community Center		
g. Other (specify)__________		________

23. In what type of program do you work? Check all that apply.

	First school	Second school
a. Day School	( )	( )
b. One day only	( )	( )
c. Two or more days	( )	( )
d. Preschool	( )	( )
e. Adult education	( )	( )
f. Other (specify)__________		

24. How many hours per week do you work at each school?

____________First school ______ ______Second school

25. What grade levels did you teach or work with this year (check all that apply):

		First school	Second school
a.	Pre School	( )	( )
b.	K - 2	( )	( )
c.	3-6	( )	( )
d.	7 and 8	( )	( )
e.	9-12	( )	( )
f.	Adult Education	( )	( )

g. Other (specify) ______________________

26. What subjects do you teach this year (check all that apply):

		First school	Second school
a.	Hebrew language	( )	( )
b.	Judaica (e.g., Bible, history, holidays) in Hebrew	( )	( )
c.	Judaica (e.g., Bible, history, holidays) in English	( )	( )
d.	Bar/Bat Mitzvah Preparation	( )	( )
e.	Secular subjects (e.g., math, reading, science)	( )	( )

f. Other (specify) ______________________

27. How many students are in your school?

____________First school ______ ______Second school

28. How many students are in your smallest class this year?

____________First school ____________Second school

29. How many students are in your largest class this year?

____________First school ____________Second school

30. How many miles do you travel from your home to the school?

First school: (one way) ____________

Second school: (one way) ____________

31. How did you find this teaching position?

(Check the one that best applies to you)

		First school	Second school
a.	Central Agency for Jewish Education	( )	( )
b.	Graduate school placement	( )	( )
c.	Through a friend or mentor	( )	( )
d.	Recruited by the School	( )	( )
e.	Approaching the school directly	( )	( )
f.	Newspaper advertisement	( )	( )
g.	National professional association	( )	( )
h.	Other (specify) ______		

33. Which of the following kinds of help and support do you currently receive?

(1) Never (2) Seldom (3) Occasionally (4) Frequently

a.	Guidance from your principal or supervisor	1	2	3	4
b.	An opportunity to work with other teachers	1	2	3	4
c.	Supervision from a mentor teacher	1	2	3	4
d.	Consultation from a faculty member at a local university	1	2	3	4
e.	Consultation from a central agency consultant	1	2	3	4
f.	Access to a teach resource center	1	2	3	4
g.	Other areas of support	1	2	3	4
h.	Other (specify) ______				

QUESTION: (Repeat for second school)

34. To what extent did each of the following factors affect your decision to become a Jewish educator where you are presently working?

(1) Definitely affected (2) Somewhat affected
(3) Definitely did not affect

a.	hours available for teaching	1	2	3
b.	salary	1	2	3
c.	convenient location	1	2	3
d.	friends who teach there	1	2	3
e.	wanted to work with the principal or rabbi	1	2	3
f.	reputation of the school	1	2	3
g.	quality of the students	1	2	3
h.	religious orientation	1	2	3
i.	my own synagogue	1	2	3
j.	effort to recruit me	1	2	3
k.	other (specify) ______		______	

QUESTION: Repeat for second school.

36.A. Which of the following benefits are available to you as a teacher in the first school in which you work? (check all that apply)

		Available/Receive	
a.	free or reduced tuition for your children		
b.	day are for your children		
c.	free or reduced membership in a synagogue or JCC		
d.	synagogue membership privileges such as High Holiday tickets		
e.	money to attend conferences		
f.	full or partial subsidy for continuing educational courses or in-service training		
g.	sabbatical leave (full or partial pay)		
h.	disability benefits		
i.	employer contributions to health plan		
j.	pension benefits		

36.B. Which of the following benefits are available to you as a teacher in the second school in which you work? (check all that apply)

		Available/Receive	
a.	free or reduced tuition for your children		
b.	day are for your children		
c.	free or reduced membership in a synagogue or JCC		
d.	synagogue membership privileges such as High Holiday tickets		
e.	money to attend conferences		
f.	full or partial subsidy for continuing educational courses or in-service training		
g.	sabbatical leave (full or partial pay)		
h.	disability benefits		
i.	employer contributions to health plan		
j.	pension benefits		

76. The following questions concern the goals, objectives and priorities of the schools in which you teach. For each of the schools you teach in, circle the response that best describes your school:

(1) Agree strongly (2) Agree
(3) Disagree (4) Disagree strongly

A. FIRST school in which I work.

a. The schools goals and objectives are clearly communicated 1 2 3 4

b. My school has a set of objectives that indicate what students are expected to attain over a specified period of time	1	2	3	4
c. I know what my school's goals are	1	2	3	4
d. I generally agree with my school's goals	1	2	3	4
e. The teachers in my school have a common set of priorities indicating which goals and objectives take precedence when two or more come into conflict	1	2	3	4
f. Priorities change too frequently and are sometimes hard to keep track of	1	2	3	4

B. <u>SECOND school in which I work</u>:

a. The Schools goals and objectives are clearly communicated	1	2	3	4
b. My school has a set of objectives that indicate what students are expected to attain over a specified period of time	1	2	3	4
c. I know what my school's goals are	1	2	3	4
d. I generally agree with my school's goals	1	2	3	4
e. The teachers in my school have a common set of priorities indicating which goals and objectives take precedence when two or more come into conflict	1	2	3	4
f. Priorities change too frequently and are sometimes hard to keep track of	1	2	3	4

FUTURE

The next set of questions ask about your future plans in the field of Jewish education.

69. In which of the following do you have knowledge and skills which you would be interested in utilizing to enhance Jewish education in your community? Circle all that apply.

1. Hebrew
2. Bible
3. Customs and Ceremonies
4. Rabbinic literature
5. Jewish history

6. Israel and Zionism
7. Skills and special talents
8. Family education
9. Special education
10. Library
11. Gifted and talent
12. Technology/computers/media
13. Counseling
14. Parent education
15. Teacher training
16. Curriculum development
17. Music
18. Drama
19. Art
20. Youth work
21. None
22. Other________________________

6. Three years from now, do you think you will be working in the field of Jewish education?

Yes 1 No 2

Do you think you will be working in Jewish education in the same community?

Yes 1 No 2

7. Do you think you will be working in the same setting or school?

Yes 1 No 2

8. Which of the following best describes your career plans over the next five years. Choose one.

1. plan to continue what I am doing
2. plan to teach in a different supplementary school
3. plan to teach in a day school (or a different day school)
4. plan to be an administrator or supervisor in a Jewish school

5. plan to have a position in Jewish education other than in a school (such as a JCC, Jewish library, or camp)
6. plan to be involved in Jewish education in Israel, or in some other country
7. plan to seek permanent position outside of Jewish education
8. to resign from employment
9. plan to retire

10. don't know/uncertain

FULL-TIME/PART-TIME

The following items concern the full-time/part-time nature of Jewish education:

73. Do you have to teach in more than one setting in order to earn a suitable wage?
Yes (1)   No (2)

71. To what extent are each of the following advantages or disadvantaged of teaching in more than one school:

(1) definite advantage
(2) somewhat an advantage
(3) somewhat a disadvantage
(4) definite a disadvantage

a. Distance between settings	1	2	3	4
b. Scheduled faculty meetings	1	2	3	4
c. Scheduled faculty in-service	1	2	3	4
d. Preparation time	1	2	3	4
e. Classroom autonomy	1	2	3	4
f. Adjustment to different expectations	1	2	3	4
g. Variety of programs	1	2	3	4

70. If you had an opportunity to work full-time, would you prefer to teach., circle one.

1. in one school
2. in several schools
3. I don't want to work full-time

2. If you are a part-time Jewish educator, what sorts of things would encourage you to consider full-time employment in Jewish education. Rank the three most important by writing 1,2,3, next to your choice where 1 is the most important.

a. Salary ____
b. benefits ____
c. job security ____
d. career advancement ____
e. greater background in Judaica and Hebrew ____
f. greater educational background ____
g. presence of colleagues and opportunities to work with them ____
h. change in family status ____
i. availability of training opportunities ____

j. job security, tenure
k. more resources at work

4. Are you a full-time or part-time Jewish educator? Check one.

full-time ( ) part-time ( )

AFFILIATION

Next we are going to ask you about your Jewish affiliations.

38. At the present time, which of the following best describes your Jewish affiliation: Circle your response.

1. Orthodox
2. Conservative
3. Reform
4. Reconstructionist
5. Secular
6. Other (Specify) ____________________________

40. Are you currently a member of a synagogue?

Yes 1 No 2

41. What denomination is the synagogue of which you are a member? Circle your response.

1. Orthodox
2. Conservative
3. Reform
4. Reconstructionist
5. Secular
6. Other (Specify) ____________________

42. Are you a teacher in the synagogue where you are a member?

Yes ( ) 1 No ( ) 2

43. Which of the following, if any, do you usually observe in your home? (circle all that apply)

1. light candles on Friday evening
2. attend a seder in your home or somewhere else
3. buy Kosher meat for home use
4. use separate dishes for meat and dairy
5. light Hanukkah candles

6. have a Christmas tree
7. fast on Yom Kippur
8. refrain from handling money on the Sabbath
9. refrain from riding on the Sabbath
10. build a Sukkah
11. fast on Tisha B'Av
12. fast on minor fasts such as Ta'anit Esther

44. During the past year, did you....

	Yes (1)	No (2)
a. attend synagogue on the High Holidays	1	2
b. attend synagogue at least twice a month on Shabbat	1	2
c. attend synagogue on holidays such as Sukkot, Passover or Shavuot	1	2
d. attend synagogue daily	1	2

45. To which of the following Jewish organisations do you belong:

	Yes (1)	No (2)
a. Local Jewish social service organisations or auxiliaries - e.g., Home for the Aged, Child and Family service	1	2
b. Sisterhood or Men's Club	1	2
c. Zionist organization	1	2
d. Bnai Brith/ADL	1	2
e. Jewish Community Center	1	2
f. Other (specify)_______________		

46. Have you ever been to Israel? Yes ( ) 1 No ( ) 2

47. If yes, did you ever live in Israel for three months or longer? Yes ( ) 1 No ( ) 2

48. As a member of the Jewish community in which of the following do you actively participate.

	Yes ( ) 1	No ( ) 2
a. volunteer on behalf of Jewish organizations	1	2
b. contribute to local Jewish federation campaign	1	2
c. contribute to Jewish causes	1	2
d. support causes by attendance at public gatherings such as rallies	1	2

49. My children are enrolled in (circle all that apply)

1. Jewish day school
2. supplementary synagogue school
3. Jewish pre-school
4. public school

5. other private/independent school
6. I have no school age children.

56. What kind of Jewish school did you attend before you were thirteen? (circle all that apply)

1. one/day week or "Sunday" school
2. two or three day/week supplementary school
3. four or five day/week Talmud Torah
4. day school

5. none
6. other (specify)

57. Did you attend a Jewish summer camp with mainly Jewish Content or program? Circle your response.

Yes ( ) 1 How many Summers? ___ ____________

No ( ) 2

58. What kind of Jewish school, if any, did you attend after you were thirteen? (Circle all that apply)

1. one day/week confirmation class
2. two or more days/week Hebrew high school
3. day school
4. none
5. other (specify)

DEMOGRAPHICS

Lastly, we want to ask you some questions about yourself.

35. What is your annual salary from your teaching?

	First school	Second School
a Under $1,000	( )	( )
1,000 - $2,999	( )	( )
$3,000 - $4,999	( )	( )
$5,000 - $6,999	( )	( )
$7,000 - $9,999	( )	( )
$10,000 - $14,999	( )	( )
$15,000 - $19,999	( )	( )
$20,000 - $24,999	( )	( )
$25,000 - $30,000	( )	( )
Over $30,000	( )	( )

65. What is your total family income?

1. $30,000 or below

2. $31,000 - $45,000
3. $46,000 - $60,000
4. $61,000 - $75,000

37. Are you Jewish?
Yes 1 No 2

39. Are you a convert to Judaism?

Yes 1 No 2

50. Age ____________

51. Sex: Male ( ) 1 Female ( ) 2

52. Where were you born?

USA
Other, please specify____________

54. What is the highest level of education that you have completed? (Choose one)

1. some high school
2. graduated high school
3. some college
4. graduate college
5. some post-graduate courses
6. graduate or professional degree
7. technical school
8. teacher-training institute

55. What degrees do you hold? Please list:

DEGREE	MAJOR
____________	____________
____________	____________
____________	____________

59. How many college or graduate credits do you have in each of the following:

	number of credits
a. Judaica or Jewish studies	
b. Hebrew language	
c. education	
d. Jewish communal service	

60. Do you hold a professional license or certification in:

	Yes 1	No 2
a. Jewish education	1	2

b. general education	1	2
c. other (please specify)	1	2

61. Marital status

1. Single, never married
2. Married
3. Separated
4. Divorced
5. Widowed

62. Is your spouse Jewish? Yes 1 No 2

63. Is your spouse also a Jewish educator? Yes 1 No 2

64. How important to your household is the income you receive from Jewish education? Choose one of the following:

1. the main source of income
2. one of our/my main sources of income
3. an important source of additional income
4. significant to our/my total income
5. I do not earn an income from Jewish teaching

THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR YOUR COOPERATION!

B:Survey

SUMMARY OF MEETING WITH ADAM GAMORAN

APRIL 8, 1993

Participants: Seymour Fox, Adam Gamoran, Annette Hochstein, Oriana Or, Shmuel Wygoda

STATUS REPORT

Discussion and critique of the January reports to the CUE.

I. The field researchers did not accomplish what they were supposed to i.e. - evaluation and feedback. The researchers job is to tell us what is the structure of the educational systems in the LC"s and what are the key issues that would confront someone who would want to make changes. This was not achieved although the field researchers conducted many interviews, and prepared written reports at the end of January.

Reconsider Evaluation project

A. Interview samples do not adequately represent the populations they purport to represent
- e.g. rabbis in Baltimore
- because the researchers were too often led to interview those that the planners wanted them to see
- too many "heavyweights" were not interviewed.

B. Insufficient skepticism about veracity of interview responses —how do we know that what they are telling is so? Insufficient cross-validation within communities
- example of Baltimore Hebrew University

C. Naïve understanding of politics of the LC's. Not sufficient political acumen (Inbar).

II. The notion that LC's should ultimately pay for the field researchers.

III. Very important and useful to have the field researchers in the LC's at this time.
They have become very prominent, but a resource is being wasted by not giving them our ear on a regular basis. We need a more regular and sustained dialogue between the field researchers, AG, EG and CUE. The field researchers served two purposes:

1 - Tell AG what's happening

2 - Tell Ellen what's going on and enable her to write a summary report on problem's in the communities.

The report did: solidified concerns and raised issues that needed articulating.
did not: let communities know what they were finding out.

IV. FUNCTION of field researchers:

1 - Communicators - in both directions.

2 - Researchers - technical problems

3 - Resource persons - in the sense of
- a) giving assistance
- b) dialogue
- c) bringing resources, ideas from CIJE
- d) having a seminar in Best Practices for each community

V. AGENDA - What are the next steps with Atlanta - what action are we suggesting? (Atlanta may not have the people to do the job)

VI. GOALS PROJECT - Creates leverage on the movements to polish their objectives. A question arose about schools and congregations. The Goals project will produce goals that can be evaluated in a legitimate fashion.

ASSIGNMENTS

RESEARCHERS:

1. Researchers should meet with Hirschhom, ELR, and Dean (?) and decide what they want and how they want it.

2. Feedback has to be checked that it is going to the right address.

3. A way needs to be developed for the field researchers to meet with the heavy weights in each community.

ADAM GAMORAN:

I. Figure out a way to get good feedback. Find a way to guarantee that the sources that are being interviewed are valid.

II. To CIJE

A. Monthly updates to SF, AH, BH, SE, SH
- either written, face-to-face, or telecon
- to begin ASAP
- would be nice to begin with face-to-face in May

B. Report on lives of educators
- must get access
- or must know when not getting access
- must be skeptical about what they're told, and cross-validate from varied sources

III. To Communities

A. Milwaukee

1. Oral report on 2 topics:
    a. What has been happening, organizationally
    - Milwaukee's (successful) launching of the LC process
    b. How Ruth has been doing
    - Are meetings run effectively? Are people getting involved? Do people feel ownership? How is the community coming along?

2. Request permission to share (1) with Baltimore and Atlanta
    - AG will have to write up the report to send them or do it orally?

B. Baltimore

1. Assuming permission is granted, tell them Milwaukee report is coming - and send it to them
2. After June kickoff - establish commission subcommittee
3. Provide feedback on what's happened in Baltimore - as in Milwaukee earlier.

IV. We need a more regular and sustained dialogue between the field researchers, AG, EG, and CUE.

Mandel Institute

1. Clarify our own thinking on the work of the field researchers and convey this to them. We must help and teach them what we want them to do as researchers. It is a mix of scientific work and political acumen.

2. Clarify the image according to this role.

3. Rank the success of the field researchers.

4. Determine what the expectations are of the lay leaders at this point from :
    a) the project?
    b) the educators?

5. Determine what the rabbis, educators, and planners are thinking.

6. Determine what they expect to happen tomorrow in a series of areas.

7. Take the initiative to introduce AG to CUE Steering Committee

SEYMOUR FOX

1. SF and AH will review outline of report prior to presentation/meeting with Ruth Cohen.

2. Speak to members of the Commission - what is the mechanism to break the logjam?

3. Read the report and think how these people will respond when they read it: lay leaders, rabbi's, professionals.

SHMUEL WYGODA

1. Prepare triggers and danger points based on chronology, minutes from meetings

2. Write Milwaukee report based on the information we now have.

Mandel Institute מכון מנדל

For the Advanced Study and Development of Jewish Education

AGENDA

ADAM GAMORAN MEETING

Thursday, April 8, 1993

PARTICIPANTS: Seymour Fox, Adam Gamoran, Annette Hochstein, Alan Hoffman, Mike Inbar, Oriana Or, Carmella Rotem, Shmuel Wygoda

I. Status Report and work to date

II. Project scope and composition

III. Communities' responsibility

IV. Evaluation project issues
  A. Field research
    1. roles of the field researchers
    2. integration of field research into community efforts
    3. the feedback loop
      a. to the communities
      b. promised feedback to Milwaukee
      c. to CIJE
    4. schedules of the above
    5. contracts for the field researchers

  B. The advisory process for the evaluation project

  C. Quantitative research
    1. supporting quantitative evaluation in the communities
    2. the possibility of a comparative survey some day

V. General CIJE issues that affect the evaluation project
  A. Centralization
  B. Leadership
  C. the meaning of systemic reform

VI. Next steps for the project

P.O.B. 4497 Jerusalem 91044, Israel Tel. 02-61X728, Fax. 02-619951 ת.ד. 4497 ירושלים 91044 טלפון 02, פקס
BITNET No. - Mandel@hujIvMs - מס׳ ביטנט

Mandel Institute מכון מַנדֶל

For the Advanced Study and Development of Jewish Education

TABLE OF CONTENTS

P.O.B. 4497 Jerusalem 91044, Israel Tel. 02-618728 Fax. 02-619951 פקס 02-619951; טלפון 02-618728 ירושלים 91044 ת.ד. 4497
BITNET No. - mandel@hujivms - מס׳ ביטנט

Received: by HUJIVMS via NJE (HUyMail-V6k); Tue, 30 Mar 93 13:24:50
+0200
Received: from RL.IB by UKACRL.BITNET (Mailer R2.07) with BSMTP id
2282; Tue,
 30 Mar 93 12:24:17 BST
Received: from RL.IB by UK.AC.RL.IB (Mailer R2.07) with BSMTP id
9687; Tue, 30
 Mar 93 12:23:53 BST
Via: UK.AC.ED.ERCVAX; 30 MAR 93 12:13:24 BST
Date: Tue, 30 MAR 93 12:12:00
From: EKJC68@ERCVAX.EDINBURGH.AC.UK
To: MANDEL@HUJIVMS

Subject: Oriana, here's my itinerary. I'll call you from Jerusalem, probably this Thursday. L'hitraot, Adam Gamoran.

