



THE JACOB RADER MARCUS CENTER OF THE
AMERICAN JEWISH ARCHIVES

MS-831: Jack, Joseph, and Morton Mandel Foundation Records, 1980 – 2008.

Series E: Mandel Foundation Israel, 1984 – 1999.

Box
D-1

Folder
2066

CIJE Goals Project correspondence and reports, 1995.

Pages from this file are restricted and are not available online. Please
contact the [American Jewish Archives](#) for more information.

**COUNCIL FOR INITIATIVES
IN
JEWISH EDUCATION**

FAX COVER SHEET

Date sent: 7/17/95

Time sent: 4:55 pm edt

No. of Pages (incl. cover): 15

To: D. Marom

From: D. Pekarsky

Organization:

Phone Number:

Phone Number: 212-532-2360

Fax Number:

Fax Number: 212-532-2646

COMMENTS:

GOALS PROJECT CONSULTATION

July 1995

Below you will find DP's attempt to articulate major decisions we made at our Sunday meeting based on our work over the last few days. In reviewing the material, please try to do the following:

1. Read it critically with an eye to catching any omissions or misrepresentations or any other problems.

2. Review it for overall soundness. Two criteria come to mind:

a. On reflection, does the proposed agenda and set of activities make good sense? Is there anything important that we should be doing missing? Or are some of the things listed not worth doing?

b. Time!

The question is not just whether there is enough time to do all these things --but whether there is enough time to do them all meaningfully. I am particularly concerned that the "kitchen-work" not get pushed aside in favor of the other activities. It may be that we will need to review the proposed set of activities with this concern in mind.

If at all possible, feedback concerning these and other pertinent matters should be pooled by the beginning of next week.

DECISIONS EMERGING OUT OF THE THREE DAYS OF DELIBERATION

Major emphases

1. Seminars, consultations, and workshops organized around the following:

Seeding the culture —bring lay and professional leaders in the field of Jewish education to a deeper appreciation of CIJE's convictions in this domain, and thus laying the ground for communal and institutional initiatives (e.g., Seminar for leadership from Affiliated Communities; Module in fall principals' seminar and at heart of spring seminar)

Meeting outstanding commitments we've made (e.g., to Baltimore, the JCC, Wexner, and possibly Atlanta and Cleveland)

Thoughtful deliberations designed to better understand the project and decide from among competing directions and projects (e.g., consultation scheduled for January, '96)

Bringing some top-notch people into the work without preconceptions concerning how they will fit in; some of the "kitchen-work" will play a significant role in this seminar (e.g. the seminar scheduled for July, '96)

2. The Kitchen

While work in this area needs to be determined based on a comprehensive plan that still needs to be worked out, we discussed some immediate projects that will need attention:

a. an inventory of existing resources in different domains.

b. a paper to be developed by NR and SF that details the ways in which Ramah is a vision-driven institution and what was necessary in the way of inputs for it to become so.

Less immediate but also discussed as possibly important kitchen work (though in need of farther consideration) were the following:

a. building maps of different content-domains.

b. monographs dealing with one or more of the following: i. "The Future As History", looking at a comprehensive and adequate approach to Jewish education in the non-Orthodox world; ii. a Jewish Sarah Lightfoot piece that looks at existing vision-guided institutions; iii) a book modelled on HORACE'S SCHOOL, detailing the process through which a fictional Jewish educating institution becomes more vision-driven.

3. Pilot Projects; Marom will continue his work with Agnon and, if it can be worked out, Pekarsky will work out an arrangement with another institution. (Toren's work with the Schechter School in Cleveland may also be pertinent here.)

Our discussion emphasized the critical importance of careful written documentation of the work that goes on in the pilot projects, as well as analyses of these experiences. Along the way, seminars designed to analyze the work being done and what is being learned would be pertinent.

4. An imperative and immediate need to develop a plan that carefully breaks down #s 1-3 and determines priorities based on their importance and on available time and resources.

Note that #s 1-4 do not include any reference to the immediate identification and education of facilitator- or coach-figures. As I understand it, we have agreed - for reasons that have in part to do with the need to develop the kitchen - to remain temporarily agnostic concerning the desirability of facilitators, our role in identifying and training them, etc. This matter will be re-approached during our January consultation.

WORK PLAN, REMAINDER OF 1995 AND 1996

July - Dec., 1995

1. Further articulate the plan for 1995 and 1996 with attention to the larger conception of the project, and with special emphasis on what's to go on in the kitchen (both short- and long-term). The plan needs to be reviewed carefully both CIJE and Mandel Institute partners to the project.
2. Planning and implementation of seminars we've committed to (Wexner, JCC, Baltimore, and possibly Atlanta)
3. Conceptualize, recruit for, and organize the seminars projected for 1996. These include the January consultation, the principals seminar, the seminar for the leadership of the affiliated communities.
4. Pilot-projects: Work-in-settings and systematic efforts to document and analyze (Pekarsky and Marom)
5. Kitchen-work: To be based on a comprehensive plan to be developed during summer of 1995. The plan will probably include a projected paper by SF and NR dealing with the conditions that made possible the development of Ramah as a vision-driven institution.
6. Module in the fall seminar for principals.

1996

1. January consultation in Jerusalem (CIJE, Mandel Institute and selected additional participants)
2. Outstanding commitment: support and/or guide Cleveland's efforts to clarify its goals for Beth Torah
2. Spring principals' seminar
3. Seminar for representatives of new affiliated communities
4. Israel Seminar in July designed to draw in potential leaders and resources (e.g. Steinberg, Paley, Hirsh, Elaine Cohen, selected rabbis)
5. Continuing kitchen work (based on plan that will soon be developed)
6. Continuing pilot project efforts (along with appropriate documentation, analysis, and discussions based on them)
7. Other activities as determined based on future deliberations, especially the January consultation.

PLEASE DISTRIBUTE THESE MATERIALS AS SOON AS POSSIBLE TO THE
INDIVIDUAL IDENTIFIED. THANKS!

MEMO TO: Alan Hoffmann and Daniel Marom ((at the Mandel Institute))

Gail Dorph, Barr Holtz, Nessa Rappaport ((CIJE, NY))

Seymour Fox ((in Jerusalem or NY))

FROM: Daniel Pekarsky

RE: Summary of our concluding session, along with the principal
decisions made.

If at all possible, please review prior to our conference
call on Monday morning, July 24.

Agenda items for our July 24 meeting include:

1. Reviewing decisions made and work-plan with attention to their
accuracy, to their wisdom, to time-constraints and to division of
labor. If necessary, prioritize. End with concrete plan of
action.
2. Milwaukee update, as well as preparation for August 1 meeting.
3. Cleveland update
4. DP's Israel plan

Dear Seymour:

I hope this letter finds you rested and in good spirits. As you requested I am writing you a summary of developments with Danny Pekarsky and the CIJE, in order to prepare you for your meetings in New York.

1. A mode of regular communication, both with Danny alone and with the whole CIJE staff, has indeed been established. It is a significant step forward. Last Thursday I had my fourth weekly (sometimes bi-weekly) call with Danny and on this Monday there will be a third telecon with the CIJE staff. This seems to be a more effective mode of work and cooperation, especially since I sense that we get heard. There are still moments in which nuances and reminders are necessary, both in person and in writing, but on the whole the meetings in Boston seem to have accomplished a lot on this level.

2. The work is focusing on closing down a workplan on the goals project in preparation for the CIJE board meetings. There is an implicit tension between Alan's need to show results and our desire for quality control, not to mention the question of how much time Danny and I need in order to do serious work. At the same time, as it becomes more clear over time, the goals project is creeping more deeply into the CIJE's larger agenda. For example, the question of goals in general and the unique goals of Jewish education in particular was brought up unwittingly by participants in and consultants to Gail's teacher-trainer group in its first meeting. The now more sensitized ears of the CIJE staff (another achievement of Boston) picked up on this, and they are asking themselves whether or not they need to introduce the goals aspect of teacher-training sooner on in this series of meetings with the teacher trainers. This seems to be out of a recognition that teacher-training and teaching are not "sciences" or "areas of technical expertise" which are divorced from content. Another pressure here is Nessa's desire to get things published, to make the power of vision and issues of content visible to the lay leaders and community at large, as part of her work in general.

In between all these concerns, what seems to be emerging - though it still waits for Alan's response and of course your own - is this: First, the goals project continues to sell vision, content, and goals to CIJE affiliates and constituencies, whether in order to meet prior and current commitments or as part of the way it talks to anybody about Jewish education (Danny has a whole list of activities in this matter). Second, between work on the "kitchen" (they are looking for a more acceptable name now in preparation for the board meetings), the pilot projects, and bringing in a select few other professionals into the deliberation on vision, content, goals, the project aspires to begin creating a basis for a systematic and broader effort a year and a half down the line. The point is that by January 1997, the goals project will have undertaken enough activities in the above three areas to consider possibilities such as setting up a center for vision, content, goals, and/or designing a systematic plan for working with communities, institutions (denominations?) on vision, content, goals.

3. *In light of this view, I have been pushing against the CIJE's propensity to want to become a provider of service*, so as to be able to show results (or feel good by simply being in the field). The point, as I see it, is to look at the workplan through the lense of developing "enabling" capacity and setting into place some kind of infrastructure for ongoing activity. Minimally, this would mean temporarily turning down future requests for goals consultations, and more ambitiously, it would mean cancelling some prior commitments. Furthermore, I have suggested the integration of the various pieces along the lines of this focus. For example, as we conceptualize the "kitchen work" and want to develop a few first pieces of it, we might want to try out those which relate to the pilot projects which we are doing.. My sense here is "less is more" - that is, we ought to try to branch out from a hard core and focus of activity rather than trying to spread too widely too quickly. Again, this comment ought to be seen separately from the desire to "seed the culture", which is not a service activity as much as an initiation into the discussion of vision, content, and goals for people like the teacher trainers, principals, Wexner graduates, etc.

4. *There are a number of issues which have direct bearing to you and to the MJL:*

a) Alan has assumed that you agreed to give Nessa four days of your time to work on the Ramah piece.

b) Danny agreed to delay all decision about primary work on the "kitchen" until we have our own deliberation with him on the conceptualization of the "kitchen" based on his forthcoming paper on that topic. My sense is that this should be high priority and that the paper should be ready to be discussed as soon as possible.

c) The agenda for the January meetings in Jerusalem with the CIJE is already shaping up: suggestions include continuing the clarification of and the work on the project as a whole and "the kitchen" in particular; going over written reports on the pilot projects so as to draw and discuss principles from them; considering how to make use of the publication of the educated Jew and Rosenak papers; considering who to bring in on the deliberation so as to build capacity, etc.

d) Alan accepted your request to delay the question of the July seminar in Israel (one conception is that this seminar would be a continued deliberation on the project with a broader participation, so as to include those who might be considered for capacity), but says that he needs a commitment from us by the end of August because of his need to schedule his and his staff's time.

e) Mike Rosenak called me and asked me where and when we plan to publish his paper on Community Wide Goals. This was after a discussion Alan had with him about the possibility of his participation in goals project activities around community wide goals. I told Mike that we were going to put out the papers in a book, that we need to discuss which of his papers or combination of them he might want to appear in the book, and that I will get in touch with him after I speak to you after your trip.

5. Finally, after reading Philip Jackson's introduction to the "Handbook of Research on Curriculum" - an article which traces the development of the debate on curriculum from Bobbit through Tyler, Schwab and the Reconceptualists - I think you ought to consider the possibility of reentering that arena with a short written piece. As Jackson describes it, the field of curriculum has separated into two separate directions - one dealing with the mechanics of curriculum development in the field and the other dealing with the discussion of philosophical, sociological, and other similar underpinnings of curriculum as they relate to the public agenda. As I read this, it occurred to me that on one level, your move to Jewish and Israeli education and your curricular emphasis on vision, content, and goals (even in the training of senior personnel) was a way of avoiding the trap which Jackson claims the whole field of curriculum has fallen into. Since, in my estimation, much of this path of development hinges on misunderstandings of both Tyler and Schwab in relation to the setting of goals for curriculum (I rechecked Tyler and don't think much is known about Schwab's work with you on the list at the end of the Prolegomenon, Melton Faculty Seminar, etc.), a small correction on this point and a few of your own comments about its implications would be an honest statement of what the last thirty years of your work in the field of curriculum adds to the discussion. It would be a shame, nay an injustice, for that to be lost.

Please let me know if there is anything else I can do for you. I will get the latest draft of the workplan to you as soon as it is ready, with any extra comments, if they come up, in the next telecon. I think that my emphases in the above are clear and hope that they are similar to your own sense of things. Please let me know if there are any serious discrepancies which we need to discuss. I will be here working on my doctorate and a few other things until the last week in August, when my daughter returns from a twenty day visit to Canada and when she, Juliet and I get ready for the move to Talpiot. I look forward to our meeting on the 31st of August at 3:30 PM.

Warm regards to Annette,

Danny

GOALS PROJECT WORK-PLAN: AUGUST 1995 - DECEMBER 1996

INTRODUCTION

The Goals Project work-plan operationalizes the agenda of inter-related challenges identified in the most recent Goals Project update, prepared in August 1995. Since the work-plan, as it is described below, is broken down according to types and dates of projected activities, it may be useful to highlight succinctly how these activities inter-relate and where we believe they will lead the project by the end of 1996.

In the larger perspective, then, the Goals Project work-plan seeks, with the cooperation of the Mandel Institute and the support of Harvard's Philosophy of Education Research Center, to do the following simultaneously:

- a) to generate a desire and demand for development in the area of content and goals of Jewish education among lay and professional leaders in the field (See sections entitled "Seeding the culture" and "Honoring existing commitments"); and
- b) to develop resources (See section entitled "Resource development center") and expertise (See sections entitled "Resource development center" and "pilot projects") and professional capacity (See section entitled "Personnel") for effective professional assistance to lay and professional leaders in the field in the area of the content and goals of Jewish education.