Adam Gamoran
Itinerary for March 31 - April 20, 1993

Sunday, March 31, to Thursday, April 8:
c/o Kanyas Family, Jerusalem
tel. 972-2-346367
fax 972-2-346082

Wednesday, April 7
meeting with Hebrew University faculty
contact: Dr. Tamar Rapoport
office tel. 972-2-882086
office fax 972-2-322345
(Note: Office will be closed on the day of the meeting.)
(home tel. 972-2-619956)

Thursday, April 8
meeting with Seymour Fox and Annette Hochstein,
Mandel Institute of Jerusalem
tel. 972-2-617418
fax 972-2-619951
e-mail: bitnet%"mandel@hujivms"

Friday, April 9 - Monday, April 12
    c/o Medina Family, Sderot
        tel. 972-7-899262

Tuesday, April 13 - Thursday, April 15
    Club Inn, Eilat
    tel. 972-2-7-334555

Friday, April 16 - Tuesday, April 20
    c/o Dr. Hanna Ayalon
        office phone: 972-3-640-8626
        office fax: 972-3-640-9477
        home phone: 972-3-533-7465
        e-mail: ayalon@il.ac.tau.ccsg
        Note: From Edinburgh I reach this e-mail address as:
            earn%ayalon@earn.il.ac.tau.ccsg

Note: If the gods of technology are with me, I will also be checking my own e-mail at my Edinburgh address on April 7 and April 16-20.

Adam

Received: by HUJIVMS via NJE (HUyMail-V6k); Tue, 30 Mar 93 15:18:29 +0200
Received: from RL.IB by UKACRL.BITNET (Mailer R2.07) with BSMTP id 6315; Tue,
30 Mar 93 14:17:42 BST
Received: from RL.IB by UK.AC.RL.IB (Mailer R2.07) with BSMTP id 5115; Tue, 30
Mar 93 14:17:34 BST
Via: UK.AC.ED.ERCVAX; 30 MAR 93 14:08:23 BST
Date: Tue, 30 MAR 93 13:57:38
From: EKJC68@ERCVAX.EDINBURGH.AC.UK
To: MANDEL@HUJIVMS
Subject: Oriana: here's my suggested agenda for the meeting on April 8
Sender: JANET "EKJC68@UK.AC.EDINBURGH.ERCVAX"
<EKJC68@ERCVAX.EDINBURGH.AC.UK>

Dear Annette and Seymour,

Just a brief note to suggest that our agenda on April 8 include the following:

I. Evaluation project issues
A. Field research
1. roles of the field researchers
2. integration of field research into community efforts
3. the feedback loop
a. to the communities
b. to CIJE
4. schedules of the above
5. contracts for the field researchers

B. The advisory process for the evaluation project

C. Quantitative research
1. supporting quantitative evaluation in the communities
2. the possibility of a comparative survey some day

II. General CIJE issues that affect the evaluation project

- A. Centralization
- B. Leadership
- C. the meaning of systemic reform

I look forward eagerly to our meeting, and I am especially grateful you are able to make time for it during chol hamoed.

Adam

Received: by HUJIVMS via NJE (HUyMail-V6k); Wed, 24 Mar 93
11:43:50 +0200
Received: from RL.IB by UKACRL.BITNET (Mailer R2.07) with BSMTP id
5320; Wed,
 24 Mar 93 09:37:44 GMT
Received: from RL.IB by UK.AC.RL.IB (Mailer R2.07) with BSMTP id
5057; Wed, 24
 Mar 93 09:37:43 GMT
Via: UK.AC.ED.ERCVAX; 24 MAR 93 9:37:40 GMT
Date: Wed, 24 MAR 93 09:38:34
From: EKJC68@ERCVAX.EDINBURGH.AC.UK
To: annette@hujivms
Subject: message
Sender: JANET "EKJC68@UK.AC.EDINBURGH.ERCVAX"
<EKJC68@ERCVAX.EDINBURGH.AC.UK>

Thanks for your message, and for the financial assistance. I will send you my full itinerary with phone numbers. Shall I call you next week when I arrive in Israel, to confirm the details of our meeting?

Adam

Received: by HUJIVMS (HUyMail-V6k); Wed, 24 Mar 93 11:22:55 +0200
Date: Wed, 24 Mar 93 11:22 +0200
Message-id: <24030093112239@HUJIVMS>
From: <MANDEL@HUJIVMS>
To: EKJC68@ERCVAX.EDINBURGH.AC.UK
Cc: mandel
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: Text/plain; charset=US-ASCII
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7BIT
Subject: Re: meeting in April

Dear Adam,

Thank you very much for your various bitnets and their various comments as well as for your report on the meeting with Jim Coleman. Just wanted you to know that we are reading it all and are looking forward to our face to face meeting for in-depth consideration of the issues, next steps, etc.

Sorry for not responding earlier to your request for funding. We are pleased to participate and will cover the $250. that you requested. Please let me know
where you will be staying, and at what telephone number you can be reached.

Have a safe flight.

Annette

Received: by HUJIVMS via NJE (HUyMail-V6k); Mon, 01 Mar 93 12:24:01
+0200
Received: from RL.IB by UKACRL.BITNET (Mailer R2.07) with BSMTP id
7663; Mon,
01 Mar 93 10:22:49 GMT
Received: from RL.IB by UK.AC.RL.IB (Mailer R2.07) with BSMTP id
4058; Mon, 01
Mar 93 10:22:48 GMT
Via: UK.AC.ED.ERCVAX; 1 MAR 93 10:22:43 GMT
Date: Mon, 1 MAR 93 10:23:28
From: EKJC68@ERCVAX.EDINBURGH.AC.UK
To: annette@hujivms
Subject: responses to the Planning Guide and Supplementary Schools
paper
Sender: JANET "EKJC68@UK.AC.EDINBURGH.ERCVAX"
<EKJC68@ERCVAX.EDINBURGH.AC.UK>

February 28, 1993

Ms. Annette Hochstein
Mandel Institute of Jerusalem

Dear Annette,

I assume that by the time you read this you will be back from your latest trip to the U.S., and I hope it was a positive and productive visit. This week I received copies of the Planning Guide and the Supplementary Schools paper, and I wanted to offer a few reactions. I think both documents are superb, and my comments mainly address implications for the future rather than suggesting any revisions.

I have two minor questions about the Planning Guide: (1) What is the "goals project" which is mentioned in several places? This sounds like a project with which our work should be coordinated. (2) On p. 6, mention is made of "CIJE project descriptions." Which document is being used as the project description for the MEF project? Do you want us to prepare something specifically for this audience?

I also have one minor comment: On p. 18-19, the terms "outputs" and "outcomes" are hard to distinguish from one another, although they are given very different meanings here. I think what is meant is "short-term" and "long-term" outcomes, and that would probably be clearer. (A more jargony terminology would be "proximate outcomes" and "long-range outcomes.")

To me, the most important contribution of the planning guide -- aside from the fact that it proposes clear, concrete activities which can be undertaken right away -- is that its approach is systemic rather than piecemeal. As you know, I think this is the major strength of the Lead Communities Project, so it is important that this document reflect the systemic approach. I worry, though, that if and when serious educational planning takes place in the communities, it will occur in isolated programs rather than through ties with broad coalitions, and that the planning taking place in coalitions will not be precise and hard-hitting enough to have significant implications for contact between teachers and students (or counselors and campers, etc.). Part of this concern comes from my reading of the Supplementary School paper from the Best Practices project, which is outstanding in recommending a systemic approach within schools, but could easily be used (or not used) on a school-by-school basis without any wider coordination. At the same time, my limited knowledge of activities which have occured in the communities thus far does not give me confidence that meetings among persons representing varied constituencies are able to move beyond funding issues, territorial issues, and very abstract goal issues, to attending to more concrete programmatic issues.

What can CIJE do to make sure my fears are not realized, i.e. that the Planning Guide and the work of Best Practices are utilized in a systemic fashion throughout the community? Part of the answer is already in the Planning Guide, in its insistence on a broad coalition, attention to mobilization of many groups, etc. But how can we ensure that these coalitions contemplate significant educational change? To help me think about this I returned to Smith and O'Day's seminal work, "Systemic school reform." Writing about secular education, they advise state-level initiatives to coordinate curriculum, teacher training, and assessment, and to re-examine responsibilities and policies at each level of the educational governance structure. In Jewish education, there is no body with the authority to initiate change as states can for secular education. (Actually, I'm not sure states have the strength to do what Smith and O'Day recommend, but that's another issue!) What is needed is some kind of leverage that would encourage persons and institutions participating in Jewish education to improve curriculum, teacher knowledge and pedagogy, and assessment, and offer a broader range of services, all in a coordinated fashion.

It seems to me that such leverage may be possible through a partnership of CIJE, local federations, and national movements. This coalition may be able to supply the resources -- financial and intellectual -- that would facilitate the development and implementation of coherent programs. To the extent that this group provides resources -- and I am including foundations when I mention federation -- it should be able to demand a high level of coordination of curriculum, staff development, and assessment. Could CIJE broker a partnership among experts from national movements (e.g., education professors at the seminaries) and the local educators within each movement in the lead communities? Recognizing that ideological differences prevent community-wide coordination of education in most areas, it makes most sense to think about coordination within movements, and to propose that this begin first within the lead communities and ultimately on a national basis.

I hope I've been able to raise some useful questions, even if my suggested responses are too simplistic. As I said above, I think both the Planning Guide and the Supplementary Schools paper are outstanding documents, and I hope as much care will be taken with how they are used as was clearly required for their preparation.

Best,

Adam

CENTRE *for* EDUCATIONAL SOCIOLOGY
Department of Sociology

The University of Edinburgh
7 Buccleuch Place
Edinburgh EH8 9LW
Scotland

Fax UK (0)31 [illegible]
Email CES@uk.ac.edinburgh
Telephone UK (0)31 650 1000
Direct dial UK (0)31 650 [illegible]

March 14, 1993

Ms. Annette Hochstein
Mandel Institute of Jerusalem
22a Hatzfira St.
Jerusalem, ISRAEL

Dear Annette,

I'm writing to report on a very helpful hour I spent with Jim Coleman discussing our project, and to lay some groundwork for our meeting on April 8. After describing the current situation in CIJE and the evaluation project, I raised three specific issues with him: (1) balancing the monitoring, evaluation, and feedback components of our project; (2) negotiating the role of the field researchers; (3) the question of a survey.

Is [illegible] the site [illegible]

In the general discussion of the current situation, Jim raised the interesting question about whether the fragmentation we have discovered in Atlanta was evident in the proposal and site visit. This question has obvious implications for selection of future communities, and I plan to address it in the future.

<u>Balancing monitoring, evaluation and feedback</u> What is the issue?

I raised the question of the difficulty we are having in balancing our aim of serving as mirrors to the communities, with your concern that we must tell community participants things they do not already know. Jim explained that at this stage, much of what we have to say will be known to some community members, but we are offering an outsider's perspective. In doing so, we help clarify where problems may lie, and this can help community members realize what they need to work on. It is often helpful to persons engaged in ongoing work to have an outsider's comments. For example, can we get persons in Atlanta to recognize the problems of communication? Even if they are aware of this — obviously some persons are aware of it since they told it to us — we are doing a service by pointing it out, because we can stimulate a constructive dialogue. In my view this is an essential part of the feedback process.

Do w/ above

The situation of reflecting back what is already known to some persons will become less true in a year or so, Jim pointed out. This is because we will be observing and reporting on changes that are occurring instead of long-standing patterns.

I think of this problem as the balance between monitoring and feedback, on the one hand, and evaluation, on the other. Obviously there is little evaluation in telling community members what some of them know. But there is still an important feedback component, and this, I think, is a valuable service. I would add that our field researchers have pointed out that even though much of what we report is known to certain community leaders, it is not known to many other community members -- some rabbis, many educators, and lay persons.

what is, the issue the nonuse of communications

I described our decision to focus on the professional lives of educators for the next report. Jim thought this was sensible and raised no specific concerns about that.

The role of the field researchers

I explained the difficulties we've had in taking our place in the communities in light of the slow pace of implementation during the period of September to February. Jim spotted a key problem immediately: as the only persons on-site, the field researchers were the most salient members of CIJE staff. Far from blending into the background, they were CIJE's most visible presence. This problem was compounded by the limited contact from New York to the communities during this period. This placed us in a somewhat paradoxical position, in which you reported some apprehension about the field researchers, as communicated to you through informal channels, at the same time as the field researchers themselves were receiving explicit requests for help. Some of these requests were in areas they could provide assistance, and some were not.

Jim suggests that within the limits of our resources, we should be as responsive as possible, because this will ease the access and apprehension problems. This seems a sensible recommendation. More fundamentally, he urges us to rethink the role of the field researchers, and I have been giving that some consideration. The following suggestion is based on the assumption, which I have held all along, that the lead communities project is a long-term endeavor, so that early investments can be allowed time to pay off.

I want to start by clarifying some distinctions among the audiences who are to be served by the various output from the evaluation project. Community reports, written by the field researchers, should be aimed at a broad community audience. They can serve the dual purpose of encouraging a constructive dialogue (even if what they report is known to some), and providing policy-relevant information (to the extent they generate new, previously unknown information). We must allow community members to guide us in deciding what constitutes a useful community report. (These may be oral reports as well as or instead of written.) At the same time, summary reports, to be written by Ellen and me with input from the field researchers, are aimed at CIJE staff. The summary reports should be evaluative and comparative, taking stock of the communities, particularly in light of one another.

Yes ✓ ✓

To be successful with this plan, I think we need to loosen substantially the strict controls with which we are currently binding the field researchers. They need to be free to establish closer relations with persons at the community level. Each of them has been approached by community members for specific assistance, and we must encourage them to be as active in providing this help. The only restriction we should maintain, I suggest, is that they provide the information in a timely fashion that

OK

answers the questions we design. In the current year, these are the three questions about vision, mobilization, and educators' lives.

What does this mean in practice? I think it means we set a schedule for the field researchers, we specify the information Ellen and I need to write the summary report, and we allow the field researchers to write reports for the communities that will be responsive to the needs of each. In the long term, I would like to see the community feel ownership for the evaluation process, including the responsibility for funding the field evaluation. We might say, for example, that as of fall 1985, the ^for communities will be responsible for their own evaluation — either by supporting the field researchers who are already there, or by relying on evaluation mechanisms built into new programs, or some combination. That free up CIJE to support evaluation in a new round of lead communities!

yes but quality control

yes!

The question of a survey

Jim suggested, and I agree, that the flow of events this year has made the survey a lower priority than our other activities, and I am postponing making a concrete proposal for a survey. Nonetheless we discussed a major substantive issue which I have been thinking about: Should we try to obtain quantitative outcome data that are specific to the programs initiated through the lead community process, or should we try to measure general advancement in the prospects for Jewish continuity (however that may be defined). Jim indicated that both are important. He compared the second (general assessment) to national and international tests that measure the progress of an education system. I described our intention to incorporate an evaluation component into each new program initiated by the lead communities. This effort, if successful, would provide information on program-specific outcomes. That leaves assessment of general progress to the survey. I described my ideal survey as one that would take place in nine communities: the three lead communities, three communities which applied but were not accepted as lead communities, and three other communities. We both found this to be an exciting model but agreed I should hold off with any proposal.

I look forward to your response, now or when we meet in Israel.

Yours,

Adam

Adam

cc: Jim Coleman
Ellen Goldring

Received: by HUJIVMS via NJE (HUyMail-V6k); Fri, 19 Mar 93 17:43:47
+0200
Received: from RL.IB by UKACRL.BITNET (Mailer R2.07) with BSMTP id
4223; Fri,
19 Mar 93 15:42:38 GMT
Received: from RL.IB by UK.AC.RL.IB (Mailer R2.07) with BSMTP id
9236; Fri, 19
Mar 93 15:42:36 GMT
Via: UK.AC.ED.ERCVAX; 19 MAR 93 15:42:31 GMT
Date: Fri, 19 MAR 93 15:43:19
From: EKJC68@ERCVAX.EDINBURGH.AC.UK
To: annette@hujivms
Subject: field researchers" contracts
Sender: JANET "EKJC68@UK.AC.EDINBURGH.ERCVAX"
<EKJC68@ERCVAX.EDINBURGH.AC.UK>

SW
agenda
in 4/6

Annette,

I want to add one more item to our discussion on April 8: renewal of the field researchers" contracts. Their contracts for this year stated that they will be informed by April 15, 1993, whether they will be rehired for next year.
I hope we will be able to sustain that promise.

As part of this process, I am initiating a performance review for each field researcher. Each is to write a self-evaluation and submit it to me. In addition, Ellen will give me her assessment of each one's work since August. I will take this input and, on the basis of my own experience and judgment, will write a performance review for each field reseacher. I plan to keep these confidential but of course would be willing to submit them to my boss. (I'm not sure who that is, though.)

I will be making specific criticisms to each, but in general all three have done creditable jobs, and I will be advising CIJE to rehire them.

Adam

CENTRE *for* EDUCATIONAL SOCIOLOGY
Department of Sociology

The University of Edinburgh
7 Buccleuch Place
Edinburgh EH8 9LW
Scotland

Fax UK (0)131 668 3263
Email CES@uk.ac.edinburgh
Telephone UK (0)131 650 1000
or direct dial UK (0)131 650 4186/4187

FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION

TO : Annette H.

FAX NO : 010 972 2 619451

FROM : Adam Gamoran

DATE : 14 March 93

PAGES : (including top sheet) 4

NOTES :

Please give to Annette H. on her return.

Thanks!

FAX NUMBER FOR REPLY +31 668 3263.

PLEASE TELEPHONE +31 650 4186/4187 IF THERE ARE ANY PROBLEMS WITH THE RECEIPT OF THIS DOCUMENT.

CENTRE for EDUCATIONAL SOCIOLOGY
Department of Sociology

The University of Edinburgh
7 Buccleuch Place
Edinburgh EH8 9LW
Scotland

Fax UK (0)31 668 3263
Email CES@uk.ac.edinburgh
Telephone UK (0)31 650 1000
or direct dial UK (0)31 650 -1186/4187

March 14, 1993

Ms. Annette Hochstein
Mandel Institute of Jerusalem
22a Hatzfira St.
Jerusalem, ISRAEL

Dear Annette,

I'm writing to report on a very helpful hour I spent with Jim Coleman discussing our project, and to lay some groundwork for our meeting on April 8. After describing the current situation in CIJE and the evaluation project, I raised three specific issues with Jim: (1) balancing the monitoring, evaluation, and feedback components of our project; (2) negotiating the role of the field researchers; (3) the question of a survey.

In the general discussion of the current situation, Jim raised the interesting question about whether the fragmentation we have discovered in Atlanta was evident in the proposal and site visit. This question has obvious implications for selection of future communities, and I plan to address it in the future.