If the work-plan is successfully implemented, by the end of 1996, CIJE and its associates, notably the Mandel Institute, will be in a position to bring a) and b) together: we will have come along way towards establishing a demand and infrastructure for effective and widespread attention to the content and goals of Jewish education in North America. Specific end-of-1996 outcomes include the following:

- a) two or three ongoing pilot-project institutions that we continue to serve and to analyze systematically with attention to our major challenges (See d.iii. below);
- b) a flow of requests on the part of additional North American institutions, agencies, and communities to become part of a serious goals-process;
- c) the presence of a cadre of individuals, familiar with and sympathetic to the project, who will serve as resources and possibly future staff for the project in its efforts to meet the requests identified in b);

d) Publishable and/or published materials that include the following:

i. a box or packet of materials that offers varied rationales for and illustrations of the project's central theses. Some of these materials to be gathered from what already exists, and some to be developed by us, e.g., a possible concept-piece on the philosophy of the Goals Project, to be used to nurture an appreciation for and interest in our work on the part of various lay and professional constituencies.

ii. three pilot-project products that serve our work: first, an article offering a thick description of the work; second, an analytic study of the work designed to forward our efforts to develop human and other resources for the project; third, a package of materials that could include articles, vignettes, testimonials, and videos that can be used to powerfully convey to others the nature and benefits of taking on a goals-process.

e) a integrated and indexed library of materials - maps, strategies, diagnostic and evaluative tools, curricula, articles, etc. - that represent the work-to-date in the [kitchen]; and that can be used in training individuals to work with institutions or by institutions themselves. This library of materials will, with the permission of the Mandel Institute, include some materials produced through the Educated Jew Project.

f) based on all of the above, a menu of possible ways for the project to assist the North American Jewish community in the area of content-and-goals, along with a plan for CIE-Mandel Institute deliberations aimed at examining and deciding among them. Possibilities might include the training of coaches, publication of a resource and methodological guide for "coaching", the development of a quasi-independent center to meet developing needs, etc.

AUGUST 1995 - DECEMBER 1996

Seeding the culture

Module in Fall Principals Seminar.

Retreat for the some 400 graduates of the Wexner Program (Dec. 1995)

Participation in the winter Teacher Education Institute with the intent of integrating the goals-dimension into the Institute's work (Dec. 1995)

Seminar for principals, organized around the theme of goals, vision, and evaluation (Spring 1996)

Extended initiatory seminar on goals for lay and professional leadership of new Affiliate Communities (Spring or summer, 1996)

Consultations

1. Honoring Pre-existing Commitments (in ways that forward our principal purposes)..

Workshop(s) for lay and professional leadership of Baltimore's central education agency around questions of mission and goals (Sept. - Nov. 1995)

Two-day workshop with 5 JCCs concerning the goals of JCC camps OR a pilot-project with a single JCC camp, probably in Milwaukee (Nov. 1995)

Consultations to Cleveland Jewish Education Center concerning the future of Beth Torah (Fall 1995; Winter-spring, 1996)

2. Project Development Consultations

CIJE-Mandel Institute Consultations, including:

Weekly Conference Calls between Pekarsky and Marom organized around theoretical and practical issues in the life of the Goals Project.

Periodic CIJE-Mandel Institute Consultations on the Development of the Goals Project, some to include Harvard's Philosophy of Education Research Center, the first one to be held in January 1996 and a second projected for late spring 1996.

Intermittent consultations, as needed
(example: a possible meeting with Sharon
Feiman-Nemser, Deborah Ball, and/or Amy
Gerstein concerning curricularization of the
Goals Project agenda for institutions).

Building capacity

1. Personnel

Projected seminar for senior-senior leaders in Jewish education designed to initiate them into the work of the project and to recruit them, as appropriate, into different facets of the project's work (Summer 1996)

2. Pilot-projects

Continuing work in the Agnom School. By December of 1995 Marom will produce a paper that documents work-to-date and that offers pertinent analyses and insights concerning the nature of the work.

Continuing work with two Milwaukee institutions. By end of January 1995, Pekarsky will produce a paper that documents work-to-date and that offers pertinent analyses and insights.

By the end of 1996 the following products will emerge from the pilot-projects: first, an article offering a thick description of the work; second, an analytic study of the work designed to forward our efforts to develop human and other resources for the project; and third, a package of materials that could include articles and/or videos incorporating descriptions, testimonials, vignettes, and analyses that can be used to convey powerfully to others the nature and benefits of taking on a goals-process.

Resource Development Center (the kitchen of old)

A conceptual piece that systematically lays out the varied kinds of work that needs to be produced in the Resource Development Center (Pekarsky).

Continuing development of a resource-bank of publishable tools, exercises, conceptual maps, etc. a) along lines laid out in Pekarsky's [to-be-written] late 1995 essay and refined through internal discussions and the January consultation; an b) in response to insights and needs emanating from pilot-projects and from our efforts to seed the culture. Initial efforts to include an experimental in-depth exploration and analysis of a

single content=domain culminating in an in-progress report by the end of 1995 (Marom, Pekarsky, Dorph, and Holtz).

An article that explains the sense in which Ramah is a vision-driven institution and the inputs that were necessary for it to come into being. Draft completed by Dec.. 1995; ready to be published or published by Dec.. 1996 (Fox and Rappaport).

Articles growing out of the pilot-projects (See "Pilot projects" section)

Attached is a revision that takes into account our 8/14 conversation and a subsequent conversation between Marom and Pekarsky. This version should be sent to Seymour Fox for review -- especially of the section concerning Ramah. Please ask Robin to send this on to him, wherever he may be as soon as possible. Thanks.

Danny P. - 21/8/95

Re - Fox
Discussion
10/10/95

① Weekend - was sent?

② Bornman ~ copy → 4 points
for
community
profile
Call
Sunday → 2:00 PM
on 10/10/95

③ Werner

Mandel Institute

מכון מנדל

Tel: 972-2-662-832

טל': 02-662-832 (רב קוואי)

Fax: 972-2-662-837

פקס: 02-662-837

זה העברה בפקסימליה

תאריך: <u>xi/8A'i</u>	אל: <u>Prof. Seymour Fox</u> nooe67, ^
מס' הדפוס: <u>7</u>	מאת: <u>41D. Mary</u>
מס' דפוס: <u>£,0 265 5012</u>	

PLEASE PASS THIS FAX ON TO Professor
Seymour Fox. Thank you

Dear Seymour:

I hope this fax finds you in good spirits. I suppose that you heard about the bombing in Ramat Eshkol, so you can imagine what is going on.

In any case, after speaking to Danny Pekarsky, I understand that you did indeed get a copy of the latest draft of the workplan for the goals project, and that you already had and will continue to have an opportunity to discuss your comments with him. I think it is a good workplan and that it might be useful for the CIJE board and sub-committee meetings as well. My weekly and at times bi-weekly conversations with Danny on the phone are going quite well and I hope you will be able to sense the progression of our work with him and the CIJE in general this week. Please let me know if there is anything on which I can be of help to you.

Danny

Date: 17 Aug 95 16:56:56 EDT
From: Nessa Rapoport <74671.3370@compuserve.com>
To: Marom <Mandel%hujivms.BITNET@uunet.uu.net>
Cc: Danny <PEKARSKY@mail.soemadison.wisc.edu>
Subject: goals "sourcebook"
Message-ID: <950817205656_74671.3370_BHWS6-1@CompuServe.COM>

It is very exciting to be writing an e-mail that is for both Danny's, with no possible mistake.

I want to respond to your note, Danny M., about the Goals materials you've been compiling. And I'll be directive, for once! The first, simplest and paradoxically most useful thing to do is to create a bibliography of all those materials in your files--that is, a master list of the official citations of the article, excerpts, books or reports, followed by 1-2 lines (no more) about their relevance to the Goals Project. You can regard those lines as written for "insiders"; don't belabor the obvious and waste your own time!

This ongoing bibliography will serve two functions: It will be very helpful for the conceptualization of the "library." That is, it will not represent a complete library, obviously, but it will be a source for the creation of the categories of documents--perhaps to correspond to the categories in which we have been thinking (philosophy, philosophy of ed., etc.). It will also help in the more theoretical conceptualization discussions.

In addition, it will enable us to start creating the bibliographical framework when we SHOULD be starting--before everyone is so enmeshed it becomes an enormous job.

Tachlis: Danny M., this is a job that a part-time smart student could do. The student would enter the citations and give you the print-out. Your role would be the 1-2 line annotations and the grouping of the materials by category/concept, perhaps in conjunction with Danny P. parallel step, after the list is first typed up, is for Danny P. (and others) to look at it and add their own materials and annotations.

This catalogue should be an ongoing list, ever-growing and categorized as the project develops.

I know that such a catalogue will be very useful, quite apart from its bibliographical function. When anyone in the Goals Project looks at it, it will stimulate ideas of other articles and books, stimulate curricular ideas, etc.

If you decide to undertake anything beyond this right now, such as contextualizing the documents, creating a partial sourcebook, etc., you will not

do it--AND we won't have the bibliography! So start small.

It will then be very easy to create a individualized bibliographies, pilot by pilot. For example, you should be maintaining such a bibliography of every document and book you've recommended to the Agnon school, with a 1-2 line notation about why you did so. Similarly, Danny P. should have such a bibliography for the Milwaukee seminars (if you distributed materials).

What will result is:

1. A "master library" of all relevant written sources for the Goals Project--and perhaps visual materials, if they were used; and
2. Many customized bibliographies, from which we can create whatever sourcebooks we will need in the future.

When the time comes to make something more permanent, which will require an elaboration of the context of these materials, the foundation will be there.

By the way, I am about to recommend the same thing to the Teacher Educator project. Gail has been distributing masses of articles, and it occurred to me that we have no master bibliography of what thinking has gone into this project--and what has been taught.

I am trying to set up an infrastructure to avoid a situation where nothing is ever finished enough to distribute. If we have impeccable bibliographies, it's a base for anyone who wants to study or get involved in our work.

Of course, we will need many other materials, per Danny P.'s work-plan. I would love to be involved and contribute my expertise. As I'm sure you know by now, I think this is a deep, rich and essential project with the possibility of making a great contribution to N. American Jewish life.

Notwithstanding my conviction, does this make sense? Or does an alternative present itself re the materials in Jerusalem that is both more useful and also doable?

Footnote to Danny M.: I have just spoken to your mother, because I found a wonderful editor in NY who looks forward to reading the book. So we'll see.

**Council for Initiatives
in
Jewish Education**

Fax Cover Sheet

Date sent: 8/14/95 Time sent: 10³⁰ est. No. of Pages (incl. cover): 7
To: DAN MAROM From: Jen Gaboury
Organization: Mandel Institute
Phone Number: Phone Number: 212-532-2360
Fax Number: Fax Number: 212-532-2646

COMMENTS:

Material sent from Dan Pekarsky
for today's telecon.

Thanks.

From: Daniel Pekarsky

RE: Some general issues and the work-plan.

Introducing the work-plan. Daniel Marom and I have been in touch since our last conference call, with special attention to a work-plan. The work-plan in question is attached. A few preliminary comments are in order. First, you will notice that the JCC and the Baltimore efforts on the horizon have been placed under the "Seeding the Culture" category. We were unsure about whether this was accurate; perhaps these activities more properly belong in an "Outstanding Commitments" category. They are placed in the "Seeding the Culture" section mainly as a way of reminding us that we can and should use these events as opportunities to nurture the kinds of appreciation and understanding we believe important. Still, there was some uncertainty among us about whether this categorization made sense.

Second, please note that we toyed with but did not yet feel ready to commit in a work-plan to two items that seem worth contemplating. Both of these items point us beyond 1996 to new stages in the unfolding of the project. We want to mention them simply to indicate the kinds of things that may be on the horizon and that may be worth beginning to think about. They are:

Development of a "Working With Institutions on a Goals Agenda Fieldbook", to be part of a curriculum for training institutional guides.

Goals Seminars (on the model of Milwaukee) in one or two communities that participated in the summer 1996 Goals Seminar for New Affiliate Communities.

Third, be on the lookout for a fax or email from DM that will offer some background and context for the work-plan. It should arrive prior to our Monday conference call.

Some questions to consider. In the course of the Pekarsky-Marom conversations, some very important questions arose that have a significant bearing not just on how we see what we are doing but also on the kinds of initiatives we think it wise - and unwise - to take up. Let me summarize two such questions below:

1. In the course of our deliberations over the last several weeks, we seem to have converged on the following areas: a) Seeding the culture? b) the (to-be-renamed) kitchen; c) pilot-projects and other building capacity efforts. But it is noteworthy that we have also undertaken a number of commitments which do not in all cases comfortably fall under these headings; some of them seem more like "Service" in response to requests from the field. Examples might include the two-day consultation for the JCC camps and perhaps the Baltimore central agency initiative.

Note that this needn't be an all-or-nothing matter: in between saying, a) "No - we can't engage in this kind of service at this stage because to do so would jeopardize developing the kinds of tools and capacity that will make our contributions more valuable down the road," and b) "Yes, we will run a set of workshops for you to help you meet your immediate needs," we could say something like, c) "We will be eager to consult to you about what you are thinking about doing - and to offer our thoughts about what it would mean to do this seriously; but we do not have the resources to do more than this with you at this time (without jeopardizing the project's development by diffusing its scarce energies))."

But as just noted, institutions often do not come to us with this in mind: they want immediate, short-term help. Here are two possible responses.

b, another possibility is to say to ourselves: "They're not where we might want them to be, and we may not get them where we would like them to be; still, here's an opportunity to take them somewhat beyond where they were, to raise the level of discourse and deliberation a notch -- and to do so in such a way that they will want to turn to us for assistance in the future." In a sense, I would describe this as a Deweyan approach.

a. and b. carry very different implications for what we should be doing. Getting clearer on this matter -- as about #1 -- would be very helpful. Implicit in these questions is the following general question: What should be the basis for accepting or refusing an invitation to work with an institution or a community?

I hope we can discuss these matters during our Conference Call..

GOALS PROJECT WORK-PLAN: AUGUST 1995 - DECEMBER 1996

Seeding the culture

Module in Fall Principals Seminar.

Retreat for the some 400 graduates of the Wexner Program (Dec. 1995)

Workshop(s) for lay and professional leadership of Baltimore's central education agency around questions of mission and goals (Sept. - Nov. 1995)

← SET Taylor

Two-day workshop with 5 JCCs concerning the goals of JCC camps (Nov. 1995)

Seminar for principals,, organized around the theme of goals,, vision,, and evaluation (spring 1996)

Extended initiatory seminar on goals for lay and professional leadership of new Affiliate Communities (Spring or summer, 1996)

Participation in the Summer Seminar for Personnel Development leaders,, with the intent of integrating the goals-dimension into their deliberations (Summer 1996)

DEL

Seminar for carefully targeted individuals around the Educated Jew articles (Fall,, early Winter 1996)

A conference organized around the Rosenak essay on community-goals (and led by Rosenak); aimed at lay and professional leadership of one or more North American communities. Conceivably, this could also become dimension of conference for new Affiliate Communities (Spring or Fall,, 1996)

Consultations

1. Honoring Pre-existing commitments.

Consultations to Cleveland Jewish Education Center concerning the future of Beth Torah (Fall 1995; Winter-spring,, 1996)

2. Project Development Consultations

CIJE-Mandel Institute Consultations,, including:

Weekly Conference Calls between Pekarsky and Marom organized around theoretical and practical issues in the life of the Goals

Project..