Balancing monitoring, evaluation, and feedback

I raised the question of the difficulty we are having in balancing our aim of serving as mirrors to the communities, with your concern that we must tell community participants things they do not already know. Jim explained that at this stage, much of what we have to say will be known to some community members, but we are offering an outsider's perspective. In doing so, we help clarify where problems may lie, and this can help community members realize what they need to work on. It is often helpful to persons engaged in ongoing work to have an outsider's comments. For example, can we get persons in Atlanta to recognize the problems of communication? Even if they are aware of this -- obviously some persons are aware of it since they told it to us -- we are doing a service by pointing it out, because we can stimulate a constructive dialogue. In my view this is an essential part of the feedback process.

The situation of reflecting back what is already known to some persons will become less true in a year or so, Jim pointed out. This is because we will be observing and reporting on changes that are occurring instead of long-standing patterns.

I think of this problem as the balance between monitoring and feedback, on the one hand, and evaluation, on the other. Obviously there is little evaluation in telling community members what some of them know. But there is still an important

DIRECTORS [illegible]

feedback component, and this, I think, is a valuable service. I would add that our field researchers have pointed out that even though much of what we report is known to certain community leaders, it is not known to many other community members -- some rabbis, many educators, and lay persons.

I described our decision to focus on the professional lives of educators for the next report. Jim thought this was sensible and raised no specific concerns about that.

The role of the field researchers

I explained the difficulties we've had in taking our place in the communities in light of the slow pace of implementation during the period of September to February. Jim spotted a key problem immediately: as the only persons on-site, the field researchers were the most salient members of CIJE staff. Far from blending into the background, they were CIJE's most visible presence. This problem was compounded by the limited contact from New York to the communities during this period. This placed us in a somewhat paradoxical position, in which you reported some apprehension about the field researchers, as communicated to you through informal channels, at the same time as the field researchers themselves were receiving explicit requests for help. Some of these requests were in areas they could provide assistance, and some were not.

Jim suggests that within the limits of our resources, we should be as responsive as possible, because this will ease the access and apprehension problems. This seems a sensible recommendation. More fundamentally, he urges us to rethink the role of the field researchers, and I have been giving that some consideration. The following suggestion is based on the assumption, which I have held all along, that the lead communities project is a long-term endeavor, so that early investments can be allowed time to pay off.

[illegible]

I want to start by clarifying some distinctions among the audiences who are to be served by the various output from the evaluation project. Community reports, written by the field researchers, should be aimed at a broad community audience. They can serve the dual purpose of encouraging a constructive dialogue (even if what they report is known to some), and providing policy-relevant information (to the extent they generate new, previously unknown information). We must allow community members to guide us in deciding what constitutes a useful community report. (These may be oral reports as well as or instead of written.) At the same time, summary reports, to be written by Ellen and me with input from the field researchers, are aimed at CIJE staff. The summary reports should be evaluative and comparative, taking stock of the communities, particularly in light of one another.

To be successful with this plan, I think we need to loosen substantially the strict controls with which we are currently binding the field researchers. They need to be free to establish closer relations with persons at the community level. Each of them has been approached by community members for specific assistance, and we must encourage them to be as active in providing this help. The only restriction we should maintain, I suggest, is that they provide the information in a timely fashion that answers the questions we design. In the current year, these are the three questions about vision, mobilization, and educators' lives.

What does this mean in practice? I think it means we set a schedule for the field researchers, we specify the information Ellen and I need to write the summary report, and we allow the field researchers to write reports for the communities that will be responsive to the needs of each. In the long term, I would like to see the community feel ownership for the evaluation process, including the responsibility for funding the field evaluation. We might say, for example, that as of fall 1995, the communities will be responsible for their own evaluation -- either by supporting the field researchers who are already there, or by relying on evaluation mechanisms built into new programs, or some combination. That free up CIJE to support evaluation in a new round of lead communities!

<u>The question of a survey</u>
Jim suggested, and I agree, that the flow of events this year has made the survey a lower priority than our other activities, and I am postponing making a concrete proposal for a survey. Nonetheless we discussed a major substantive issue which I have been thinking about: Should we try to obtain quantitative outcome data that are specific to the programs initiated through the lead community process, or should we try to measure general advancement in the prospects for Jewish continuity (however that may be defined). Jim indicated that both are important. He compared the second (general assessment) to national and international tests that measure the progress of an education system. I described our intention to incorporate an evaluation component into each new program initiated by the lead communities. This effort, if successful, would provide information on program-specific outcomes. That leaves assessment of general progress to the survey. I described my ideal survey as one that would take place in nine communities: the three lead communities, three communities which applied but were not accepted as lead communities, and three other communities. We both found this to be an exciting model but agreed I should hold off with any proposal.

I look forward to your response, now or when we meet in Israel.

Yours,

Adam

Adam

cc: Jim Coleman
Ellen Goldring

COUNCIL FOR INITIATIVES IN JEWISH EDUCATION

Mailing Address:
163 Third Avenue #128, New York, NY 10003
Phone: (212) 532-1961 • Fax: (212) 213-4078

MEMO TO: John Colman, Shulamith Elster, Seymour Fox, Annette Hochstein, Stephen Hoffman, Barry Holtz, Virginia Levi, Morton Mandel, Charles Ratner, Esther Leah Ritz, Shmuel Wygoda, Henry L. Zucker

FROM: Ellen Goldring and Adam Gamoran

DATE: March 4, 1993

Enclosed is a first report to CIJE leadership on the Lead Communities project, prepared as a result of the work of the Monitoring, Evaluation and Feedback project of CIJE. Please note that this document is strictly confidential. We hope that you find this and future reports useful as we move ahead with the Lead Communities project.

Received: by HUJIVMS via NJE (HUyMail-V6k); Sun, 14 Mar 93
14:49:56 +0200
Received: from RL.IB by UKACRL.BITNET (Mailer R2.07) with BSMTP
id 5696; Sun,
 14 Mar 93 12:48:53 GMT
Received: from RL.IB by UK.AC.RL.IB (Mailer R2.07) with BSMTP id
2636; Sun, 14
 Mar 93 12:48:53 GMT
Via: UK.AC.ED.ERCVAX; 14 MAR 93 12:48:51 GMT
Date: Sun, 14 MAR 93 12:49:18
From: EKJC68@ERCVAX.EDINBURGH.AC.UK
To: annette@hujivms
Subject: meeting with Coleman
Sender: JANET "EKJC68@UK.AC.EDINBURGH.ERCVAX"
<EKJC68@ERCVAX.EDINBURGH.AC.UK>

To my great pleasure, Jim Coleman lectured in Edinburgh last week and I was able to meet with him about the ealuation project. I've written a letter about the meeting, which I'm sending you by fax since I'm sending it by fax to Jim also. The meeting was very helpful to me, and I look forward to your reactions when we meet.

I am looking forard to seeing you.

PREMIER INDUSTRIAL CORPORATION

FACSIMILE HEADER SHEET

73138 (5/90) PRINTED IN U.S.A.

DATE 3/11 **TIME:** ______ **NUMBER OF PAGES SENT:** 5

TO: FAX NO. ( ) 619-951	**FROM: FAX NO.** (216) 961-9962
Name CAROLINE [illegible]	**Name** BENNY LEVI
Company	**Company**
Street Address	**Tele. No.** ( ) **Ext.**
City, State / Zip / Country	

August 1, 1992

MONITORING, EVALUATION, AND FEEDBACK IN LEAD COMMUNITIES -- TENTATIVE PLAN OF WORK FOR 1992-93

I. CONTENT

For Lead Communities, 1992-93 will be a planning year. The agenda for the evaluation project is to raise questions that will (a) stimulate and assist the planning process; (b) enumerate the goals that Lead Communities intend to address; and (c) identify current practice so that progress towards goals can be assessed in the future. Broadly, the field researchers will raise three questions:

(1) What are the visions for change in Jewish education held by members of the communities? How do the visions vary across different individuals or segments of the community? How vague or specific are these visions? To what extent do these visions crystallize over the course of the planning year (1992-1993)?

(2) What is the extent of community mobilization for Jewish education? Who is involved, and who is not? How broad is the coalition supporting the CIJE's efforts? How deep is participation within the various agencies? For example, beyond a small core of leaders, is there grass roots involvement in the community? To what extent is the community mobilized financially as well as in manpower?

(3) What is the nature of the professional life of educators in this community? Under what conditions do teachers and principals work? For example, what are their salaries, and their degree of satisfaction with salaries? Are school faculties cohesive, or fragmented? Do principals have offices? What are the physical conditions of classrooms? Is there administrative support for innovation among teachers?

Visions of reform. The issue of goals was not addressed in A Time To Act. The commission report never specified what changes should occur as a result of improving Jewish education, beyond the most general aim of Jewish continuity. Specifying goals is a challenging enterprise given the diversity within the Jewish community. Nonetheless, the Lead Communities project cannot advance -- and it certainly cannot be evaluated -- without a compilation of the desired outcomes.

For purposes of the evaluation project, we will take goals to mean outcomes that are desired within the Lead Communities. We anticipate uncovering multiple goals, and we expect persons in different segments of the community to hold different and sometimes conflicting preferences. Our aim is not to adjudicate among competing goals, but to uncover and spell out the visions for change that are held across the community. To some extent, goals that emerge in Lead Communities will be clearly stated by participants. Other goals, however, will be implicit in plans and projects, and the evaluation team will need to tease them out. The evaluation project will consider both short-term and long-term goals.

Another reason for focusing on visions is that a lack of clear goals has hindered the success of many previous reform efforts in general education. For example, the New Futures Initiative, an effort by the Casey Foundation to invigorate educational and community services in four inner-city communities, was frustrated by poor articulation between broad goals and specific programs. Although the communities were mobilized for reform, the connections between community leaders and front-line educators did not promote far-reaching programs for fundamental changes. New programs were generally supplemental, and they tended to produce superficial changes.

Questions related to visions include asking about anticipated obstacles, about overcoming barriers between segments of the Jewish community, and about how participants foresee moving from goals to implementation. By asking questions about visions, the evaluation project will not only document goals, but will help persons at all levels of the Lead Communities project -- lay leaders, parents, educators, and other Jewish professionals -- to think about their visions of the future. This process may lead to interactive thinking about goals, and may help the communities avoid purely top-down or bottom-up strategies.

It will be important to consider the concreteness of the visions in each community. Do the visions include a concept of implementation, or do ideas about goals remain abstract? Do participants recognize a link between their visions of change and the structure they have established to bring about change?

Community mobilization. According to A Time To Act, mobilizing community support for Jewish education is a "building block" of the Lead Communities Project, a condition that is essential to the success of the endeavor. This involves recruiting lay leaders and educating them about the importance of education, as well as increasing the financial resources that are committed to education. The Report quotes one commissioner as saying, "The challenge is that by the year 2000, the vast majority of these community leaders should see education as a burning issue and the rest should at least think it is important. When this is achieved...money will be available to finance fully the massive program envisioned by the Commission (p.64)."

Recent advances in educational theory also emphasize the importance of community-wide, "systemic" reform instead of innovations in isolated programs. Educational change is more likely to succeed, according to this view, when it occurs in a broad, supportive context, and when there is widespread consensus on the importance of the enterprise. Hence, an important issue for the evaluation of Lead Communities is the breadth and depth of participation in the project. What formal and informal linkages exist among the various agencies of the community? Which agencies participate in the visions of change that have been articulated?

As part of their applications Lead Communities are proposing planning processes for the first year of work. In studying mobilization in the communities, we need to observe how this planning process unfolds. Is the stated design followed? Are departures from initial plans helpful or harmful? Is there broad participation? Are the planners developing thoughtful materials? We will need to describe the decision-making process. Is it open or closed? Are decisions pragmatic or wishful?

The professional lives of Jewish educators. Enhancing the profession of Jewish education is the second critical building block specified in A Time To Act. The Report claims that fundamental improvement in Jewish education is not possible without radical change in areas such as recruitment, training, salaries, career tracks, and empowerment of educators. Hence, the evaluation project will establish baseline conditions which can serve as standards for comparison in future years.

Field research may center on characteristics and conditions of educators including background and training, salaries, and degree of satisfaction with salaries; school facilities; cohesiveness of school faculties; administrative support for innovation; and so on. Additionally, we will observe a subset of educational programs that are in place as the Lead Communities project begins. These observations will be used as baseline data for comparative purposes in subsequent years. We will try to consider programs which, according to the visions articulated in the community, seem ripe for change.

II. METHODS

In the long term (e.g., four years?), it is possible to think about quantitative assessment of educational change in Lead Communities. This assessment would involve limited surveys that would be administered in 1993-94 and repeated perhaps every two years. For the present, the evaluation project will make only limited use of quantitative data, relying mainly on information gathered by the community itself, such as participation rates, trends in funding, teacher turnover, etc. The bulk of the assessment carried out by the evaluation project, at least during the first two years, will emphasize qualitative assessment of the process of change in Lead Communities. The main methodological tools will be interviews and observations.

Snowball sampling for interviews. A "snowball" technique for selecting interview respondents appears appropriate here. In this approach, the researcher identifies an initial group of respondents, and adds to the list of subjects by asking each interviewee to suggest additional respondents. At some point in an interview, for example, the researcher might ask, "Who else is involved in (program x)? Who else is a leader in this area in this community?" Subsequently, the researcher interviews some of those named by previous subjects, particularly if new subjects are named by more than one previous informant.

In the snowball approach, it is important to begin with multiple starting points, so that one does not become confined to a narrow clique within the community. We might use the following three starting points from which we would snowball outward:

(1) Key actors identified in the Lead Communities proposal from each community.

(2) A list of leaders of all community organizations that are involved in education, possibly prepared by the head of the local Jewish federation. The list must include leaders of any organizations that are not participating in the Lead Communities project.

(3) Random samples of educators and lay persons not included in (1) or (2).

These samples should clarify the social ecology of the Jewish community.

Aims of evaluation. The purpose of the evaluation, especially in the first two years, is weighted more towards developing policy than towards program accountability. Feedback on the process is seen as much more important than summative evaluation at the present time. We suspect that most Jewish educators recognize that Jewish education is not succeeding, and will understand that the field researchers are not there to document their failures. Instead, the field researchers can serve the educators and their communities by helping them reflect on their situations and by serving as mirrors in which their programs can be viewed alongside their goals.

In one sense, the evaluation project does emphasize accountability. By the end of the first year, Lead Communities are expected to have well-articulated visions for change, and implementation plans developed. The evaluation project will help judge whether the processes within the Lead Communities are leading towards these outcomes, and will assess progress toward these general goals in the spring of 1993.

Received: by HUJIVMS via NJE (HUyMail-V6k); Fri, 05 Mar 93 14:29:08
+0200
Received: from RL.IB by UKACRL.BITNET (Mailer R2.07) with BSMTP id
4752; Fri,
05 Mar 93 12:27:56 GMT
Received: from RL.IB by UK.AC.RL.IB (Mailer R2.07) with BSMTP id
5054; Fri, 05
Mar 93 12:27:56 GMT
Via: UK.AC.ED.ERCVAX; 5 MAR 93 12:27:49 GMT
Date: Fri, 5 MAR 93 12:28:35
From: EKJC68@ERCVAX.EDINBURGH.AC.UK
To: annette@hujivms
Subject: trip in April
Sender: JANET "EKJC68@UK.AC.EDINBURGH.ERCVAX"
<EKJC68@ERCVAX.EDINBURGH.AC.UK>

Annette,

I'm looking forward to meeting with you during the first week of April. I think we have a lot to cover, so I will be grateful for any time you can spare for me.

I'm writing now about the arrangements for that trip. I had hoped that my trip would be fully funded by Tel Aviv University, but it turns out that's not quite true. Is there any possibility you can contribute $250 towards the cost of my trip in April?

How did I get to this point? It's a long story, do you want to hear?
Here goes: I have been awarded a grant from the United States-Israel Foundation (I think this is the Israeli Fulbright group) for "lecturing and consulting at Tel Aviv and Hebrew Universities." I did not apply for this grant; the folks I am lecturing to at Tel Aviv University did. When I received the letter, I assumed "Hebrew University" meant Seymour, so I accepted. It turns out that

unbeknownst to me, a group in Sociology of Education at Hebrew U had also applied for these funds to bring me over, but unfortunately they did not tell me they were doing so, and I made my plans without leaving any open days for them, except during the chofesh when they cannot schedule a lecture.

Each of the institutions I am visiting is supposed to contribute $250 towards the grant, but now the folks in Sociology of Education at Hebrew U do not want to chip in (understandably). So I am writing to see if you are able to take their place.

Sorry for the trouble, and if this is not possible for you I'll understand -- and I will still want to meet with you!

Yours,

Adam

```
Received: by HUJIVMS via NJE (HUyMail-V6k); Mon, 01 Mar 93 12:24:01
        +0200
Received: from RL.IB by UKACRL.BITNET (Mailer R2.07) with BSMTP id
        7663; Mon,
 01 Mar 93 10:22:49 GMT
Received: from RL.IB by UK.AC.RL.IB (Mailer R2.07) with BSMTP id
        4058; Mon, 01
 Mar 93 10:22:48 GMT
Via:        UK.AC.ED.ERCVAX;  1 MAR 93 10:22:43 GMT
Date:       Mon,  1 MAR 93 10:23:28
From:       EKJC68@ERCVAX.EDINBURGH.AC.UK
To:         annette@hujivms
Subject: responses to the Planning Guide and Supplementary Schools
           paper
Sender: JANET "EKJC68@UK.AC.EDINBURGH.ERCVAX"
          <EKJC68@ERCVAX.EDINBURGH.AC.UK>
```

February 28, 1993

Ms. Annette Hochstein
Mandel Institute of Jerusalem

Dear Annette,

I assume that by the time you read this you will be back from your latest trip to the U.S., and I hope it was a positive and productive visit. This week I received copies of the Planning Guide and the Supplementary Schools paper, and I wanted to offer a few reactions. I think both documents are superb, and my comments mainly address implications for the future rather than suggesting any revisions.

I have two minor questions about the Planning Guide: (1) What is the "goals project" which is mentioned in several places? This sounds like a project with which our work should be coordinated. (2) On p. 6, mention is made of "CIJE project descriptions." Which document is being used as the project description for the MEF project? Do you want us to prepare something specifically for this audience?

I also have one minor comment: On p. 18-19, the terms "outputs" and "outcomes" are hard to distinguish from one another, although they are given very different meanings here. I think what is meant is "short-term" and "long-term" outcomes, and that would probably be clearer. (A more jargony terminology would be "proximate outcomes" and "long-range outcomes.")

To me, the most important contribution of the planning guide -- aside from the fact that it proposes clear, concrete activities which can be undertaken right away -- is that its approach is systemic rather than piecemeal. As you know, I think this is the major strength of the Lead Communities Project, so it is important that this document reflect the systemic approach. I worry, though, that if and when serious educational planning takes place in the communities, it will occur in isolated programs rather than through ties with broad coalitions, and that the planning taking place in coalitions will not be precise and hard-hitting enough to have significant implications for contact between teachers and students (or counselors and campers, etc.). Part of this concern comes from my reading of the Supplementary School paper from the Best Practices project, which is outstanding in recommending a systemic approach within schools, but could easily be used (or not used) on a school-by-school basis without any wider coordination. At the same time, my limited knowledge of activities which have occured in the communities thus far does not give me confidence that meetings among persons representing varied constituencies are able to move beyond funding issues, territorial issues, and very abstract goal issues, to attending to more concrete programmatic issues.