Periodic GIVE-Mandel Institute Consultations on the Development of the Goals Project,, the first one to be held in January 1996.

Intermittent consultations

Periodic consultations with the Philosophy of Education Research Center at/Harvard.

Consultation with Sharon Feiman-Nemser and Deborah Ball concerning curricularization of the Goals Project Agenda for institutions (spring 1996)

Consultation with Amy Gerstein of the Essential Schools Coalition; possibly, this consultation could be combined with the Feiman-Nemser/Ball consultation (Spring 1996)

Building capacity

1. Personnel

Seminar for senior-senior leaders in Jewish education designed to initiate them into the work of the project and to recruit them, as appropriate, into different facets of the project's work (Summer 1996)

2. Pilot-projects

Continuing work in the Agnon School. By December of 1995 Marom will produce a paper that documents work-to-date and that offers pertinent analyses and insights concerning the nature of the work. By December of 1996, Marom will produce an article summarizing the effort and what we learn from it (along dimensions to be determined)..

Continuing work with two Milwaukee institutions.. By end of January 1995, Pekarsky will produce a paper that documents work-to-date and that offers pertinent analyses and insights. By end of 1996 Pekarsky will draft an article analyzing this experience..

Periodic seminars for selected clienteles organized around Marom's and Pekarsky's analyses of Pilot Project efforts at different stages. Seminar topics will vary but will be selected based on their capacity to illuminate what is involved in helping an institution

go through a goals-sensitive change process, as well as the skills, training and resources needed to guide an institution through such a process. (January 1995, July 1996, December 1996)

Resource Development Center (the kitchen of old)

A conceptual piece that systematically lays out the varied kinds of work that needs to be produced in the Resource Development Center (Pekarsky).

Continuing development of a resource-bank of tools, exercises, conceptual maps, etc. a) along lines laid out in Pekarsky's late 1995 essay and refined through internal discussions and through the January consultation, and b) in response to insights and needs emanating from the pilot-projects.

KIRK
-omnium

I Initial development of the resource-bank will include an experimental in-depth exploration and analysis of a single content-domain culminating in an in-progress report by the end of 1995 (Marom, Pekarsky, Dorph, and Holtz).

Curricularization of the Rosenak essay on community-vision for use by North American communities (In-progress through 1996, with some materials available by end of year).. (Marom and Pekarsky)

Curricularization of the Mandel Institute's Educated Jew papers for use by North American communities and educating institutions, to be done Sept. - Dec., 1996.. (Marom and Pekarsky)

An article that explains the sense in which Ramah is a vision-driven institution and the inputs that were necessary for it to come into being. Draft completed by Dec. 1995; ready to be published or published by Dec. 1996 (Fox and Rappaport)..

Development of a to-be-published monograph (Future as History, or Jewish Lightfoot, or Journey to vision-drivenness, or...), precise topic to be decided during the January 1996 CME/Mandel Institute Consultation; draft completed by Dec. 1996.

Look under "Pilot Projects" for additional products, projected for this period.

PUSLj
PUSLj

To: Mandel Institute
From: Daniel Bekarsky

Date: 8-10-95
Page 001 of 007

as Presentation
Legal Strategy

MEMO TO: Daniel Marom
FROM: Daniel Pekarsky
RE: Goals Project Work Plan and our Scheduled call

It was good talking with you the other morning ((evening for you)), and I'm looking forward to our next conversation 8:30 a.m. Thursday my time. It turns out that I won't have much time to talk on this occasion, but certainly until 9 a.m. Did you check out the question of charging these calls to the Mandel Institute? As I mentioned, it makes me nervous - particularly if our conversations will sometimes be long ones -- to put the calls on my bill since there's often quite a lag between reimbursement request and response. Let me know.

In preparation for our conversation and for our teleconference early next week, here's a second iteration of the Work-plan. It doesn't reflect the richness of our conversation, although, as you'll see, I refer to issues we discussed in the cover-memo. In the wake of our conversation, I've changed some of the categories in ways that highlight what we're about more clearly -- I thought your advice was very good on this matter. Note that in some cases I have subsumed certain pre-existing commitments, e.g. Baltimore, under a heading like seeding-the-culture, rather than under a separate heading entitled "pre-existing commitments" or "consultations". My reasons are 1) not wanting to multiply categories, and 2) reminding us that we can shape these consultations/workshops in ways that forward our agendas.

I'll call you at 4:30 pm ((your time)) on Thursday at the M.I.

MEMO TO: CIJE/Mandel Institute collaborators on the Goals Project
FROM: Daniel Pekarsky
RE: Some general issues and the work-plan.

Daniel Marom and I have been in touch since our last conference call, with special attention to a work-plan. The work-plan in question is attached. In the course of our conversations, some very important questions arose that have a significant bearing not just on how we see what we are doing but also on the kinds of initiatives we think it wise - and unwise -- to take up. Let me summarize two such questions below:

1. All of us have jointly agreed on the following areas: a. Seeding the culture; b) the ((to-be-renamed)) kitchen; c) pilot-projects and other building capacity efforts. In addition, under the heading of pre-existing commitments, we have grouped misc. activities, some of which readily fit in a., b., or c., and some of which don't. The latter include one-time consultations and other forms of what might be called "Service". Examples of the latter might include the two-day seminar for the JCC camps, the Beth Torah Consultation scheduled for this coming year, and perhaps the Baltimore central agency initiative.

The question is this: to what extent, if at all, should what might be called "Service" be a category for the Goals Project when it is not meaningfully subsumable under one of the other headings? Should we be responsive to requests from Baltimore, Atlanta, the JCCs, etc. if we don't see opportunities for meaningful pilot-projects emerging from these initiatives? Put differently, if Baltimore's community agency initiative doesn't have the potential to turn into a serious and ongoing pilot-project, is it the kind of thing we should be staying away from?

Note that this needn't be an all-or-nothing matter: in between saying, "No - we don't do that kind of stuff," and "yes, we will run a set of workshops for you," we could say something like, "We will be happy to consult to you about what you are thinking about doing - and to offer our thoughts about what it would mean to do this seriously; but we do not have the resources to do more than this with you at this time."

2. The Goals Project has expressed an interest in working with agencies and institutions in a sustained way, and we have been skeptical of agencies which come to us -- midstream, so to speak -- for help on a particular matter to which they do not want to devote more than, say two or three sessions. Our view has been - and perhaps should be - that we should be trying to encourage serious initiatives that involve an effort over time to wrestle with Jewish sources and to think systematically about questions of goals and their relationship to practice.

But as just noted, institutions often do not come to us with this in mind: they want immediate, short-term help. Here are two possible responses.

a. One option that we have is to say: "Look here - this is not the kind of thing we do; and we think you would be wiser to undertake the more intensive and time-consuming process we recommend..

b. another possibility is to say to ourselves: "They're not where we might want them to be,, and we may not get them where we would like them to be; still,, here's an opportunity to take them somewhat beyond where they were,, to raise the level of discourse and deliberation a notch --- and to do so in such a way that they will want to turn to us for assistance in the future." In a sense,, I would describe this as a Deweyan approach..

a. and b. may carry very different implications for what we should be doing.. Getting clearer on this matter -- as about #1 - - would be very helpful.. Implicit in these questions is the following general question:: What should be the basis or the bases for accepting or refusing an invitation to work with an institution or a community?

I hope we can discuss these matters during our Conference Call..

→ Large plan of program - First kitchen, capacity, Pilot projects on the way
Thompson on the way
Covers
Strategic
1/15/95
E. J. F. F. F.

Seeding the culture

Workshop(s) for lay and professional leadership of Baltimore's central education agency around questions of mission and goals ((Sept. - Nov., 1995),

Seminar for principals,, organized around the theme of goals, vision,, and evaluation ((spring 1996))

Participation in the Summer Seminar for Personnel Development leaders,, with the intent of integration the goals-dimension in their deliberations (Summer 1996)

Seminar for carefully targeted individuals around the Educated Jew articles (Fall, early Winter 1996)

One or two extended retreats or seminars organized around the Rosenak essay on community-goals (and led by Rosenak; aimed at lay and professional leadership of one or more North American communities. (Spring or Fall, 1996)

1. Honoring Pre-existing commitments.

Consultations to Cleveland Jewish Education Center
concerning the future of Beth Torah (Fall 1995; Winter-
spring, 1996)

2. Project Development Consultations

Weekly Conference Calls between Pekarsky and Marom organized around theoretical and practical issues in the life of the Goals Project..

Bi-annual [twice a year?] consultations with the Philosophy of Education Research Center at Harvard.. → 2004/11/11
of kop m

✓ A CIJE-Mandel Institute Consultation on the Development of the Goals Project ((January 1996))

Consultation with Sharon Feiman-Nemser and Deborah Ball ^{11/11/95} concerning curricularization of the Goals Project Agenda for institutions ((spring 1996))

Building capacity

1. Personnel

Seminar for senior-senior leaders in Jewish education designed to initiate them into the work of the project and to recruit them, as appropriate, into different facets of the project's work ((Summer 1996))

2. Pilot-projects

Continuing work in the Agnon School.. By December of 1995 Marom will produce a paper that documents work-to-date and that offers pertinent analyses and insights concerning the nature of the work. By December of 1996, Marom will produce an article summarizing the effort and what we learn from it (along dimensions to be determined)..

Continuing work with two Milwaukee institutions. By end of January 1995, Pekarsky will produce a paper that documents work-to-date and that offers pertinent analyses and insights. By end of 1996 Pekarsky will draft an article analyzing this experience.

Seminar organized around Marom's and Pekarsky's analyses of Pilot Project efforts, possibly with an eye towards drawing out insights pertinent to the training of institutional guides. The articles developed by Marom and Pekarsky will serve as texts for this seminar ((Winter 1996))

Confidential
Project Development Center (formerly "the kitchen")

A conceptual piece that systematically lays out the varied kinds of work that needs to be produced in the Project Development Center (Pekarsky).

Background notes to the Goals Project Workplan:

Since the workplan is broken down according to types and dates of activities, it may be useful to note in advance how these activities are seen to interrelate both across and over time. In the larger perspective then, the CIJE goals project workplan seeks, with the cooperation of the Mandel Institute and the support of Harvard's Philosophy of Education Research Center (see under "project development consultations"), to simultaneously:

a) generate a desire and demand for development in the area of the content and goals of Jewish education among lay and professional leaders in the field (see under "seeding the culture" and "honoring existing commitments");

b) develop resources (see under "resource development center"), expertise (see under "resource development center" and "pilot projects"), and professional capacity (see under "personnel") for effective professional assistance to lay and professional leaders in the field in the area of the content and goals of Jewish education

If the workplan is successfully implemented, by the end of 1996 the CIJE will be in a position to consider, with its associates, alternative ways of systematically bringing a) and b) to bear on each other. The point is that rather than seeking to provide immediate assistance to a limited number of communities and/or institutions over the next year and a half, the workplan wants to work towards the development of a demand and infrastructure for effective ongoing and widespread attention to the content and goals of Jewish education in North America. Following this route, the 1997 workplan would be addressing the possibility of activities such as the development of an independent center providing assistance to lay and professional leaders in the field in the area of the content and goals of Jewish education and/or the development of a systematic plan for intervention in particular communities and institutions of Jewish education in that area (including, perhaps, the training of goals "coaches", publication of a resource and methodological guide for goals "coaching" etc.).

conference
coll

-> FOLLOWING THINGS WILL BE IN PLACE AND BY WHICH WE CAN BE
INFORMED WE WILL HAVE ADVANCED

WHAT IS POSSIBLE NOW

→ TEACHER TRAINING → COMES RIGHT AWAY
→ TAKEN
→ DEC → 2 NUMBER BEGINNING 10th

Dear Alan, Barry, Danny, Gail, and Nessa:

In my last phone conversation with Danny Pekarsky, we agreed that I would send you the enclosed "Background notes to the Goals Project Workplan." Together with the Workplan which Danny will be sending you, this will be the basis for our conference call on Monday. I look forward to speaking to you all.

Daniel Matom

A handwritten signature in dark ink, appearing to be 'DM' or 'Matom', written over the printed name 'Daniel Matom'.

To: Mandel Institute
From: Daniel Pekarsky

Date: 7-23-95
Page 001 of 015

JANNY
ALAC
DEROAH
ANNCTIE
S P*P
Fax F. C.

From: Daniel Pekarsky at 008628322644004
To: Mandel Institute at 0110912972662662807

07-23-95 11:03 pm
02 of 015

1

PLEASE DISTRIBUTE THESE MATERIALS AS SOON AS POSSIBLE TO THE
INDIVIDUAL IDENTIFIED. THANKS I

MEMO TO: Alan Hoffmann and Daniel Marom ((at the Mandel Institute))

Gail Doron, Barr Holtz, Nessa Rappaport ((CIJE, NY))

Seymour Fox ((in Jerusalem or NY))

FROM: Daniel Pekarsky

RE: Summary of our concluding session, along with the principal
decisions made.

If at all possible, please review prior to our conference
call on Monday morning, July 24.

Agenda items for our July 24 meeting include:

1. Reviewing decisions made and work-plan with attention to their accuracy, to their wisdom, to time-constraints and to division of labor. If necessary, prioritize. End with concrete plan of action.
2. Milwaukee update, as well as preparation for August 1 meeting.
3. Cleveland update
4. DP's Israel plan

SUMMARY OF JULY 1995 CONSULTATION, Day 3
Home of Gail Dorph, NYC

INTRODUCTORY

I have already distributed a separate document that summarizes the basic decisions made at this session our, along with a first draft of a work-plan that flows from these decisions. Without repeating everything included in that document, this document tries to summarize issues, concerns, insights, etc. that were articulated at this meeting and that provide the backdrop for the decisions that were made. I've organized the summary around a few major themes that were discussed. (For your convenience, at the end of this summary I have appended a copy of the earlier and previously distributed document that summarizes decisions made.)

FROM COACHES TO FACILITATORS TO GUIDES TO.....

Terminological change. Over the course of our discussions we seem to have moved away from calling the folks who will work with institutions "coaches". The term "facilitator" seemed to replace it, but it's not clear that this is the best term. "Guide" was another term that was suggested, and there may have been another. I will use the term "guide" below, with the qualification that the question of what to call the person in question be revisited. [The Hebrew "moreh derech" has a nice feel to it -- but not the way it's usually translated. Any thoughts about this?]

Characterizing the guide's role, training, etc.: proceed with caution! We noted that our work over the last several months had given us a lot of insight concerning characteristics that an effective guide would need to possess as well as concerning the nature of the work; and it certainly might be valuable to integrate the varied insights we've acquired in this area in a single document that might be used in further deliberations.