What can CIJE do to make sure my fears are not realized, i.e. that the Planning Guide and the work of Best Practices are utilized in a systemic fashion throughout the community? Part of the answer is already in the Planning Guide, in its insistence on a broad coalition, attention to mobilization of many groups, etc. But how can we ensure that these coalitions contemplate significant educational change? To help me think about this I returned to Smith and O'Day's seminal work, "Systemic school reform." Writing about secular education, they advise state-level initiatives to coordinate curriculum, teacher training, and assessment, and to re-examine responsibilities and policies at each level of the educational governance structure. In Jewish education, there is no body with the authority to initiate change as states can for secular education. (Actually, I'm not sure states have the strength to do what Smith and O'Day recommend, but that's another issue!) What is needed is some kind of leverage that would encourage persons and institutions participating in Jewish education to improve curriculum, teacher knowledge and pedagogy, and assessment, and offer a broader range of services, all in a coordinated fashion.

It seems to me that such leverage may be possible through a partnership of CIJE, local federations, and national movements. This coalition may be able to supply the resources -- financial and intellectual -- that would facilitate the development and implementation of coherent programs. To the extent that this group provides resources -- and I am including foundations when I mention federation -- it should be able to demand a high level of coordination of curriculum, staff development, and assessment. Could CIJE broker a partnership among experts from national movements (e.g., education professors at the seminaries) and the local educators within each movement in the lead communities? Recognizing that ideological differences prevent community-wide coordination of education in most areas, it makes most sense to think about coordination within movements, and to propose that this begin first within the lead communities and ultimately on a national basis.

I hope I've been able to raise some useful questions, even if my suggested responses are too simplistic. As I said above, I think both the Planning Guide and the Supplementary Schools paper are outstanding documents, and I hope as much care will be taken with how they are used as was clearly required for their preparation.

Best,

Adam

Received: by HUJIVMS via NJE (HUyMail-V6k); Mon, 15 Feb 93 13:11:53 +0200
Received: from RL.IB by UKACRL.BITNET (Mailer R2.07) with BSMTP id 3107; Mon,
15 Feb 93 11:10:54 GMT
Received: from RL.IB by UK.AC.RL.IB (Mailer R2.07) with BSMTP id 6287; Mon, 15
Feb 93 11:10:52 GMT
Via: UK.AC.ED.ERCVAX; 15 FEB 93 11:10:43 GMT
Date: Mon, 15 FEB 93 11:11:16
From: EKJC68@ERCVAX.EDINBURGH.AC.UK
To: annette@hujivms
Subject: summary report
Sender: JANET "EKJC68@UK.AC.EDINBURGH.ERCVAX"
<EKJC68@ERCVAX.EDINBURGH.AC.UK>

Thanks for your excellent comments on the summary report. We will revise it this week for distribution. I'll get back to you on recommendations for distribution, but my initial reaction is that in addition to those you listed, I'd like Barry Holtz and Shulamith Elster to see it.

I also have some concerns about the fact that we are contradicting Esther Leah Ritz's advice in that the summary report evaluates the communities without having given them a chance to respond. I would like to write to her and explain why we are doing it this way. What do you think?

P.S. I'm not saying the communities should see the summary report! They are not its intended audience.

P.P.S. Maybe I'll just write a cover memo to CIJE staff which would explain the current situation. That would explain it for Esther as well. I'll write something and show it to you. Ok?

Received: by HUJIVMS via NJE (HUyMail-V6k); Mon, 15 Feb 93 18:45:14
+0200
Received: from RL.IB by UKACRL.BITNET (Mailer R2.07) with BSMTP id
4701; Mon,
15 Feb 93 16:44:13 GMT
Received: from RL.IB by UK.AC.RL.IB (Mailer R2.07) with BSMTP id
7627; Mon, 15
Feb 93 16:44:12 GMT
Via: UK.AC.ED.ERCVAX; 15 FEB 93 16:36:27 GMT
Date: Mon, 15 FEB 93 16:37:06
From: EKJC68@ERCVAX.EDINBURGH.AC.UK
To: annette@hujivms
Subject: distributing the summary report
Sender: JANET "EKJC68@UK.AC.EDINBURGH.ERCVAX"
<EKJC68@ERCVAX.EDINBURGH.AC.UK>

I"d like to ask your advice about the mechanics of distributing the summary report. Is the quality of a faxed copy sufficient for distribution? Or is it important to get xeroxes of the original? What is your normal procedure?
If a faxed copy is sufficient, I assume I should send it to Ginny Levi with imstructions on who is supposed to receive it. Is that correct?

We do plan to make some revisions based on your comments, but we will finish it this week.

CENTRE *for* EDUCATIONAL SOCIOLOGY
Department of Sociology

The University of Edinburgh
7 Buccleuch Place
Edinburgh EH8 9LW
Scotland

Fax UK (0)31 668 3263
Email CES@uk.ac.edinburgh
Telephone UK (0)31 650 1000
or direct dial UK (0)31 650 4186/4187

February 19

Annette,

I'm writing to brief you on what I anticipate will be responses from the evaluation project to community requests for information. If you can touch base with Ellen next week, your information will be most up-to-date.

In general, we are prepared to assist with the design of instruments and interpretation of data. We also look forward to assisting the communities to develop evaluation components of new or ongoing projects.

Milwaukee
We are preparing a written response to Dr. Cohen. In the response we will explain that we will help if they wish us to design instruments for studying the status of educators and educators' attitudes, but we are not able to administer surveys. We will also provide the community with written reports which will include qualitative information about the professional lives of educators. Finally, we are eager to help them make evaluation a normal practice in implementing any Jewish educational program or project.

Baltimore ^ at his initiative!
Julie met with Marshall on 2/16 to discuss the ways in which she can help their efforts. They are going to meet again in about 10 days, after he has had a chance to confer with others to articulate their needs more specifically. So there is an ongoing dialogue.

Atlanta
Claire has already assisted Lauren in designing a teacher survey. We have not received new requests as far as I know.

* * *

One other point: I was remiss earlier in not emphasizing for you the major role played by the field researchers in writing the summary report. Most of the section on community comparisons was either written by the field researchers or summarized by Ellen and me on the basis of what the field researchers wrote in the community reports.

* * *

I did not write a cover memo to Mort to go with the summary report.

Good luck next week.

Adam

Peabody College
VANDERBILT UNIVERSITY
NASHVILLE, TENNESSEE [illegible]
Telephone [illegible]
Department of Educational Leadership • Box 514 • Direct phone 322-8000

ATTENTION: ANNETTE HOCHSTEIN-PLEASE HOLD-ARRIVING ON SUNDAY 2/21

TO: ANNETTE HOCHSTEIN

FROM: ELLEN GOLDRING

RE: RESPONSE TO RUTH COHEN in MILWAUKEE

DATE: FRIDAY, February 19

Welcome to NY! Adam asked us to prepare these materials for your upcoming visits in the communities, especially Milwaukee.

Roberta and I have drafted a response to Ruth Cohen's specific requests re her role in Milwaukee.

Beyond sending our responses for your meetings, please let us know if you have any other comments on these drafts as we would like to send them directly to Ruth as well.

I look forward to seeing you in NY. Call if you need anything else or if I can assist in any other way during your visit.

Post-it™ brand fax transmittal memo 7671 # of pages ▸

To Roberta Goodman	From Ellen Goldring
Co.	Co.
Dept.	Phone #
Fax # 608 [illegible]	Fax #

Peabody College
VANDERBILT UNIVERSITY
NASHVILLE, TENNESSEE [illegible]
TELEPHONE [illegible]
Department of Educational Leadership • Box [illegible] • Telephone [illegible]

February 19, 1993

Dr. Ruth Cohen
Director, Milwaukee Lead Community Project
1360 Prospect Avenue
Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53202-3094

Dear Dr. Cohen,

Thank-you for sharing your ideas about our continued collaboration with the CIJE evaluation team.

We will work closely with you to provide assistance needed to support your efforts in this project. We are prepared to assist with the design of instruments, data gathering strategies, and interpretation of data in your self-study and survey of educators. Given our other responsibilities, we are not able to administer surveys, analyze data or write reports based upon data you collect. We will certainly be happy to consult with those who are analyzing data and to comment on draft versions of your reports.

We will be collecting qualitative data on the professional lives of educators, as well as observing educational programs. We will provide the community with written reports and share information with you on these topics. The reports will also include information about visions for change and community mobilization.

In addition, we look forward to assisting you in developing evaluation components for programs that you will be implementing in Milwaukee. We will work with your local staff and educators to incorporate evaluation as an on-going, routine practice in the Milwaukee Jewish community.

Sincerely,

Ellen Goldring

Ellen Goldring
Associate Director, CIJE Monitoring, Evaluation, and Feedback Project

Dr. Ruth Cohen
Director, Milwaukee Lead Community Project
Milwaukee Jewish Federation
1360 Prospect Avenue
Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53202-3094

February 19, 1993

Dear Ruth:

Thank you for your thoughtful proposal regarding data collection for the Lead Community project. I particularly appreciate the emphasis on our having a collaborative partnership which underlies your proposal.

I will respond to your proposal first in overarching terms and then in terms of specific requests.

As a CIJE field researcher, I am always available to the community for lending expertise in helping devise research instruments, sharing information about existing questionnaires and evaluation projects, and helping interpret data. Furthermore, I want to help the community make evaluation a normal practice in implementing any Jewish educational program or project.

I will go through your specific requests one by one to help clarify my role. In response to your question III, my comments are as follows:

> III. 1. I am able to assist you in the collection of the baseline data for 1a. and 1b rather than being responsible for the collection. I can provide assistance by: 1) helping you develop the instrument(s); and 2) helping you interpret the data gathered. Additionally, documenting the professional life of Jewish educators is a major focus of the field researchers' mandate. I will include analysis on the professional life of Jewish educators in my reports to the community.
>
> III.2. I will be happy to consult with you as you analyze the data collected in III.1. I will review and comment on any drafts you write.
>
> III.3. I can assist you in your development of data gathering processes.
>
> III.4. I can make suggestions as you develop instruments for data collection.
>
> III.5. I will document as many of the focus groups as possible.

III.6. I will be happy to consult and provide assistance as you analyze the data.

III.7. I will review and comment on any drafts that you write including prelimary outlines.

III.8. Observing educational programs is an expectation of my on-going role as a field researcher. I will include my analysis of these programs in my reports to the community.

III.9. At this time, I am unaware of the status of other CIJE research consultants. I cannot comment on what assistance they would or would not be able to provide.

I have already provided you with information on I.e. which asks for assistance in finding out what other communities have done to address personnel issues. I will continue to provide you with any instruments, suggestions, or resources that I happen to come across.

I am excited about working with you on these specific items. I look forward to our continuing collaboration.

B'Shalom,

Roberta Goodman

Roberta Goodman
Field Researcher
CIJE Monitoring, Evaluation and Feedback Project

Received: by HUJIVMS (HUyMail-V6k); Sun, 14 Feb 93 22:00:38 +0200
Date: Sun, 14 Feb 93 22:00 +0200
From: <ANNETTE@HUJIVMS>
To: MANDEL@HUJIVMS

Received: by HUJIVMS (HUyMail-V6k); Sun, 14 Feb 93 21:22:26 +0200
Date: Sun, 14 Feb 93 21:21 +0200
From: <ANNETTE@HUJIVMS>
To: EKJC68@ERCVAX.EDINBURGH.AC.UK
Cc: annette@hujivms,
GOLDRIEB@VUCTRVAX
Subject: Re: reports

FIRST OF THREE MESSAGES

Dearest Adam and Ellen,

',tis a pleasure indeed to get onto this miraculous communications thing to thank you for the very helpful, constructive and -- to me -- very useful draft summary report you wrote. It comes at a a critical time and raises some important points e.g. re participation in decisionmaking; links with
educators; funding, the role of CIJE HQ; framing "the problem"; the role of the field researchers.
All important stuff made up of two categories: those issues relevant for the f.r's work (helping frame
the problem; defining their role); those aimed at headquarters (e.g.funding; structures; relationships).

With the members of the steering committee dispersed upon three continents I will suggest that we take first steps without waiting to hear from them, and incorporate their input as soon as it comes = hopefully very soon.

(Mike Inbar got back to me by the time I was writing. I incorporated his views).

Here are some fairly random comments:

- The opening focus on conditions for change is useful. So are the categories used for the analysis.
The following questions came to mind:

- A general sense that current economic pressures may have more to do with motivation for change, re-structuring and funding issues than is allowed in the report (more on this later).

- Under the heading "community settings influencing change" you speak of geographic dispersion etc.. as probable cause for the limited involvement in decisionmaking in Atlanta. Could it not be that the 80% or so of the community who are not born Atlantans -- wherever they live -- are less represented in the decisionmaking structures? That participation is in fact a function of being "old Atlantans" (in) versus the others? To be pondered.

As to structures:
- The fate of the BJE's in the 3 communities reflects a general dissatisfaction with many BJE's throughout the country. Is it possible that this + economic pressures is what some of the re-structuring is about?

By the way -- the CIJE has NO interest nor has it taken a position as regards structural reform (p.17). [This is the almost only factual matter re-the CIJE that I will take up - your analysis is too good for me to want my own petty or detail matters to affect it. The Almost relates to the fact that the request for open and participatory process implies that there was process. I believe that as soon as there will be process, participation and joint work will be the fact - but that of course remains for CIJE to prove] On the first matter though I think that BEYOND our request for an ad-hoc wall-to-wall coalition of all groups, religious denominations, educators, rabbis, other stakeholders to plan and decide on the Lead Communities project, we have sofar NOTHING to say on the structural issue. As you know, we found the situations described already in place when we selected the communities. The only statements made concern the pluralistic composition of the Lead Communities project's governing body -- this also characterized the Commission on Jewish Education. This translates as a request that the local comission allow for broad representation of education-stakeholders of all convictions, persuations, etc.

Received: by HUJIVMS (HUyMail-V6k); Sun, 14 Feb 93 22:01:58 +0200
Date: Sun, 14 Feb 93 22:01 +0200
From: <ANNETTE@HUJIVMS>
To: MANDEL@HUJIVMS

Received: by HUJIVMS (HUyMail-V6k); Sun, 14 Feb 93 21:31:42 +0200
Date: Sun, 14 Feb 93 21:31 +0200
From: <ANNETTE@HUJIVMS>
To: EKJC68@ERCVAX.EDINBURGH.AC.UK
Cc: annette@hujivms,
goldreib@victrvax,
goldrieb@vuctrvax,
goldreib@vuctrvax
Subject: Re: reports

SECOND MESSAGE OF THREE

But the structural/organizational issue is, I believe more complex than expressed - particularly in pages 7 and 8. Inded on two topics the issues need looking into further.
They are
a) the mutual relationship of the religious denominations and the federations and
b) the move to increasingly delegate the responsibility of planning for education to federation planners.

The first needs to be understood, because we are in a period of change. The Commission was unusual in its capacity to join both worlds. Baltimore is unusual in its inclusive communal structure. Most other places are not this way. Since most formal education is denominational, and since federation funding for education is growing, there is much to be looked at.

The second -- also the product of change, and perhaps of economic pressures that lead to respond to the poor performance of many BJE's -- raises the following issue: there is a clear federationization" of educational planning. The subject is moving from the hands of educators to those of social and policy planners (Again -- probably far less so in Baltimore (oops - is your description of the Baltimore arrangement on pp7-8 accurate?).

In every case it is not clear whether the advocacy role for education's part of the communal pie will be strengthened by the move to federation or will become swallowed by other, stronger topics. And of course what will happen to the content at the hand of non-educators. This is a major issue for the educators.
What is likely to happen? Should one intervene? Is it very important?

- Small point re-book censurship in Baltimore: are we talking of ultra-orthodox bookstores refusing to sell secular-Jewish books, or are we saying that one cannot buy secular-Jewish books in Baltimore?

- Another small point: is there not an imbalance re-dealing with the orthodox versus the absence (?!) of the unaffiliated - or less affiliated in your analysis.
[Being formally one of them orth. I might be suspect of over-sensitivity - but please check].

Received: by HUJIVMS (HUyMail-V6k); Sun, 14 Feb 93 22:03:11 +0200
Date: Sun, 14 Feb 93 22:03 +0200
From: <ANNETTE@HUJIVMS>
To: MANDEL@HUJIVMS

Received: by HUJIVMS (HUyMail-V6k); Sun, 14 Feb 93 21:47:25 +0200
Date: Sun, 14 Feb 93 21:47 +0200
From: <ANNETTE@HUJIVMS>
To: EKJC68@ERCVAX.EDINBURGH.AC.UK
Cc: ANNETTE@HUJIVMS,
GOLDRIEB@VUCTRVAX
Subject: Re: reports

THIRD BUT NOT LAST MESSAGE

- In you interesting analysis on pages 9-10 and 13 I wonder what would emerge from a different sort of problem framing.
One way is to see the problem as poor curriculum. another is to view poor curriculum as a symptom. The problem is the shortage of well trained curriculum personnel to write good curricula.
As you Know the commission concluded that to deal with curriculum one would first have to deal with the shortage of educational personnel equipped to deal with it.
It would be interesting and maybe useful to have the field researchers on their next round in the field try out alternative ways of viewing the problem. I am interested in knowing how
they feel about this.

- p.11: Over the last couple of years there have been interesting analyses of the financial issues. The problem of funding is difficult.
Two hypotheses different from those offered on p 11 may be worth looking into: the loss of big givers does not reflect a drop in the number of wealthy people, or a drop in philanthropic money. Instead it reflects a trend among the next generation to donate to general social, cultural etc.. causes rather than to Jewish causes (therefore community mobilization is so important!) It could well be a matter of what interests people.

Received: by HUJIVMS (HUyMail-V6k); Sun, 14 Feb 93 22:03:46 +0200
Date: Sun, 14 Feb 93 22:03 +0200
From: <ANNETTE@HUJIVMS>
To: MANDEL@HUJIVMS

Received: by HUJIVMS (HUyMail-V6k); Sun, 14 Feb 93 21:55:37 +0200
Date: Sun, 14 Feb 93 21:55 +0200
From: <ANNETTE@HUJIVMS>
To: EKJC68@ERCVAX.EDINBURGH.AC.UK
Cc: annette@hujivms,
goldrieb@vuctrvax
Subject: Re: reports

FOURTH BUT NOT LAST OF WHAT WAS GOING TO BE A THREE PART MESSAGE

As to the rise of private foundations, it is a major fact of the last few years, and you can see it reflected in the communities we have selected. Baltimore (I don't remember reading this on page 11) has received from a private foundation a challenge grant of $10million for Jewish education if it collects as much. They are working hard on this.

To confuse matters further, it is clear and obvious that economic pressures also have significant impact.

Received: by HUJIVMS (HUyMail-V6k); Sun, 14 Feb 93 22:04:24 +0200
Date: Sun, 14 Feb 93 22:04 +0200
From: <ANNETTE@HUJIVMS>
To: MANDEL@HUJIVMS

Received: by HUJIVMS (HUyMail-V6k); Sun, 14 Feb 93 21:58:56 +0200
Date: Sun, 14 Feb 93 21:58 +0200
From: <ANNETTE@HUJIVMS>
To: EKJC68@ERCVAX.EDINBURGH.AC.UK
Cc: ANNETTE@HUJIVMS,
=sys$login:tempi07133.tmp,
GOLDRIEB@VUCTRVAX
Subject: Re: reports

FIFTH AND HOPEFULLY LAST...
(EVER HAD THE THING GO CRAZY ON YOU?)

All the suggestions on pp 21-22 are on target.