At the same time, the assumption animating our most recent conversations is that a good deal more in the way of pilot-projects and what we have been calling "kitchen-work" needs to be done if we are to move towards an adequate understanding of the guides' work and a reasonable approach to their training. These considerations played a major role in our decision to frame a work-plan that defers a number of basic questions concerning guides and instead emphasizes a) seeding the culture; b) the kitchen; c) pilot projects; and d) efforts to identify, excite, and engage particularly strong educators who might in various ways (in the kitchen, as institutional guides, as consultants to us, as vocal supporters, etc.) forward our work. The sense of the

group is that as our learning proceeds across the year we will re-visit the basic questions concerning the guides;; the projected January consultation in Israel may provide an especially hospitable context for this kind of a conversation.

As the preceding paragraph suggests,, comments made concerning guides at our meetings should be taken as raising issues and as attempting tentative formulations ((to be revisited during the year)) rather than as staking out a CIJE position.. With this caveat,, some central points in our discussion are summarized below.

Who would select the guides,, who would train them and who would they work for? Much of our conversation built on ((and then began to depart from)) a model that ran something like this::

1. Based on pilot-projects,, work going on in the kitchen,, and seminars that build on these,, CIJE would develop and publicize a profile of the kind of person it felt would make an adequate guide,, a profile emphasizing personal characteristics,, desired background,, etc..
2. using this profile,, local institutions ((or perhaps communities wanting to groom one person to work with more than one institution)) would identify individuals they felt would make good guides and would present them to CIJE as candidates for training..
3. From candidacy to admission - an uncertain matter that will need to be revisited.. On one view,, CIJE would work with whomever the institution/community sends;; on a second view,, CIJE would decide who ((from among those identified at the local level)) meets the minimum standards for participation in its training-program;; on a third view,, CIJE would admit all but reserve scholarship funds for those which meet its standards..
4. CIJE would take responsibility for developing the training program.. Those admitted to the program would engage in a careful program of study that might involve three months of study ((possibly in Israel)) spread across three summers as well as work in between.. It would probably be necessary to individualize the program of study and preparation with attention to the individual's pattern of strengths and weaknesses and the context in which he/she would be working;; conceivably some sort of tutor-tutee relationship would prove desirable..
5. After the training,, CIJE would continue in a consulting-relationship to these guides as they go

about their work. It would also convene periodic conferences for them designed to enable them to continue learning from us and from each other, to wrestle with issues, to share insights and problems, etc. CIJE would also organize opportunities for stake holders in participating institutions to meet around appropriate agendas.

As our discussion proceeded, this basic model was revised in at least the following way. While not abandoning the notion that the local entity ((community/institution)) would play a major role in identifying the guide, we recognized the possibility that some would be unable to come up with anyone appropriate for the work at hand; and we therefore returned to the notion that CIJE should also be trying to identify individuals who might serve as guides to institutions and communities.. They would be among those to whom financial support would be offered to facilitate their professional growth as philosophical guides..

Where should we ((and communities)) be looking for guides? A number of views, some of them possibly complementary, were expressed on this matter:

1. One thought was to look to university faculty -- either Judaica professors who would need to be strengthened in education or education faculty who would be strengthened Judaically..
2. A second possibility was to look for individuals already working in Jewish educating institutions or communal education-related agencies..
3. A third possibility was to begin a careful search for top-notch individuals around the country whom we intuitively judge to be worth our trying to cultivate without worrying too much at this stage about their institutional roles and professional backgrounds. (These might be the ones we invite to next summer's projected seminar in Israel..)

WHO WE ARE:

1. There were some interesting discussions of CIJE's own identity as catalyst of improvement in Jewish education. There was, for example, a discussion of how we stand vis-a-vis being service-providers, a training institution, or an intermediary organization that hands off responsibilities for training and serving to other bodies. The sense of our meeting seemed to be that while it may important on occasion and for strategic

reasons to offer service and to engage in training, we needed to maintain our identity as an intermediary organization.

2. There was a second formulation that emphasized our identification with the view that improvement will depend on simultaneous attention to personnel, community mobilization, goals, and evaluation.

3. There was also a third formulation that, in the context of our discussions over these three days, seemed particularly rich: we are the organization that believes in the practical power of powerful ideas. This, the comment was made, is our signature as an organization. If "the power of ideas" is taken to include "the power of critical inquiry", the theme seems to capture much that we've been discussing.

KITCHEN-WORK ON THE HORIZON

Our conversations emphasized the importance of developing appropriate conceptual, textual, curricular and other materials that would serve as resource-library to the project's efforts to work with educating institutions and other bodies. Much of this work could be conceptualized as an effort to identify resources at each of the five levels we've discussed, supplemented by the tentative grid we've been playing with.

Some of the major possible directions which we discussed are identified below.

Inventory of existing resources and materials. Much of the material that belongs in an adequate resource-library already exists, and DM is familiar with a good deal of it. The challenge is to gather it, to categorize and index it in a meaningful way so that it will be readily available, and to package it in ways will enhance the likelihood that it will be drawn on and appropriately used.

Curricularizing the Educated Jew materials: developing a range of supplementary materials that will facilitate effectively using the Educated Jew materials to stimulate rich and in-depth reflection on serious content-issues and their implications for educational policy and practice. These secondary materials could range from efforts to exhibit what an institution or curriculum modelled on one of these thinkers might look like, to strategies for engaging constituencies we work with to wrestle with the basic existential questions addressed by these thinkers, to strategies for getting educating institutions to use one or more of these articles as tools in reflecting on their own vision and practices, etc.

Refining and curricularizing the Rosenak piece on community-wide vision. Developing exercises, pedagogical strategies, and a range of supporting materials from out of classical and other texts that could be used in conjunction with this essay in our work with communities struggling with the problem of pluralism and education.

Subject-area maps. Following up on our previous discussions, we reiterated the need to map out different subject-areas like Bible, or Hebrew, or Jewish history, with attention to a range or inter-related matters that include: different conceptions of each area understood in relation to the philosophical positions in which these conceptions are rooted; curricular and pedagogical approaches and materials associated with each conception; the skills, knowledge-base and sensibilities required of an educator tied to a particular conception; strategies that could lead an educator to become more reflective about his/her approach to a given subject-area, with attention to competing approaches organized around different understandings of the area and/or pedagogy, etc..

Larger pieces. We recognized that the work going on in the kitchen must also include larger conceptual and other kinds of pieces that excite the imagination of the constituencies we will be working with and stretch their conceptions of what is necessary and possible in the world of Jewish education. We identified a number of different articles/books that seemed worthy of serious consideration. These include the following:

1. A piece, to be developed by SF and NR, that analyzes the development of Camp Ramah with attention to the question: what is necessary in the way of efforts and preconditions for the development of a vision-driven institution?
2. A Jewish Sarah Lightfoot book which provides us with living examples of Jewish educating institutions that are vision-driven, the examples ranging from Esh Ha'Torah to Camp Ramah, to Ha-bonim, etc.. The book would provide impressionistic support for the project's assumption that the serious success-stories in Jewish education have been vision-driven institutions. The book would try to make these institutions come alive for the reader, with attention to the ways in which their respective guiding visions find expression in daily life and institutional practices.
3. "The Future as History", modelled on the Carnegie effort to sketch out an educational environment of the future. In a skeptical environment that wonders about the possibility of a powerful non-Orthodox educational institution, the challenge is to develop an image of an

institution -- or perhaps a configuration of inter-related institutions -- that would meaningfully address the educational needs of significant segments of the non-Orthodox world.