We recommend that you leave pages 23, 24 and the top of 25 out -- they are not really part of the report and should be discussed and decided upon among ourselves.

Please see this as sharing some of the thinking elicited by your report.
You should decide whether there is anything to incorporate or to further check: the document is good and useful as is.
I will consult with steering committee members and CIJE heads as to whom this report should go to. My own view is that Esther-Leah Ritz, Mort Mandel (Chair) and Henry Zucker (Director) or Steve Hoffman (his right arm in the CIJE) should recceive it next week. Please give me your advice/opinion. I believe the most important use will reside in its impacting decisionmaking at the CIJE regarding several of the issues raised.

Thank you very much!

Received: by HUJIVMS (HUyMail-V6k); Sat, 13 Feb 93 20:05:02 +0200
Date: Sat, 13 Feb 93 20:04 +0200
From: <ANNETTE@HUJIVMS>
To: EKJC68@ERCVAX.EDINBURGH.AC.UK
Cc: annette
Subject: Re: welcome back! hope your trip was successful

Dear Adam and Ellen,

Just to let you know that I read the summary report,
found it very useful and important and will write
much more tomorrow!

Shavua Tov

Annette

Vo

Received: by HUJIVMS (HUyMail-V6k); Thu, 11 Feb 93 07:41:30 +0200
Date: Thu, 11 Feb 93 7:40 +0200
From: <ANNETTE@HUJIVMS>
To: Mandel@hujivms

Received: by HUJIVMS via NJE (HUyMail-V6k); Wed, 10 Feb 93 17:48:04 +0200
Received: from RL.IB by UKACRL.BITNET (Mailer R2.07) with BSMTP id 4184; Wed,
10 Feb 93 15:40:52 GMT
Received: from RL.IB by UK.AC.RL.IB (Mailer R2.07) with BSMTP id 4784; Wed, 10
Feb 93 15:40:51 GMT
Via: UK.AC.ED.ERCVAX; 10 FEB 93 15:29:48 GMT
Date: Wed, 10 FEB 93 15:30:35
From: EKJC68@ERCVAX.EDINBURGH.AC.UK
To: annette@hujivms
Subject: reports
Sender: JANET "EKJC68@UK.AC.EDINBURGH.ERCVAX"

Annette,

I'm getting a lot of pressure from the field researchers to show the reports to someone in the community. They want to know if they are on track, and that's the best way of finding out. Plus, they feel they are betraying a trust by not being forthcoming.

In addition, I am worried that we are making a much bigger deal out of these reports by not sharing them, than if we did.

Have you had a chance to think about my latest suggestion that we share them as "first impressions"?

Adam

Skimed?

```
Received: by HUJIVMS via NJE (HUyMail-V6k); Sun, 31 Jan 93  13:49:34
+0200
Received:  from  RL.IB by UKACRL.BITNET (Mailer R2.07) with BSMTP id
0645; Sun,
 31 Jan 93 11:48:35 GMT
Received: from RL.IB by UK.AC.RL.IB (Mailer  R2.07)  with  BSMTP  id
5883; Sun, 31
 Jan 93 11:48:35 GMT
Via:       UK.AC.ED.ERCVAX; 31 JAN 93 11:48:33 GMT
Date:      Sun, 31 JAN 93 11:49:08
From:      EKJC68@ERCVAX.EDINBURGH.AC.UK
To:        annette@hujivms
Subject:   responses
Sender: JANET "EKJC68@UK.AC.EDINBURGH.ERCVAX"
        <EKJC68@ERCVAX.EDINBURGH.AC.UK>

Thanks  for  responding so promptly.   It's Sunday morning--I'b back
from London, but you may already have left for  the  US.   I  passed
your message to Ellen.  You have her correct address -- I'm not sure
why it isn't working
for you.

I'd be delighted if you could spare some time for Julie and Claire =
-  when  will  you be in B & A?  What times did you have in mind to
meet with them?

I will ponder your message as I wait to hear from Jim, and  we  will
talk further.

Have a good trip,
Adam

P.S.   Feb  7  is  fine for a telecon -- where will you be, and what
time do you want to talk?
BMAIL> file gamoran
```

Received: by HUJIVMS (HUyMail-V6k); Sat, 30 Jan 93 17:57:38 +0200
Date: Sat, 30 Jan 93 17:57 +0200
From: <ANNETTE@HUJIVMS>
To: mandel@hujivms

Received: by HUJIVMS (HUyMail-V6k); Fri, 29 Jan 93 13:52:20 +0200
Date: Fri, 29 Jan 93 13:51 +0200
From: <ANNETTE@HUJIVMS>
To: EKJC68@ERCVAX.EDINBURGH.AC.UK
Cc: annette,
goldreib@vuctrvax
Subject: Re: first reponses to first reports

Dear Adam and Ellen,

Thank you for forwarding the reports so promptly.
Here are initial responses to the F.R.'s documents --
from Mike Inbar and myself.

The documents are pleasantly written, pleasant to read
papers. In the descriptions and comments there are some
useful insights about each of the communities.

However the documents are difficult to respond to, among other
because they do not seem to focus on a defined purpose, on specific
common issues, topics or problems.
They have an ad-hoc and somewhat arbitrary character to them,
offering a variety of general impressions. Mike asks me to point in
particular to the fact that the three reports offer heterogeneous
items, based on heterogeneous methods. (E.g. some did interview
educators, some did not. Some may have interviewed a critical
minimum number of actors others did not).

This heterogeneity he feels, creates a serious problem of
validity. We need homogeneity re-sources and methods for
the reports' reliability. Mike thinks that we should
view these documents as internal drafts only, not for any
sort of release -- he feels they are not yet reports.

When access to additional sources of information allows the f.r.s to undertake the data-collection as planned, and to focus on the three issues that were proposed, then they can write actual and valid reports.

We know of course why that is. The situation did not permit the f.r.'s to systematically respond to their own mandate, and I trust that it is clear that this does not reflect any judgement on their skills and abilities.
I realize how frustrating the situation must be. But at least on this side of the ocean the feeling is that these reports, written under the constraints of a projects that still needs to get off the ground - while there is nothing one would want to delete from them, do not do justice to your mandate or to the idea of a "monitoring, evaluation and feedback loop".

I hope that my trip and subsequent discussions and follow-up with the communities will also clear the way for the f.r.'s. At which point we will be able to do the real thing.
I realize that we need to put our heads together as to how to doeal with this -- when all the feedback is in and you will want to decide. Perhaps a telecon after February 7th?

Any word yet from Jim?

I will be in both Baltimore and Atlanta for a few hours. If time permits I would love to meet or talk briefly with Julie and with Claire.

Best Regards and Shabbat Shalom,

Annette

Received: by HUJIVMS via NJE (HUyMail-V6k); Wed, 27 Jan 93 12:39:28 +0200
Received: from RL.IB by UKACRL.BITNET (Mailer R2.07) with BSMTP id 1332; Wed, 27 Jan 93 10:38:36 GMT
Received: from RL.IB by UK.AC.RL.IB (Mailer R2.07) with BSMTP id 7118; Wed, 27 Jan 93 10:38:34 GMT
Via: UK.AC.ED.ERCVAX; 27 JAN 93 10:38:31 GMT
Date: Wed, 27 JAN 93 10:39:04
From: EKJC68@ERCVAX.EDINBURGH.AC.UK
To: annette@hujivms
Subject: "tips" for speaking about evaluation to Fed execs.
Sender: JANET "EKJC68@UK.AC.EDINBURGH.ERCVAX"
<EKJC68@ERCVAX.EDINBURGH.AC.UK>

RATIONALE FOR THE PROJECT

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 component to document its efforts and gauge its success.

By <monitoring> we mean observing and documenting the planning and implementation of changes. <Evaluation> means interpreting information in a way that will strengthen and assist each community's efforts to improve Jewish education. <Feedback> will occur in the form of oral and written responses to community members and to the CIJE.

Two aspects of educational change need to be addressed: The <process> of change and the <outcomes> of change. At present, we are in much better position to study the process of change, because the outcomes have not yet been defined. What results are we expecting? Increased participation? Gains in Judaic knowledge? More ritual practices?
Better affect towards Jewish institutions? We will use our study of

the process of change to elicit the goals of the project that are particular to the three communities taking part.

The lead communities project is a direct result of A TIME TO ACT. Although that document provided the essential blueprint for the project, it was silent on the question of outcomes.
One contribution of the early stages of the evaluation project will be to enumerate the variety of specific goals envisioned within the lead communities.

Despite the ambiguity about goals at present, there are a few uncontroversial outcomes. For example, all would agree that increased participation in Jewish institutions by the Jews of the community is desirable. This type of measure can be monitored from the outset.

FIELD RESEARCH IN LEAD COMMUNITIES

Studying the process of change in lead communities should be a major component of the CIJE strategy. Documenting the process is especially important because the effects of innovation may not be manifested for several years. For example, suppose Community X manages to quadruple its number of full-time, professionally-trained Jewish educators. How long will it take for this change to affect cognitive and affective outcomes for students? Since the results cannout be detected immediately, it is important to obtain a qualitative sense of the extent to which the professional educators are being used effectively.

Studying the process is also important in the case of unsuccessful innovation. Suppose despite the best=laid plans, Community X is unable to increase its professional teaching force. Learning from this experience would require knowledge of the point at which the process broke down.

It is essential to begin monitoring the process of change as soon as possible -- ideally before the change process actually begins. There are three reasons to commence this study early on:

(1) In order to understand change, it is obviously essential to gather baseline information before the change has occurred. Baseline information means not only essential quantitative data, such as enrollment figures, but understanding of the structure and culture of the community at the outset. What ideas about Jewish education are prevalent? How are these ideas, or visions, distributed through the community? What is the nature of leadership and communication in this community? To what extent is the community mobilized for Jewish education?

What characterizes the professional lives of Jewish educators? Answers to these questions must be chronicled to strengthen the collective memory for later comparison.
The earlier the evaluation staff is present, the sooner they can obtain a general background understanding of the community, and can also establish a positive rapport with community members. That way they are less likely to miss or misinterpret changes that occur once the implementation begins.

(2) The early presence of evaluation staff can help stimulate new visions for Jewish education and can heighten the mobilization of the community. Lead communities have the opportunity to consider dramatically restructured approaches to

Jewish education in addition to modifications of existing programs. By asking community members about their visions for

the future, and by providing feedback that facilitates communication about such visions, the evaluation project can encourage a constructive dialogue within the communities.

(4) The CIJE is a long-term enterprise, not a one-shot deal. There is every chance that more lead communities will be created in the next three, five, or ten years. We need to learn about the launching and gearing-up process so other communities can learn from this

experience. For example, very little is known about mobilizing lay persons in support of education. We need to watch how this occurs so other communities can follow.

To carry out this task, we have hired a team of three FIELD RESEARCHERS.
One researcher is based in each community, but they will all spend time in all three communities. This is because they have complementary strengths -- they differ in their expertise as researchers, and in their knowledge of Jewish education -- and because keeping more than one pair of eyes on a situation provides both a check and a stimulus for deeper interpretation.

The design of the lead communities project calls for each community to carry out a self-study, which presumably would include information on community composition, population trends, and enrollment figures. The field researchers are prepared to assist in this process, but they cannot be its primary agents, lest they have no time for their other activities.

For next year, we are proposing a survey component to the evaluation

project, which would gather baseline data on affective, behavioral, and cognitive outcomes, probably from a selected youth cohort within each community. We hope to proceed with the surveys despite the lack of consensus about goals, because of the overriding importance of gathering some form of baseline data on outcomes which can be tracked over the years. The surveys would incorporate community input into their design.

Received: by HUJIVMS via NJE (HUyMail-V6k); Mon, 25 Jan 93 13:41:41
+0200
Received: from RL.IB by UKACRL.BITNET (Mailer R2.07) with BSMTP id
3918; Mon,
25 Jan 93 11:40:55 GMT
Received: from RL.IB by UK.AC.RL.IB (Mailer R2.07) with BSMTP id
8767; Mon, 25
Jan 93 11:40:54 GMT
Via: UK.AC.ED.ERCVAX; 25 JAN 93 11:40:49 GMT
Date: Mon, 25 JAN 93 11:41:19
From: EKJC68@ERCVAX.EDINBURGH.AC.UK
To: annette@hujivms
Subject: reports
Sender: JANET "EKJC68@UK.AC.EDINBURGH.ERCVAX"
<EKJC68@ERCVAX.EDINBURGH.AC.UK>

Thanks for your message. We are seeing eye to eye. (Is that an Americanism? I mean we agree.)
Regarding your upcoming visits to lc's --will there be formal meetings? When? May one of our f.r.'s observe? I haven't forgotten your request for tips on presenting the MEF project to Fed executives, and I'll e-mail
some thoughts on that this week.

Ellen and Roberta were at a meeting in New York (senior policy advisors or just CIJE staff, I'm not sure) when Art announced the impending changes in CIJE leadership. They know this is confidential. I'll try to find out who exactly was at this meeting if you'd like.

More later.....

Received: by HUJIVMS (HUyMail-V6k); Mon, 25 Jan 93 22:50:35 +0200
Date: Mon, 25 Jan 93 22:47 +0200
From: <ANNETTE@HUJIVMS>
To: EKJC68@ERCVAX.EDINBURGH.AC.UK
Cc: annette@hujivms
Subject: Re: reflections on yesterday's conversation

Americanism indeed. But after 25 years of marriage to an American I have become somewhat proficient.

The meeting in New York was that of the Senior Policy Advisors -- a networking and information group that convenes once or twice a year to receive reports and discuss. As usual, reports are that your team did veryu well. I know about Art.

The purpose of my Lead Communities tour is to start the dialogue again, or put it on track. It is not a formal meeting (whatever formal means) and I think we would be not well advised to have the f.r.'s there. There is a strong feeling about that they must keep a low profile for a while (hopefully very short), until we get things back on track.

It would help me greatly to have some pointers from you for the discussion. The issue of "why no quantitative data" is sure to surface. How should I respond to it? OF course this is a secondary point. The main one is to re-iterate the rationale for the project and explain why it is useful to have f.r.'s in place even as the project is just beginning to move.

Looking forward to read the reports

Good night!

Annette

Received: by HUJIVMS (HUyMail-V6k); Mon, 25 Jan 93 06:55:03 +0200
Date: Mon, 25 Jan 93 6:55 +0200
From: <ANNETTE@HUJIVMS>
To: mandel@hujivms

Received: by HUJIVMS (HUyMail-V6k); Sun, 24 Jan 93 22:48:34 +0200
Date: Sun, 24 Jan 93 22:48 +0200 22:48 +0200
From: <ANNETTE@HUJIVMS>
To: EKJC68@ERCVAX.EDINBURGH.AC.UK
Cc: annette@hujivms
Subject: Re: reflections on yesterday's conversation

Dear Adam,

Many thanks for your two memos. Hope I can do justice
to both at this late time.
As to showing the draft reports to the communities
I believe that we are in close agreement as regards the
appropriate way of sharing the reports. Our intention is
to have the appropriate person in the community see the draft
and correct errors/ and/or comment on it.

However at the present time, under circumstances where the gap
between what was intended for the researchers and what is, is
so large and the situation is as unclear at it is, we would
be ill advised to add anything that might further
mis-understandings about the evaluation project. In order to
preempt this are suggesting that the steering committee
with Elen and with you
see and discuss the draft BEFORE anyone elese = and in order to
jointly decide what the best course of action is. Hopefully it
will be to share the report with the person in the community.

I would not call Esther Leah yet, since we don't know if we
have a report, and because she is not yet apprised of the
changed leadership situation. That will happen around the
time of the Board meeting. Will let you know.

I am flying to Cleveland, Atlanta and Baltimore next week (Sunday to Friday) - with Steve Hoffmann and Shulamith. Hope to know much more when I return.

As regards fiancial administration - things will remain unchanged until the end of February and will then move to Cleveland. Thanks for alerting me to your concerns. I will discuss them with Ginny Levi who will be in charge of administration - and trust she will be helpful to you, in particular as regards the regular passing on of information (I have built an effective system with Cleveland - and believe the same should be possible for you).

We have not yet formulated our April plans and schedules, therefore I need a little more time to be able to respond to yours. We certainly want to see you at the Mandel Institute when you come,
so let's get back to this when I return from the New World.

Looking forward to reading the reports - please fax or e-mail them.

Best Regards,

Bonne nuit!

Annette

Peabody College
VANDERBILT UNIVERSITY
NASHVILLE, TENNESSEE 37203
TELEPHONE (615) 322-7311
Department of Educational Leadership • Box 514 • Direct phone 322-8000

Anette

13 January 1993

Professor Seymour Fox
Annette Hochstein
Mandel Institute
PO Box 4497
Jerusalem 91044
ISRAEL

Dear Seymour, Annette, Shmuel and Danny,

I am settling back into work here and want to write to thank you again for hosting me at the Mandel Institute. It was extremely interesting to learn about the Institute in greater detail and hear about the School for Educational Leadership. I hope this is just the beginning of a long-term collaborative relationship.

I also want to express my personal thanks for assisting us after the incident with our car. It was extremely reassuring to have your help.

I look forward to seeing you in February and hope you will be able to visit Vanderbilt at some time in the near future.

Warmest wishes,

Ellen Goldring

Received: from RL.IB by UK.AC.RL.IB (Mailer R2.07) with BSMTP id 0360; Wed, 20
Jan 93 13:38:51 GMT
Via: UK.AC.ED.ERCVAX; 20 JAN 93 13:38:44 GMT
Date: Wed, 20 JAN 93 13:39:15
From: EKJC68@ERCVAX.EDINBURGH.AC.UK
To: annette@hujivms
Subject: reflections on yesterday's conversation
Sender: JANET "EKJC68@UK.AC.EDINBURGH.ERCVAX"
<EKJC68@ERCVAX.EDINBURGH.AC.UK>

Hello again! Here's message number 2, my reflections after yesterday's conversation:

I had a good talk with Ellen last night. She and the field researchers are wrapping up 2 1/2 days of hard work revising the reports. My request to cease formal interviews coincides well with what they had decided that day. This week they are finishing their reports. Next week they will be helping Ellen and me with the summary report. The following week they will spend reflecting on what they know so far and where the major gaps in their knowledge are--what do they not know, who have they not talked to, what issues allow fruitful comparisons across communities, etc.
On the basis of this reflection, they will each propose a plan for next steps, which Ellen and I will then consider together with them. Thus, there will be at least three weeks with no formal interviews, and we will not resume until we get the go-ahead. The field researchers will not be totally out of sight, but they will not be out interviewing and they will not be travelling.

The decision not to show the reports to anyone in the communities at this time also coincided with a decision they had made already, or, to be more precise, a decision Ellen had already enforced. However, Ellen's conversations with the field researchers and subsequently with me raised a number of difficulties that I thought you should be aware of.
We support this decision, but it is not without its costs:

(1) The field researchers have established positive working relations with the community planners -- Marshall in Baltimore, Steve in Atlanta, and Howard in Milwaukee. Each of these men know that we are writing up our observations to date, and each is eager to see what we've come up with.
As a matter of pure courtesy we should show them what we're in the process of writing.

(2) Beyond courtesy, we need their help in correcting obvious errors of fact that even the most careful research sometimes fails to avoid.

(3) A third difficulty is that the field researchers need feedback on how they are doing. I don't mean a pat on the back, I mean they need to hear an opinion from one of their subjects about whether they're focusing on the right issues and making helpful observations. This feedback will help them and us make better decisions about how to adjust their roles.

(4) You'll recall that Steve Gelfand explicitly asked to see the Atlanta report in draft form. This isn't an unsurmountable problem because we can say, with honesty, that the reports will still be in draft form as long as we show them to someone in the communities before we finalize them, even if we hold them back at the present time.

(5) You may also recall Esther Leah Ritz's advice to show drafts to someone from the communities. She based her suggestion on the principle that when an evaluation is prepared, the subject should get to see it before it becomes part of the record. In holding back the reports, we are actually going against her advice (instructions?). One might say we're only showing the reports to the advisory committee at this time, but by sharing them with you and Seymour -- which is important for us to do -- we are really sharing them with CIJE before we allow a response from someone in the communities. I see this as a problem. At a minimum, I should probably contact Esther and tell her how we are proceeding don't you think?

* * * * * *

So I think these are the costs of our decision. My fondest hope is that when you receive the reports in the middle of next week, you'll see that they are at most, helpful, and at worst, harmless, and you'll feel that we can show them to Marshall, Steve, and Howard, respectively, as DRAFT REPORTS for their eyes only and for their comments. Yours,
Adam

Received: by HUJIVMS via NJE (HUyMail-V6k); Wed, 20 Jan 93 15:42:28
+0200
Received: from RL.IB by UKACRL.BITNET (Mailer R2.07) with BSMTP id
8704; Wed,
20 Jan 93 13:38:08 GMT
Received: from RL.IB by UK.AC.RL.IB (Mailer R2.07) with BSMTP id
0305; Wed, 20
Jan 93 13:38:07 GMT
Via: UK.AC.ED.ERCVAX; 20 JAN 93 13:38:04 GMT
Date: Wed, 20 JAN 93 13:38:34
From: EKJC68@ERCVAX.EDINBURGH.AC.UK
To: annette@hujivms
Subject: what I meant to add yesterday
Sender: JANET "EKJC68@UK.AC.EDINBURGH.ERCVAX"
<EKJC68@ERCVAX.EDINBURGH.AC.UK>

Annette,

Thanks for the call yesterday. Today I'm sending you two memos. This one contains a couple of items I meant to add to our conversation but which slipped my mind at the end. The next message contains my thoughts after reflecting on our call.

(1) Will the accounting and disbursement of funds move from New York to Cleveland? If so, how will this occur? I am concerned that this aspect of the transition be smooth. (A side point -- the JCCA accountants have been wonderful in setting up our accounting system and paying and reimbursing people promptly, but I have had to work hard to obtain the information I need to monitor our budget. I hope this can be maintained or improved following the transition.)

(2) You'll recall that we've had family plans to visit Israel at the end of May. For purely family reasons, we've decided to shift this visit to April, to coincide with the boys' school holiday. We are anticipating being in Israel from April 4-20. I am giving a workshop at Tel Aviv University on April 18-19. Would there be a time earlier in the period that you and I could meet? The best dates for us would probably be April 7 or 8, but our schedule is not fully set yet. I hope this does not cause a hassle for you, and if you are unavailable during this time -- it coincides with Pesah (April 5-12) -- I would of course understand.
Adam

Received: by HUJIVMS via NJE (HUyMail-V6j); Fri, 15 Jan 93 19:13:04
+0200
Received: from RL.IB by UKACRL.BITNET (Mailer R2.07) with BSMTP id
3010; Fri,
15 Jan 93 17:12:13 GMT
Received: from RL.IB by UK.AC.RL.IB (Mailer R2.07) with BSMTP id
8134; Fri, 15
Jan 93 17:12:05 GMT
Via: UK.AC.ED.ERCVAX; 15 JAN 93 17:12:00 GMT
Date: Fri, 15 JAN 93 17:12:25
From: EKJC68@ERCVAX.EDINBURGH.AC.UK
To: annette@hujivms
Subject: board meeting and field researcher reports
Sender: JANET "EKJC68@UK.AC.EDINBURGH.ERCVAX"
<EKJC68@ERCVAX.EDINBURGH.AC.UK>

Annette,

I'm writing about two issues:

BOARD MEETING
I've been giving more thought to the February board meeting and the question of my participation. Here's what I'm thinking: If my role there would be to report on the evaluation project, i.e., say what we've done so far, what we're doing next, and answer questions, I think Ellen can do that absolutely just as well as I can, so I would prefer not to attend. If you have in mind a presentation of some of our findings, e.g. the summary report which will make comparisons among the communities, or any recommendations we present which the board would wish to take up, then I think my presence would be more important. In other words, I'm not needed just to report on the evaluation process, but if the content of the evaluation is at issue, then I feel responsible and would attend.

I suggest that we wait a few weeks to see how the reports turn out and make a decision at that time. You probably haven't decided on the agenda for the board meeting yet so that gives more time.

FIELD RESEARCHER REPORTS

Ellen and I have read and critiqued the first drafts of the field reports.
We are applying what we call the "Seymour test": Could Seymour Fox have written these reports without ever having visited the communities? Only if the answer is no, do the reports have a chance to be informative, both to the communities and to the CIJE.

Ellen and the field researchers are meeting in Nashville next week to revise the reports. We will then send them to our advisory panel, and ask for responses in one week's time. We will also send them to you, even though you are not a mere advisor any more!

Ellen and I will decide next week whether the reports are worth sharing with the communities. I think the answer is going to be yes. Assuming it is, I would like to send each draft report to one person in its respective community, for his/her eyes only, with a request for a meeting with the field researcher one week hence, to discuss the following:

(a) Are there any obvious errors of fact or interpretation?
(b) Is this likely to be helpful to your community's planning efforts? What revisions might make it more helpful?
(c) What direction can future reports take that would be helpful to you?

Do you want to leave it to the field researchers to identify the one person in their communities with whom they will discuss the draft reports?
I think they all know who they'd go to. Or do you want to give us instructions about that?

P.S. The reports are fairly innocuous. They are mostly descriptive. They
do highlight some key issues that confront each community, and in that sense I think they are going to be helpful. The reports would fail the "Seymour test" in the sense that if he listed 12 problems, he would not miss any of those identified by the communities. But he would not necessarily know which three are most central in each community, nor would he know how the key issues relate to their contexts. And I don't think the federation leaders know that already either. So that's why I think the reports will be useful to the communities.

I am confident that the reports, and the summary report being prepared by Ellen and me, will be potentially useful to CIJE, i.e. you, Shulamith, Art, and Barry.

Shabbat shalom,

Received: from RL.IB by UK.AC.RL.IB (Mailer R2.07) with BSMTP id
1206; Mon, 04
Jan 93 13:39:00 GMT
Via: UK.AC.ED.ERCVAX; 4 JAN 93 13:38:58 GMT
Date: Mon, 4 JAN 93 13:39:25
From: EKJC68@ERCVAX.EDINBURGH.AC.UK
To: annette@hujivms
Subject: February meetings
Sender: JANET "EKJC68@UK.AC.EDINBURGH.ERCVAX"
<EKJC68@ERCVAX.EDINBURGH.AC.UK>

Annette,

Sorry I didn't let you know I received your message last week.

My lack of response was due to a combination of the time of year, and my taking the message home for discussion. (I have no modem at home this year.) As you know I have carefully avoided making any trips out of the UK this year. The reason for this is because it does not seem fair to bring my family to Scotland and leave them here while I fly around to meetings.

As things have turned out, I've been much more involved with CIJE than I originally thought I would be this year. I am enjoying my involvement and find it very stimulating. Nonetheless, I would rather avoid the trip to New York unless it is critical for the long-term needs of the project. As I understand it, my role at the meeting would be to make a brief presentation on the progress of the Evaluation project, and answer questions. Do I understand correctly? Is this not something Ellen could do with equal effectiveness? Or am I missing something?

I agree it would be a good time to review the project. This might also be something Ellen could participate in, although if she comes to New York she may not have the time to go to Chicago also.
I would definitely not be able to make a prolonged trip to both New York and
Chicago in February.
Thanks VERY much for giving me so much lead time to make a decision about this.

Adam

```
Received: by HUJIVMS (HUyMail-V6j); Sat, 02 Jan 93 22:14:17 +0200
Date:      Sat,  2 Jan 93 22:13 +0200
From:       <ANNETTE@HUJIVMS>
To:        EKJC68@ERCVAX.EDINBURGH.AC.UK
Cc:        annette@hujivms
Subject:   Re: data gathering after January

Dear Adam,

I sent again last week's message -- since I do not know
if the lack of response is due to vacation time, busy time
or simply a message never received.

We are now thinking of a possible meeting with COleman
during those same February days, since Mike Inbar will
also be in the US.  Wouldn't it be great to review the project

Hit <CR> for next page, : to skip to next part....
BMAIL>
 [2J [H
at that time?

Best Regards,
Happy New Year,

Annette
```

Ellen, let's you and I now work out a way of letting the field

Received: by HUJIVMS via NJE (HUyMail-V6j); Thu, 17 Dec 92 11:18:33 +0200
Received: from RL.IB by UKACRL.BITNET (Mailer R2.07) with BSMTP id 3516; Thu,
 17 Dec 92 09:17:37 GMT
Received: from RL.IB by UK.AC.RL.IB (Mailer R2.07) with BSMTP id 9129; Thu, 17
 Dec 92 09:17:36 GMT
Via: UK.AC.ED.ERCVAX; 17 DEC 92 9:14:32 GMT
Date: Thu, 17 DEC 92 09:14:48
From: EKJC68@ERCVAX.EDINBURGH.AC.UK
To: annette@hujivms
Subject: data gathering after January
Sender: JANET "EKJC68@UK.AC.EDINBURGH.ERCVAX"
<EKJC68@ERCVAX.EDINBURGH.AC.UK>

I like Ellen's idea about shadowing, but I would not abandon the educators unless we are sure it is interfering with implementation, for the reasons I listed (need for baseline data) and for the reason Annette added (need to learn about education in the community).
But as Ellen points out, it's difficult to know beforehand who's "in" the CIJE and who isn't.
For those who aren't, we don't want to ask questions about lead communities, but we have to introduce ourselves somehow, and we need to avoid giving the false impression that the field researchers ARE the CIJE or that lead communities is primarily a research project. We will have to work this out carefully,
in concert with the implementation plans, in January.

Ellen, let's you and I now work out a way of letting the field researchers know what's going on.
I'm thinking of presenting it as an issue about which we'd like their advice.

Received: by HUJIVMS via NJE (HUyMail-V6j); Wed, 16 Dec 92 19:45:13 +0200
Received: from ctrvax.Vanderbilt.Edu by ctrvax.Vanderbilt.Edu (PMDF #3172) id
Date: 16 Dec 1992 11:41:11 -0600 (CST)
From: GOLDRIEB0VUCTRVAX
Subject: Re: (Annette, could you pass this on to Seymour also? Thanks.)
To: ANNETTE@HUJIVMS.BITNET
Cc: ekjc68@ercvax.edinburgh.ac.uk
Message-id: <01GSDR3731KM8WWUNM@ctrvax.Vanderbilt.Edu>
X-Envelope-to: ANNETTE@HUJIVMS.BITNET
X-VMS-To: IN%"ANNETTE0HUJIVMS.BITNET"
X-VMS-Cc: IN%"ekjc68@ercvax.edinburgh.ac.uk"
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

Hi Annettee and Adam,

I have received both of your memos and would like to respond with some questions, perhaps, more than answers.

In regard to thsi first issue, I agree the option b seems to be the best , however, I am concerned that in practice, it will or may leave us in a smilar situation to where we are now.
It will be very difficult to define apriori, before an interview who is really committed to CIJE
or maybe the FR or others may think they are, but it comes across that they are not. In addition, how will we define educators, some Rabbis (for example in Atlanta) are also educational directors, etc.
And thirdly,
we still have the risk of the FR talking to educators who still have ho idea what a LC is, or what Cije is etc.

As I mentioned, I am raising some concerns , whether this option will adequately help us with the current situation.

I would suggest, that an alternative would be to try to work with Seymours
suggestion about an input model. Perhaps the FR could "shadow" and monitor only those people, events, etc that are directly involved with CIJE , in other words focusing on specific "inputs". I think this would hellp keep the evaluation focused on what is actually happening in the LC's rather than turning the evaluation into an implementation issue, which is what is happening now, as I understand it. This may help clarify the link between the evaluation and the implmentation in the eyes of the lc's as well.
I realize that this alternative does not allow us to collect
as much baseline data, so maybe we would to try to incorporate
these two models somehow. My point is, I agree with Anneetee, as your implementation
activities become clear and begin, we need to see what the impact, reaction
etc is to them according to the "constituencies or audiences" of each activity.

Imthe short term, I agree with both of you that we need to alert the FR's to an upcoming change. We can ask them to hold off on interviews until you, ARt etc have finalized plans for implementation, and until adam and I have had a chance to review their initial drafts of the reports, or we can ask them to focus on jewish educational systems im their communities only for collecting baseline data.

I look forward to hearing from you both, especially if you want
me to say anything the the FR before I leave here. Annette, we will
be able to continue our discussions face to face and I will
call you upon arriavel to set up our specific timelines.

In summary, I want to perhaps clarify a point which I may not have made clear, we touched upon it over the phone, if we want to the FR to monitor, and provide feedback on implementation, we have to
clarify a system of communication so they know what is happening in the LC. At present, this is not systematic from CIJE's part or the LC's part.
These discussions have been very helpful for me.

Bye Bye, Ellen.

[[m

Received: by HUJIVMS (HUyMail-V6j); Wed, 16 Dec 92 13:26:12 +0200
Date: Wed, 16 Dec 92 13:15 +0200
From: <ANNETTE@HUJIVMS>
To: EKJC68@ERCVAX.EDINBURGH.AC.UK
Cc: goldrieb@vuctrvax,
annette@hujivms
Subject: Re: (Annette, could you pass this on to Seymour also? Thanks.)

Dear Adam,

It was wonderful to receive your E-mail, with its so clear formulation of our common understandings and concerns I would like to respond immediately.

As regards the first issue -- i.e. with whom, when and how do evaluators talk about what -- we here concurr with your

advice and think that option b) is probably the preferred one at this time (subject to ongoing revision). I would just like to add that a major purpose in addition to the ones you state is to allow the field researchers to learn more about the Jewish educational system -- educators institutions and programs.

We also think that it is probably wise to alert the field researchers and thus to miniumise the danger of misunderstanding on their part. They may also have useful insights for us.

Which leeds us to the next point -- the report. Here too we are in agreement. I just wonder if project directors (who - by the way - may be people other than the current planners) should see the draft before or after Art has seen it.

As to the implementation question. At this point we still need to overcome preliminary hurdles or stumbling blocks -- things that have not yet been appropriately addressed:

- getting leadership on board and involved
getting agreement on the project
- getting dedicated staff
- getting the local commission launched

We have of course an action plan, and preparations are
moving ahead on all elements
e.g. pilot projects for early implementation
best practices
planning and self-study guidelines
etc....
but these and other cannot make their conrtribution
before a green light of sorts is given locally.
We are working on several fronts to get this done
Both Mort and Art will be here the whole of next
week, at which point we will take decisions.

That's it for implementation thinking - which may
or may not include whoops and other modes of communication.

Before signing off - two more points:
working with me on this project is Shmuel Wygoda,
a colleague who has joined the Institute staff in
as senuior researcher. He was with us in the
US this past month and will be in on our
future communications since he and I work on
this project together.

Ellen hello, this should have read
Dear Ellen and Adam"
Allas I do not know how to edit the thing = so you
get cc'd until I know better... sorry.

Warm regards to both of you. We look forward to hearing
more and to seeing Ellen.

Annette

Received: by HUJIVMS via NJE (HUyMail-V6j); Tue, 15 Dec 92 12:09:38 +0200
15 Dec 92 10:08:57 GMT
Via: UK.AC.ED.ERCVAX; 15 DEC 92 10:08:48 GMT GMT
Date: Tue, 15 DEC 92 10:09:02
From: EKJC68@ERCVAX.EDINBURGH.AC.UK
To: annette@hujivms
Subject: (Annette, could you pass this on to Seymour also? Thanks.)
Sender: JANET "EKJC68@UK.AC.EDINBURGH.ERCVAX"
<EKJC68@ERCVAX.EDINBURGH.AC.UK>

December 15, 1992

Dear Seymour, Annette, and Ellen,

It was nice to talk with you last night. Wouldn't it be something if we all lived in the same city and could meet regularly! I bet we'd get a lot done. As it is we'll have to make do with infrequent conversations.

In this message, I'll first summarize what I took to be the main points from our discussion. Then I'll suggest some possible future directions that may be suitable for the next phase of the lead communities project. Hopefully my suggestions will take account of the actual state of affairs in the communities to date.

I think two main points emerged:

(1) In many cases, important members of the lead communities are having as their first introduction to the CIJE, an interview with the field researchers. This is creating some awkward situations, and may be making it more difficult to provide an effective introduction through the implementation side of the project.

(2) If the field researchers prepare reports that are not useful -- for example, if they state the obvious, such as "few people know what a lead community is" -- there is a danger that the funders of and/or participants in the project will, justifiably, complain that we are spending money on researchers which we should be spending on programs.

My reflections on these points are as follows:

The first issue is very serious. Obviously we must not allow the evaluation work to impede the implementation in any way. I think the short-term solution to this issue is straightforward: After this week, we are finished interviewing for the time being. We then have a period of reflection, during which the field researchers will be processing the information they have gathered so far. This period will give us the time to decide to whom they should and should not talk over the next several months. Possible longer-term decisions are:

- (a) talk only with persons leading the local CIJE effort
- (b) talk with the above, and talk with educators also, but don't ask anyone about CIJE who isn't already committed to CIJE
- (c) talk with everyone who will talk to us, as originally planned

Any other possibilities? Provisionally, I favor (b). The reason for continuing to talk to educators would be to collect baseline information about their professional lives, and to monitor changes in their views about the future of Jewish education in their communities. But we do not need to decide this until January.

It would be helpful if we could alert the field researchers to this issue. I don't know if they are planning to conduct an interview here and there after this week -- if so we will need to tell them to stop. More generally, it is advisable to let them know what's going on if possible.

Issue number (2) has always been with us. It is, in fact, the reason I have been pushing so hard for a report at the end of January -- I want to show, or at least find out, if the evaluation team can be useful to the implementors as soon as possible. I think we settled on our short-term strategy for this issue over the phone: The field researchers will write their reports, and Ellen and I will read them and decide whether or not to give them to the advisory committee. If we and the advisory committee believe they are likely to be useful, we will give them to the CIJE. If we decide to release them, we will give local CIJE project directors a chance to react before we finalize the reports.

I think there is a good chance the reports will be useful to the communities. The field researchers see themselves as working to elicit information that will be helpful to community members -- that is the audience they see themselves as addressing. But we have all agreed, as far back as my meeting in Jerusalem last June, that we will not release anything that would be harmful to the implementation. I do not see any need to raise this issue with the field researchers, at least not directly. I think they know I've been pushing for reports so that we can make a contribution.

It would be helpful to know what steps are contemplated to expand the implementation of the project within the communities. Are you going to go to each community and whoop it up, make a big splash about being a lead community? Are you going to try a softer approach, building a coalition quietly before you try to bring it all together? Or what? This decision will guide the evaluation project to an important extent. Is there any information we can provide you that will help you make this decision? I'd have thought you'd like to know how far the lead community coalition actually extends in each community -- as opposed to how far it appeared to extend in the proposal -- but perhaps you know that already. (I don't, but I haven't been there.) Is there any other information we can pull together that would help you

decide on the next step?
I look forward to your reactions -- first, I'd like to know whether I've summarized the main concerns correctly, and second, I'd appreciate any suggestions about what we should do in light of the concerns.

Best,

Adam

```
2JHl EKJC680ERCVAX.EDINBURGH.AC.UK => annette@hujivms; 13/11/92, 18:18:37; M EKJC68
.MAIL
    EBCDIC (EKJC680ERCVAX.EDINBURGH.AC.UK)
1mMIME type: text/plain

Received: by HUJIVMS via NJE (HUyMail-V6j); Fri, 13 Nov 92 18:18:37 +0200
Received: from RL.IB by UKACRL.BITNET (Mailer R2.07) with BSMTP id 0661; Fri,
 13 Nov 92 16:18:11 GMT
Received: from RL.IB by UK.AC.RL.IB (Mailer R2.07) with BSMTP id 0070; Fri, 13
 Nov 92 16:12:52 GMT
Via:       UK.AC.ED.ERCVAX; 13 NOV 92 15:36:44 GMT
Date:      Fri, 13 NOV 92 15:36:50
From:      EKJC680ERCVAX.EDINBURGH.AC.UK
To:        annette@hujivms
Subject:   anticipated content of first reports -- for discussion
Sender: JANET "EKJC680UK.AC.EDINBURGH.ERCVAX"
        <EKJC680ERCVAX.EDINBURGH.AC.UK>
```

CIJE Evaluation Project   ADAM

Hit <CR> for next page, : to skip to next part.....
BMAIL>
Anticipated Content of First Reports
November, 1992

COMMENTS WELCOME

The first reports from the monitoring, evaluation, and feedback project are due at the end of January, 1993. The reports, one for each community, will be based on initial visits to the communities during November-December 1992. Each local CIJE director will receive the report on his/her community, and the field researchers will be available to present relevant portions of the reports orally to appropriate groups within the communities. A summary report will also be prepared for the CIJE staff and board subcommittee on evaluation.

What will the reports contain? The task of the evaluation project during the CIJE's first year is to monitor the process

Hit <CR> for next page, : to skip to next part.....
BMAIL>
of becoming a lead community, with attention to emerging visions of Jewish education, and a focus on the "enabling elements" described in A Time to Act: community mobilization, and the professional lives of educators. The reports will serve as "mirrors" to the community, displaying the current state of Jewish education and the ongoing efforts to improve it. The first reports will be primarily descriptive rather than analytic, and we anticipate discussion of the following areas:

Description of the community and its education system

```
(1) The community as a whole: What is the character of this
Jewish community?  What do some of its leaders perceive as
important strengths and resources upon which to build?

(2) Education system: What is the structure of Jewish
education in this community?  What institutions are involved,
and, roughly, what is the nature of their personnel?

Becoming a lead community
(1) Preparation:  What motivated participants to become

Hit <CR> for next page, : to skip to next part.....
BMAIL>
2dUolved in the lead community proposal?  What did/do they
hope to gain--for their own communities, and for American
Jewry more generally?  Who was involved in the proposal-
writing process?  How, if at all, has participation in the
local CIJE effort changed since then?  What does the concept
of a "lead community" mean to members of this community?

(2) Mobilization:  Who is presently involved in the
community's CIJE effort?  Who is not involved?  What role do
educators play in the CIJE, and/or what role is envisioned for
them?  To what extent are diverse groups represented in the
local CIJE efforts?  What attempts are underway to broaden
financial support for Jewish education?

(3) Visions:  Who in the community has given thought to goals
for Jewish education?  What programs are envisioned or newly
established?  What is the diversity of views about the desired
future of Jewish education in this community?  To what extent
are these views seen as attainable?

Challenges to the community

Hit <CR> for next page, : to skip to next part.....
BMAIL>
ZBKis section will focus on issues that emerge as key
 'hallenges to the efforts to establish a broad=based planning
process for community=wide improvement of Jewish education.
For example, the need to develop visions for Jewish education,
or to draw educators into the local CIJE effort, might turn
out to be important issues.  This section is based on the
premise that the CIJE lead communities project is more than
"just another project;" its goal is fundamental, systemic
invigoration of Jewish education in these communities and,
ultimately, throughout North America.
BMAIL>
Current message filed in MAIL folder
Message #1 was deleted.
BMAIL> reply
No current message
BMAIL> select mail
Current folder is mail, 2 messages selected
BMAIL> select
Current folder is MANDEL, 3 messages selected
BMAIL> dir
2JH                                 => MANDEL <=
#  Date               From     Size   Fmt   L  FileN          Subject
======================================================================
```

SIGNIFICANT POINTS FROM ADAM GAMORAN'S PAPER

ON LESSONS FROM THE NEW FUTURES INITIATIVE FOR THE CIJE

1. MUCH MORE TIME SHOULD HAVE BEEN INVESTED FROM THE BEGINNING IN DEVELOPING COLLABORATIVE RELATIONSHIPS AND COORDINATING EFFORTS: page 5: "...James Van Vleck, chair of the collaborative in Dayton: "As we've sobered up and faced the issues, we have found that getting collaboration between those players is a much more complicated and difficult game than we expected". Part of the difficulty lay in not spending enough time and energy building coalitions and consensus at the outset. Otis Johnson, who leads the Savannah collaborative, is quoted as saying: "If we had used at least the first six months to plan and do a lot of bridge-building and coordination that we had to struggle with through the first year, I think it would have been much smoother."

page 8: Those involved in New Futures believe they should have spent more time building coalitions and establishing strategies before introducing new programs...Institutional change cannot be changed by fiat, but only through a slow process of mutual consultation and increasing commitment.

2. WHAT EACH LEAD COMMUNITY SHOULD BE ABLE TO ANSWER, pages 6-7: "Although New futures provided general guidelines, no particular programs were specified... Each lead community must be able to answer the question, "how should students' and educators' daily lives be different?"

3. IN RESPONSE TO CYNICISM ABOUT POSSIBILITIES OF FIGHTING AGAINST THE TIDE: "Jewish educators would be quite correct to claim that if North American youth fail to remain Jewish, it is largely due to circumstances beyond the educators' control. But this is besides the point. At issue is not external impediments, but how educational and social agencies can respond to changing external circumstances. In New Futures cities, educators have mainly attempted to get students to fitexisting institutions. If CIJE communities do the same, their likelihood of failureis equally great. Instead, lead communities must consider changes in their organizational structures and underlying assumptions to meet the needs of a changing Jewish world."

4. THE IMPORTANCE OF BLANCING ENTHUSIASM WITH PLANNING: page 9: If "lead communities" is a twenty-year project, surely it is worth taking a year or more for presentation. Deliberation at the planning stage creates a risk that momentum will be lost, and it may be important to take steps to keep enthusiasm high, but the lesson of New Futures show that enthusiasm must not overtake careful planning."

Adam's responses to tentative questions:

THE UNIVERSITY OF EDINBURGH

CENTRE for EDUCATIONAL SOCIOLOGY
Department of Sociology

The University of Edinburgh
7 Buccleuch Place
Edinburgh EH8 9LW
Scotland

Fax UK (031) 668 3263
Email CES@uk.ac.edinburgh
Telephone UK (031) 650 1000
or direct dial UK (031) 650 4186/4187

September 9, 1992

Dr. Julie Tammivaara
South 4319 Miami
Spokane, WA 99223

Dear Julie,

I was so pleased to receive your letter with the draft of the interview questions. I think the team is making excellent progress. I've taken a few extra days to respond since you've given me a lot to respond to!

I'd like to raise three general issues, and then a few specific points about each section:

GENERAL QUESTIONS
(1) All three lists of questions are termed "Questions for Jewish Educators." Yet questions about vision and about mobilization need to be asked of a broader set of respondents, including professional and lay leaders in communal organizations, parents/congregants, members of JCC's, perhaps unaffiliated Jews, etc. How will you handle these different audiences? Will you develop separate protocols for each category? I'm sure that many of the same questions can be asked of different types of persons, but some questions might be more appropriate for educators than for other respondents. Particularly in the questions about vision, we need to think about varied ways of approaching the subject.

Perhaps we should step back and lay out the possible different categories of interviewees. These might be:

professional educators (mainly teachers and principals)
rabbis (who are educators to varying degrees)
students (would need to limit this: e.g. secondary only?)
parents of students
congregants who are not parents
    --especially lay leaders of congregations
JCC members
professional leaders of communal organizations (eg, Fed, JCC)
lay leaders of communal organizations
persons unaffiliated with congregations and JCC's

I want to raise some questions about this list. First, what have I left out? Second, how are we going to prioritize conducting interviews with persons in these groups? Will we omit some of them? Which ones? Third, how will the interview questions be modified for these groups of respondents?

As a first cut, let me go back to the methods section of my "tentative plan" which I presented in August. I listed three starting points from which we would snowball outward:

(1) Key actors involved in the l.e. proposal
(2) Leaders of community organizations involved in education
(3) Random samples of lay persons not included in (1) or (2)

If we follow this plan, we would first need interview questions for professional and lay leaders of communal organizations, professional educators and rabbis, and lay leaders of congregations. (Perhaps lay leaders of communal organizations could have the same interview questions as lay leaders of congregations.) This plan gives lower priority to interviewing students.

This discussion leads me to conclude that you will need three versions of the questions about vision, and possibly mobilization:

(a) questions for educators
(b) questions for other professionals
(c) questions for lay persons, including leaders of communal organizations and of congregations, parents, etc.

Time permitting, there could be a fourth version of the questions about vision for students.

How does this sound to you? I'd be happy to hear about alternative approaches. I'm sure there will be a lot of overlap among these versions of the questions--perhaps the main difference would be in the way you introduce the questions.

(2) There are a lot of questions here!! I am concerned about the length of the interviews, particularly for educators, who would presumably be responding to all three sections. How can these questions be prioritized? Here are a couple of alternate ideas:

(a) Ask only the visions questions in the Nov.-Dec. visits. In the Jan.-Apr. visits, ask the mobilization and professionalism questions of persons interviewed previously, and ask the visions questions of a broader sample. In the May-June visits, ask again about visions and mobilization (to monitor changes), and ask about professionalism from a broader sample.
(b) From a limited sample, ask about all three subjects in the Nov.-Dec. visits.

(Non-educators would not be asked about professionalism.) Broaden the sample and ask about all three subjects in Jan.-Apr. For the May-June visits, return to key respondents to monitor changes in vision and mobilization.

My concern with plan (b) is that there would be a lot of questions for one round of interviews. Of course, many variations on these ideas are possible. For example, you could follow plan (a) but add mobilization questions numbers 1 - 7 for the Nov.-Dec. interviews. I hope you will discuss these and other plans that you devise and let me know what you intend to do.

(3) Do you have any plans to pilot the questions? I urge you to do so. The easiest thing is to try them out on each other, and that is certainly a good way to start. But I suggest finding some interview subjects outside the lead communities who would be willing to help out by responding to the questions. As you well know, practice interviews of realistic subjects will help prepare you for the kinds of responses you may receive in the L.c.'s. In addition, practicing the interviews will show if I am right to be concerned about the length of the interviews.

SPECIFIC QUESTIONS

Generally I think you've devised some high-quality questions. A few reactions:

Vision questions:

Obviously you need some sort of warm-up here, and as I noted above, the warm-up will likely be different for different categories of respondents. Non-educators will have much less to say about these questions. What sort of probes can we devise to help them along? For example:

> What should Jewish education in this community look like in five years? How does that differ from what exists today?
>
> What kind of Jewish education would you like your children or grandchildren to receive? Is that type of education available today? (If not): What changes are needed to bring that about?

Mobilization questions:

Again, some sort of introduction is needed. What is the process referred to in question 1?

What are the points behind questions 8 and 9? (I can make some guesses, but I'd like to hear your views. I'm not criticizing, just wondering.)

I think question #13 is great. Why does it come under mobilization? Does it link up with the visions questions?

What do we mean by "policy and funding decisions" in question #16? We definitely need to know this, but I wonder if we need a more subtle way of asking it.

Professionalization questions:
We've been using "professionalization" and "professionalism" as a shorthand for referring to this topic. Let's not lose sight of the fact that most Jewish educators are not full-time professionals, and many are not making a career of Jewish education. Nor should we take it as given that this is a goal of the reform of Jewish education. So let's use our shorthand, but remember that, more accurately, these questions are about the professional lives of educators, i.e. the conditions under which they work and the efforts they expend. We can take it as a given that one goal is to improve the professional lives of educators--that is a required element of A Time to Act.

Unlike the other sections, these questions are clearly intended only for educators. Questions for non-educators about the professional lives of educators would come under vision.

At the beginning of this section (or elsewhere), we need to establish some basic background information such as how much they teach/administer, what their subjects are if they are teachers, how long they've been Jewish educators, etc.

Generally I think these questions get at the heart of the matter. Someone should review the Los Angeles Jewish Teachers Survey--and any other community teacher survey--to see if there are other ideas.

****

I hope these responses are helpful, and that you can discuss them in upcoming weekly conference calls as well as in group meetings. I just heard from Ellen that the first "official" team visit may be to Atlanta in late October, so that leaves about five weeks to address these issues and polish the questions. I would appreciate the opportunity to respond at least once more to the next draft of the questions and to any decisions you make regarding which sections to ask of whom at what point in the year. If time gets short, remember that you can reach me by fax.

Thanks much for keeping me up-to-date.

Best,

Adam

cc: Roberta, Claire, Ellen, Annette

Roberta Goodman
Claire Rottenberg
Julie Tammivaara

Questions for Jewish Educators

20 August 1992

VISION

VISION From Old French *videre*, to see.

To have vision implies the ability to see things as they are, as they can be, and as they should be. A visionary thinks beyond the present; ideas have a shape; persistence is crucial. Vision and visionary can denote both qualities of unusual discernment (positive) and of unrealistic fantasy (negative). Where the line is drawn may depend upon realization; that is, when the vision is realized, its holder is redeemed. To see things as they are is a skill; as they can be is a political one, and as they should be is a moral issue.

1. What is the purpose of Jewish education?

2. Describe changes you have seen in Jewish education over the years.

    a. What beliefs have been confirmed?
    b. What beliefs have been challenged?

3. What is your vision of Jewish education? (*Probe* for specifics in organization, process, outcome, clients, etc.)

4. How shared is your vision with others?

5. Who does not share your vision? Why?

6. What is needed to realize your vision?

7. Realistically, what could be achieved in the next five years or so?

8. Who and what are your sources of influence? (*Probe*: reading, talking, workshops, courses, etc.)

9. What are two or three Jewish precepts that have guided you?

10. What are some important precepts that particularly apply to Jewish education or schooling? (*Probe*: give some alternatives.)

Roberta Goodman
Claire Rottenberg
Julie Tammivaara

Questions for Jewish Educators

20 August 1992

MOBILIZATION

n.b. Need to keep in mind who are the mobilizers, who are the mobilized.

1. Who is involved in the process?

2. Who is the "driver?"

3. What has been done to get people involved in Jewish life in your community?

4. What would you like to see done? (Alternative: What should have been done?)

5. How do strategies differ for different categories of people? (For example, families with young children, families with grown children, families with no children, singles, intermarried couples, etc.)

6. In what ways do you feel connected to the Jewish community?

7. When do you (or in what ways do you) feel alienated from the Jewish community? (Probe: What makes you proud/ashamed of the community?)

8. What does Israel mean to you? (Get at unconditional versus conditional support issue, religious vs. national issue, etc.)

9. What are the major threats to the survival of the Jews in this country? Worldwide?

10. What constitutes support for Jewish education? (Probe: resources, people, attitudes, etc.)

11. What signs would indicate to you things were improving in Jewish education?

12. What would inspire you to become even more involved in Jewish education?

13. Many adults criticize their early Jewish education. Why do you think this is so?

14. Who is not reached by your community's efforts to increase involvement?

15. Who chooses not to become involved? Why?

16. Who shapes policy and funding decisions about Jewish education?

14. Who is not reached by your community's efforts to increase involvement?

15. Who chooses not to become involved? Why?

16. Who shapes policy and funding decisions about Jewish education?

Roberta Goodman
Claire Rottenberg
Julie Tammivaara

Questions for Jewish Educators

20 August 1992

PROFESSIONALIZATION:

1. At what point did you make a definite decision to become an educator?
(*Probe*: what were specific circumstances at the time?)

2. What were the main attractions the job held for you?

3. What people were influential in your decision to become an educator?
(*Probe*: Family, Friends, Other Educators, Others?)

4. Thinking back to when you decided to become an educator.... What qualities did you possess that you thought suited you to this work?

5. In what ways is your work different from what you expected when you began as an educator?

6. Tell me about your formal schooling.

   a. Grammar school
   b. High school
   c. College
   d. Non-formal training

7. How long have you held your current position?

8. What positions (and for how long) did you hold before this one? (Affirm non-paying, non-institutional work.)

9. How many other educators work with you?

10. How long have each of them held their current position?

11. Imagine you were having a conversation with a prospective educator. How would you describe what you do? (*Probe*: frustrations and benefits of work as well as content.)

12. What would you tell prospective students and parents about your educational program?

13. Think for a moment about your fellow educators.

    a. When and where do you interact with them? (*Probe*: singly or in groups)
    b. How are educators as a group perceived by others?
    c. How do others show they respect (or do not respect) you?

14. What salary and/or benefits do you receive?

15. Looking ahead, what career opportunities do you see for yourself?

16. What career opportunities would you like to see made available to you?

17. What opportunities for professional growth (workshops, college courses, conferences, etc.) have you had?

18. In what areas of your work do you feel powerful? Not so powerful? (*Probe*: explain in detail)

19. Thinking back on your own Jewish education, describe a really wonderful teacher you had.

20. Describe a teacher who was not so wonderful.

21. How do lay people assist you in your work?

22. How *should* they be assisting you?

23. As you think about your work, what do you see as the main purpose(s) of Jewish education?

24. How would you like to see your students changed or transformed as a result of your teaching?

25. Describe a model 40-year-old Jewish person. (Allow for multiple descriptions.)

26. What changes have you effected in the structure of your educational program?

27. What circumstances would cause you to leave your position?

28. When was the last time you were tempted to leave? (*Probe*: What were specific circumstances? What happened?)

29. What two or three changes would significantly improve your situation?

30. What kinds of decisions do you participate in at your school? (*Probe*: specific examples.)

31. What resource materials are available to you?

32. How is curriculum chosen? Modified?

33. How has status of Jewish educators changed since you became involved either as a student or teacher?

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

Adam Gamoran
University of Wisconsin-Madison

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

January, 1992

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

In 1988, the Annie E. Casey Foundation committed about $40 million over a five-year period to fund community-wide reforms in four mid-sized cities: Dayton, Ohio; Little Rock, Arkansas; Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania; and Savannah, Georgia.[1] The reforms were aimed at radically improving the life-chances of at-risk youth, and at the core of the agenda were changes in educational systems and in relations between schools and other social service agencies. Despite major investments, not only financial but in time, energy, and good will, from participants as well as the Foundation, the New Futures Initiative has made little headway in improving education. According to a three-year evaluation:

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

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

There are striking similarities between the action plans of New Futures and the CIJE's lead communities project. Consideration of the struggles of New Futures therefore provides important lessons for the CUE which may allow us to avoid the pitfalls that New Futures has encountered. In this paper, I will describe the design and implementation of New Futures, and show its similarities to the CIJE's agenda. Next, I will summarize New Futures' successes and frustrations.[2] Finally, I will explore the implications of the New Futures experience for the CIJE.

The Design of New Futures

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

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

The New Futures Initiative differed from the CIJE in that it began with clear ideas about what outcomes had to be changed. These included increased student attendance and achievement, better youth employment prospects, and reductions in suspensions, course failures, grade retentions, and teenage pregnancies. New Futures recognized, however, that these were long-term goals, and they did not expect to see much change in these outcomes during the first few years. The three-year evaluation focused instead on intermediate goals, asking five main questions (Wehlage, Smith, and Lipman, 1991, p. 17):

> 1. Have the interventions stimulated school-wide changes that fundamentally affect all students' experiences, or have the interventions functioned more as "add-ons"...?
>
> 2. Have the interventions contributed to...more supportive and positive social relations...throughout the school?
>
> 3. Have the interventions led to changes in curriculum, instruction, and assessment...that generate higher levels of student engagement in academics, especially in problem solving and higher order thinking activities?
>
> 4. Have the interventions...give(n teachers and principals) more autonomy and responsibility...while also making them more accountable...?
>
> 5. Have the interventions brought to the schools additional material or human resources...?

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

New Futures' Limited Success

Good pt. —

New Futures' greatest achievement thus far may be the "improved capacity to gather data on youths" (Education Week, 9/25/91, p. 12). Prior to New Futures, the cities had little precise information on how the school systems were functioning. Basic data, such as dropout and achievement rates, were not calculated reliably. Establishing clear procedures for gathering information means that the cities will be able to identify key areas of need and keep track of progress. For example, the data pointed to sharp discrepancies between black and white suspension rates, and this has made suspension policies an important issue. The outcome indicators showed little change over the first three years, but they were not expected to. New Futures participants anticipated that data-gathering will pay off in the future.

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

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

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

Another example of unchanged culture was manifested in strategies for dealing with the suspension problem. As New Futures began, it was not uncommon for a third of the student body in a junior high school to receive suspensions during a given school year. In some cases, suspended students could not make up work they missed; this led them to fall further behind and increased their likelihood of failure. In response, several schools began programs of in-school suspensions. However, out-of-school suspensions remained common, and in-school suspensions were served in a harsh and punitive atmosphere that contradicted the goal of improving the schools' learning environments.

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

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

Inherent tensions in an outside intervention contributed to these difficulties. The use of policy evaluation has made some participants feel "whip-sawed around" (Education Week, 9/25/91,

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

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

Implications: How Can the CIJE Avoid Similar Frustration?

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

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

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

Changing culture as well as structure. Jewish educators are no less likely than staff in secular schools to find sources of failure outside their institutions. Indeed, the diminished (though not eradicated) threat of anti-semitism, the rise in mixed-marriage families, disillusion with Israel, and the general reduction of spirituality in American public and private life,[4] all may lower the interests of youth in their Jewishness and raise the chances of failure for Jewish education. Thus, Jewish educators would be quite correct to claim that if North American youth fail to remain Jewish, it is largely due to circumstances beyond the educators' control. But this is besides the point. At issue is not external impediments, but how educational and social agencies can respond to changing external circumstances. In New Futures cities, educators have mainly attempted to get students to fit existing institutions. If CIJE communities do the same, their likelihood of failure is equally great. Instead, lead communities must consider changes in their organizational structures and underlying assumptions to meet the needs of a changing Jewish world.

How do CUE plans address this concern? The intention to mobilize support for education, raising awareness of its centrality in all sectors of the community, is an important first step, particularly since it is expected to result in new lay leadership for education and community collaboration. New Futures' experience shows that this tactic is necessary but not sufficient. In New Futures cities, community collaboratives galvanized support and provided the moral authority under which change could take place. Yet little fundamental change occurred. Educators have not experimented much with new curricula, instructional methods, responsibilities or roles, because their basic beliefs about teaching and learning have not changed.

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

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

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

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

Conclusion

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

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

> Lo alecha ha-m'lacha ligmor, v'lo ata ben horin l'hibatel mi-menah. Ha-yom katzar v'ha-m'lacha m'rubah, v'ha-poalim atzeylim, v'ha-sahar harbeh. U-va'al ha-bayil dohek — Pirke Avot.
>
> (It is not your responsibility to finish the task, but neither are you free to shirk it. The day is short and the task is large, the workers are lazy, and the reward is great. And the Master of the House is pressing — Sayings of the Fathers.)

NOTES AND REFERENCES

1. Lawrence, Massachusetts, was originally included as well, with an additional $10 million, but it was dropped during the second year after the community failed to reach consensus on how to proceed.

2. This account relies largely on two sources. One is an Education Week news report by Deborah L. Cohen, which appeared on Sept. 25, 1991. The second is an academic paper by the Casey Foundation's evaluation team: Gary G. Wehlage, Gregory Smith, and Pauline Lipman, "Restructuring Urban Schools: The New Futures Experience" (Madison, WI: Center on Organization and Restructuring of Schools, May 1991).

3. The reforms required (or "strongly encouraged") by the Casey Foundation were site-based management, flexibility for teachers, individualized treatment of students, staff development, and community-wide collaboration. This list is longer than the CIJE's, whose required elements are building the educational profession and mobilizing community support.

4. On the decline of spirituality in America, see Robert N. Bellah et. al, Habits of the Heart (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1985).

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

Adam Gamoran

University of Wisconsin, Madison

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

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

One year later the successor to the Commission, the Council for Initiatives in Jewish Education (CIJE), is mobilizing to establish lead communities and to carry out the strategic plan.

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

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

(1) What is the *process* of change in lead communities? This question calls for field research in the lead communities. It requires a combination of qualitative and quantitative data, and offers formative as well as summative evaluation —that is, feedback as well as monitoring for the lead communities.

(2) What are the *outcomes* of change in lead communities? This question is especially challenging because the desired outcomes have yet to be defined. Hence, addressing the question requires, first, enumeration of possible outcomes, second, development of indicators for measuring selected outcomes, and third, research on the connection between programs in lead communities and the measured outcomes.

Field Research in Lead Communities

Studying the process of change in lead communities should be a major component of the CIJE strategy. Documenting the process is especially important because the effects of innovation may not be manifested for several years. For example, suppose Community X manages to quadruple its number of full-time, professionally-trained Jewish educators. How long will it take for this change to affect cognitive and affective outcomes for students? Since the results cannot be detected immediately, it is important to obtain a qualitative sense of the extent to which the professional educators are being used effectively. Studying the process is also important in the case of unsuccessful innovation.

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

Field researchers. A team of at least two full-time field researchers would be hired to carry out the field research in three lead communities. Although budgetary and personnel constraints are likely to constrain the number of researchers the CIJE is able to hire, we should be aware that the depth of monitoring, evaluation, and feedback will be related to the number of researchers supported by the CIJE. I estimate that two field researchers would be able to provide the level of detail described in this memo if there are three lead communities with an average Jewish population size of about 50,000 or smaller.

Field researchers would have the following responsibilities:

1. Supplement community self-studies with additional quantitative data, as determined following a review of the self-studies in all of the lead communities.

2. Use these data, along with interviews and observations in the field, to gain an understanding of the state of Jewish education in the community at the outset of the lead community process.

3. Attend meetings and interview participants in order to monitor the progress of efforts to improve the educational delivery system, broadly conceived.

4. Prepare informal quarterly briefs which will serve as a source of feedback for participants in the lead communities.

5. Write a nine-month report (May 1993) describing and interpreting the process and products of change to date. An important contribution of the report would be to discuss the operative goals of programs in the lead community. The report would also assess progress toward the Commission's goals, and would speak frankly about barriers to implementing the plans of the local commission. In this way, the report would serve as formative evaluation for the community and the CIJE.

6. Replicate the initial data collection a year later, and continue monitoring progress toward the commission plan.

7. Issue a 21-month report (May 1994), which would describe educational changes that occurred during the first two years, and present an assessment of the extent to which goals have been achieved. Two types of assessment would be included:

(a) Qualitative assessment of program implementation.

(b) Tabulation of changes in rates of participation in Jewish education, which may be associated with new programs.

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

The 21-month reports would serve as both formative and summative evaluation for the local commissions and the CIJE. In other words, they would not only encourage improvement in ongoing programs, but would also inform decisions about whether programs should be maintained or discontinued.

7. Field researchers would also serve as advisers to reflective practitioners in their communities (see below).

Schedule. During fall 1991, a job description and list of qualifications would be prepared. The researchers would be hired and undergo training during spring and summer 1992. During this period, further details of the monitoring and feedback system would be worked out. The fieldwork itself would begin in late summer or early fall 1992.

Director of monitoring, evaluation, and feedback. The field researchers would be guided by a director of monitoring, evaluation, and feedback. The director would be responsible for providing leadership, establishing an overall vision for the project. Further responsibilities would include making final decisions in the selection of field researchers; participating in the training of field researchers and in the development of a detailed monitoring and feedback system; overseeing the formal and informal reports from field researchers; and guiding plans for administration of surveys and tests in the lead communities.

Reflective practitioners. In each lead community, two or more reflective practitioners would be commissioned to reflect on and write about their own educational efforts. The reflective practitioners, who could be selected by their local councils, would be teachers or administrators involved in CIJE programs with reputations for excellent practice, or who are attempting to change their practices substantially.

The field researchers would supervise and advise the reflective practitioners.

Collection of achievement and attitudinal data. Although specific goals for education in lead communities have yet to be defined, it is essential to make the best possible effort to collect rudimentary quantitative data to use as a baseline upon which to build. Details of this data collection, and a plan for longitudinal follow-ups, cannot yet be specified. As an example, we might administer a Hebrew test to seventh graders in all educational institutions in the community. Seventh grade would be chosen because it is the grade that probably captures the widest participation of students who study Hebrew. The test would need to be highly inclusive, covering, for example, biblical, prayerbook, and conversational Hebrew. It may not be restricted to multiple- choice answers, in order to allow respondents to demonstrate capacity to use Hebrew as a language. The test would be accompanied by a limited survey questionnaire of perhaps twelve items, which would gauge students' attitudes and participation levels. This data collection effort would be led by a survey researcher, with assistance from the field researchers, from community members who would be hired to help administer the survey, and from specialists who would score the tests.

Development of Outcomes

It is widely recognized that the question of the outcomes of Jewish education, which was not addressed in the Commission report, cannot be avoided by the CIJE. This is not only a practical necessity, but a requirement of the research project: to evaluate the success of programs in the lead communities, one must know the criteria by which they are to be evaluated. Hence, the research project will take up the issues of (a) what are the aims of Jewish education; and (b) how can those aims, once defined, be measured?

Proposed tasks for this component of the project for thefirst two years are:

1. Commission a thought paper by an experienced professional on the outcomes of Jewish education. Guidelines for the paper would include:

    (a) The focus would be concrete rather than vague.

This might be accomplished by posing the question as,"If you were to evaluate the outcomes of Jewish education, what would you look at?"

    (b) Outcomes should be addressed in the areas of cognition, attitudes, values/beliefs, practices, and participation.

2. Distribute the paper for comments to national/continental organizations for feedback.

3. Engage the original writer to expand the paper in light of feedback received from the major organizations. The revision should include an analysis of points of agreement and disagreement among the organizations.

4. Present the revised paper to the research advisory group, posing the following questions:

(a) What do you make of this set of outcomes?

(b) How might they be measured?

The research advisory group would have two additional sources of information to consider: the operative goals of programs in lead communities, as described by field researchers in their 9-month reports; and conceptions of the educated Jew developed by the Mandel Institute.

5. Commission appropriate experts to begin selecting or creating outcome indicators.

Stimulation of Self-Contained Research Projects

At any time during the process, the CIJE may require urgent attention to specific issues of educational effectiveness. (An example might be the relative effectiveness of supplementary school and summer camp attendance for Jewish identification.) After developing an internal consensus, CIJE would either (1) issue a request for proposals on that topic, or (2) recruit and commission individual to carry out the research project.

Timeline

FIELDWORK	*OUTCOME DEVELOPMENT*
Fall 1991	create job description
Spring 1992	oversee hiring, training
Fall-Spring, 1992-93	fieldwork underway, commission paper quarterly briefs, administer surveys/tests
May 1993	9-month reports solicit responses to outcomes paper
August 1993	revised paper due meeting of advisory committee
Fall-Spring, 1993-1994	fieldwork continues, develop outcome
	quarterly briefs indicators
May 1994	21-month reports

August 1, 1992

Monitoring, Evaluation, and Feedback in Lead Communities — Tentative Plan of Work for 1992-93

I. CONTENT

For lead communities, 1992-93 will be a planning year. The agenda for the evaluation project is to raise questions that will (a) stimulate and assist the planning process; (b) enumerate the goals that lead communities intend to address; and (c) identify current practice so that progress towards goals can be assessed in the future. Broadly, the field researchers will raise three questions:

(1) What are the visions for change in Jewish education held by members of the communities? How do the visions vary across different individuals or segments of the community? How vague or specific are these visions? To what extent do these visions crystallize over the course of the planning year (1992-1993)?

(2) What is the extent of community mobilization for Jewish education? Who is involved, and who is not? How broad is the coalition supporting the CIJE's efforts? How deep is participation within the various agencies? For example, beyond a small core of leaders, is there grass-roots involvement in the community? To what extent is the community mobilized financially as well as in manpower?

(3) What is the nature of the professional life of educators in this community? Under what conditions do teachers and principals work? For example, what are their salaries, and their degree of satisfaction with salaries? Are school faculties cohesive, or fragmented? Do principals have offices? What are the physical conditions of classrooms? Is there administrative support for innovation among teachers?

Visions of reform. The issue of goals was not addressed in *A Time to Act*. The commission report never specified what changes should occur as a result of improving Jewish education, beyond the most general aim of Jewish continuity. Specifying goals is a challenging enterprise given the diversity within the Jewish community. Nonetheless, the lead communities project cannot advance —and it certainly cannot be evaluated—without a compilation of the desired outcomes.

For purposes of the evaluation project, we will take goals to mean outcomes that are desired within the lead communities. We anticipate uncovering multiple goals, and we expect persons in different segments of the community to hold different and sometimes conflicting preferences. Our aim is not to adjudicate among competing goals, but to uncover and spell out the visions for change that are held across the community. To some extent, goals that emerge in lead communities will be clearly stated by participants. Other goals, however, will be implicit in plans and projects, and the evaluation team will need to tease them out. The evaluation project will consider both short-term and long-term goals.

Another reason for focusing on visions is that a lack of clear goals has hindered the success of many previous reform efforts in general education. For example, the New Futures Initiative, an effort by the Casey Foundation to invigorate educational and community services in four inner-city communities, was frustrated by poor articulation between broad goals and specific programs. Although the communities were mobilized for reform, the connections between community leaders and front-line educators did not promote far-reaching programs for fundamental changes. New programs were generally supplemental, and they tended to produce superficial changes.

Questions related to visions include asking about anticipated obstacles, about overcoming barriers between segments of the Jewish community, and about how participants foresee moving from goals to implementation. By asking questions about visions, the evaluation project will not only document goals, but will help persons at all levels of the lead communities project —lay leaders, parents, educators, and other Jewish professionals — to think about their visions of the future. This process may lead to interactive thinking about goals, and may help the communities avoid purely top-down or bottom-up strategies.

It will be important to consider the concreteness of the visions in each community. Do the visions include a concept of implementation, or do ideas about goals remain abstract? Do participants recognize a link between their visions of change and the structure they have established to bring about change?

Community mobilization. According to *A Time to Act*, mobilizing community support for Jewish education is a "building block" of the lead communities project, a condition that is essential to the success of the endeavor. This involves recruiting lay leaders and educating them about the importance of education, as well as increasing the financial resources that are committed to education. The Report quotes one commissioner as saying, "The challenge is that by the year 2000, the vast majority of these community leaders should see education as a burning issue and the rest should at least think it is important. When this is achieved . . . money will be available to finance fully the massive program envisioned by the Commission (p. 64)."

Recent advances in educational theory also emphasize the importance of community-wide, "systemic" reform instead of innovations in isolated programs. Educational change is more likely to succeed, according to this view, when it occurs in a broad, supportive context, and when there is widespread consensus on the importance of the enterprise. Hence, an important issue for the evaluation of lead communities is the breadth and depth of participation in the project. What formal and informal linkages exist among the various agencies of the community? Which agencies participate in the visions of change that have been articulated?

As part of their applications lead communities are proposing planning processes for the first year of work. In studying mobilization in the communities, we need to observe how this planning process unfolds. Is the stated design followed? Are departures from initial plans helpful or harmful? Is there broad participation? Are the planners developing thoughtful materials? We will need to describe the decision-making process. Is it open or closed? Are decisions pragmatic or wishful?

The professional lives of Jewish educators. Enhancing the profession of Jewish education is the second critical building block specified in *A Time to Act*. The Report claims that fundamental improvement in Jewish education is not possible without radical change in areas such as recruitment, training, salaries, career tracks, and empowerment of educators. Hence, the evaluation project will establish baseline conditions which can serve as standards for comparison in future years.

Field research may center on characteristics and conditions of educators including background and training, salaries, and degree of satisfaction with salaries; school facilities; cohesiveness of school faculties cohesive; administrative support for innovation; and so on. Additionally we will observe a subset of educational programs that are in place as the lead communities project begins. These observations will be used as baseline data for comparative purposes in subsequent years. We will try to consider programs which, according to the visions articulated in the community, seem ripe for change.

II. METHODS

In the long term (e.g., four years?) it is possible to think about quantitative assessment of educational change in lead communities. This assessment would involve limited surveys that would be administered in 1993-94 and repeated perhaps every two years. For the present, the evaluation project will make only limited use of quantitative data, relying mainly on information gathered by the community itself, such as participation rates, trends in funding, teacher turnover, etc. The bulk of the assessment carried out by the evaluation project, at least during the first two years, will emphasize qualitative assessment of the process of change in lead communities. The main methodological tools will be interviews and observations.

Snowball sampling for interviews. A "snowball" technique for selecting interview respondents appears appropriate here. In this approach, the researcher identifies an initial group of respondents, and adds to the list of subjects by asking each interviewee to suggest additional respondents. At some point in an interview, for example, the researcher might ask, "Who else is involved in (program x)? Who else is a leader in this area in this community?" Subsequently, the researcher interviews some of those named by previous subjects, particularly if new subjects are named by more than one previous informant.

In the snowball approach, it is important to begin with multiple starting points, so that one does not become confined to a narrow clique within the community. We might use the following three starting points from which we would snowball outward:

(1) Key actors identified in the lead communities proposal from each community.

(2) A list of leaders of all community organizations that are involved in education, possibly prepared by the head of the local Jewish federation. The list must include leaders of any organizations that are not participating in the lead communities project.

(3) Random samples of educators and lay persons not included in (1) or (2).

These samples should clarify the social ecology of the Jewish community.

Aims of evaluation. The purpose of the evaluation, especially in the first two years, is weighted more towards developing policy than towards program accountability. Feedback on the process is seen as much more important than summative evaluation, at the present time. We suspect that most Jewish educators recognize that Jewish education is not succeeding, and will understand that the field researchers are not there to document their failures. Instead, the field researchers can serve the educators and their communities by helping them reflect on their situations and by serving as mirrors in which their programs can be viewed alongside their goals.

In one sense, the evaluation project does emphasize accountability. By the end of the first year, lead communities are expected to have well-articulated visions for change, and implementation plans developed. The evaluation project will help judge whether the processes within the lead communities are leading towards these outcomes, and will assess progress toward these general goals in the spring of 1993.