4. A Jewish version of "Horace's School" -- a book that would chart the journey of a hypothetical institution in the direction of becoming more self-consciously attentive to questions of basic goals and their relationship to educational practice and evaluation. A companion-piece would try to identify and describe actual educational institutions that have succeeded in becoming significantly more vision-driven.

5. A more conceptual piece that discusses the ways in which vision can enrich the quality of Jewish education. This piece might draw on pertinent empirical and interpretive work being done in general education, e.g. that of Smith, Cohen et. al., and Newmann. Conceivably, such an article could be worked up into a CIJE Policy Brief.

Which of these 5 projects would be worth our doing is a matter we felt deserved careful consideration; and the thought was that this was among the central topics that should engage us in a consultation we imagine taking place in Jerusalem in January of 1996. (See below for further discussion of this point.)

POSSIBLE CONFERENCES,, SEMINARS,, WORKSHOPS

CIJE has already committed itself to a number of seminars and workshops organized around questions of mission, vision, and goals. We agreed in our discussions that, to the extent possible, these must be approached in ways that make it likely that these activities represent an initiation, a starting-point, or a springboard rather than a self-contained events with no after-life.

Beyond our existing commitments, we projected a number of other seminars and conferences designed to enhance our own learning and understanding of the work at hand, to seed the culture, and to develop capacity. Below is a list of the kinds of seminars we considered:

1. a January consultation in Jerusalem that convenes all the participants in the July consultation, along with selected additional individuals that might include David Cohen, possibly Deborah Kerdinann, and maybe a few others. The challenge of this back-stage conference is to carefully examine, elaborate, and decide among some of the ideas we've been considering and to further refine the project's plan-of-action.

Specific proposals, e.g., concerning extended pieces that might be written, would be written up and distributed prior to the conference. This conference will be enriched by what we learn between July 1995 and December 1995 through our pilot-projects, our kitchen-work, and the seminars and workshops scheduled for the next several months.

2. two already-scheduled conferences for principals. The planned fall conference could devote a substantial segment to questions of goals and vision; and the spring conference could in its entirety be organized around such questions.

3. a third seminar for principals that would bring together those who, from the perspective of this project, seem the most promising to set about launching a serious goals-agenda in their institutions.

4. A seminar for professional/lay teams from CIJE Affiliate communities, to be held some time in the spring or summer. Conceivably, the teams could include stronger institutional representation that we had in Jerusalem. This seminar, like that in Jerusalem, is designed to educate the participants concerning the importance of pursuing a goals-agenda at institutional and communal levels and to enlist their support on behalf of this agenda.

5. A conference organized around the Educated Jew essays, due to be published next year.

6. A week-long seminar tentatively scheduled for next July (near the time of the CAJE conference in Israel) that attempts to initiate into our work and to excite select individuals we take to be exceptionally strong as well as sympathetic to the direction of our efforts. Participants will be invited to participate in a conference in which we will share with them our thinking (including some of the work going on in the kitchen), elicit their feedback, and develop a sense of who among them shows promise of working effectively in one or another phase of the project (in the kitchen, as an institutional guide, as a leader of seminars that aim to seed the culture, etc.) The view was expressed that, given the nature of this seminar, scholarships facilitating attendance would be appropriate.

Here are some of the names mentioned as candidates for this seminar: Michael Paley, Elaine Cohen, Esther Netter, Jodi Hirsh, Bernie Steinberg, Deborah Kerdimann

From: Daniel Pekarsky at 608528324044044
To: Mandel Institute at 662837w57612-662827

67-23-95 11:08 pm
01 010 of 015

9

((perhaps as a faculty member)). It was suggested that if we could identify suitable congregational rabbis, this might be a good idea. In addition, it might be worth folding into this seminar the principals mentioned in #3 above.

Given a number of realities, it was stressed that nailing down time, place, and participants needs to be accomplished very soon.

CONCLUSION

As noted at the beginning of this document, what I have thus far written represents the discussion that provided the background for basic decisions made at our Sunday meeting, decisions summarized in a brief document that I have already distributed. For the sake of convenience, I am appending a copy of that document to this one ((See next page)).

10

GOALS PROJECT CONSULTATION
July 1995,

Below you will find DP's attempt to articulate major decisions we made at our Sunday meeting based on our work over the last few days. In reviewing the material, please try to do the following:

1. Read it critically with an eye to catching any omissions or misrepresentations or any other problems.
2. Review it for overall soundness. Two criteria come to mind:
 - a. On reflection, does the proposed agenda and set of activities make good sense? Is there anything important that we should be doing missing? Or are some of the things listed not worth doing?

b. Time!

The question is not just whether there is enough time to do all these things -- but whether there is enough time to do them all meaningfully. **I am particularly concerned that the "kitchen-work" not get pushed aside in favor of the other activities.** It may be that we will need to review the proposed set of activities with this concern in mind.

If at all possible, feedback concerning these and other pertinent matters should be peoled by the beginning of next week.

11

DECISIONS EMERGING OUT OF THE THREE DAYS OF DELIBERATION

Major emphases

1. Seminars, consultations, and workshops organized around the following:

Seeding the culture -- bring lay and professional leaders in the field of Jewish education to a deeper appreciation of CUEF's convictions in this domain, and thus laying the ground for communal and institutional initiatives ((e.g., Seminar for leadership from Affiliated Communities; Module in fall principally' seminar and at heart of spring seminar))

Meeting outstanding commitments we've made ((e.g., to Baltimore, the JCC, Wexner, and possibly Atlanta and Cleveland))

Thoughtful deliberations designed to better understand the project and decide from among competing directions and projects ((e.g., consultation scheduled for January, '96))

Bringing some top-notch people into the work without preconceptions concerning how they will fit in; some of the "kitchen-work" will play a significant role in this seminar ((e.g. the seminar scheduled for July, '96))

2. The Kitchen

While work in this area needs to be determined based on a comprehensive plan that still needs to be worked out, we discussed some immediate projects that will need attention:

a. an inventory of existing resources in different domains.

b. a paper to be developed by NR and SF that details the ways in which Ramah is a vision-driven institution and what was necessary in the way of inputs for it to become so.

Less immediate but also discussed as possibly important kitchen work ((though in need of further consideration)) were the following:

a. building maps of different content=

domains.

b. monographs dealing with one or more of the following: i. "The Future As History", looking at a comprehensive and adequate approach to Jewish education in the non-Orthodox world; ii. a Jewish Sarah Lightfoot piece that looks at existing vision-guided institutions; iii) a book modelled on HORACE'S SCHOOL, detailing the process through which a fictional Jewish educating institution becomes more vision-driven.

3. Pilot Projects: Marom will continue his work with Agnon and, if it can be worked out, Pekarsky will work out an arrangement with another institution. (Toren's work with the Schechter School in Cleveland may also be pertinent here.)

Our discussion emphasized the critical importance of careful written documentation of the work that goes on in the pilot projects, as well as analyses of these experiences. Along the way, seminars designed to analyze the work being done and what is being learned would be pertinent..

4. An imperative and immediate need to develop a plan that carefully breaks down #s 1-3 and determines priorities based on their importance and on available time and resources.

Note that #s 1-4 do not include any reference to the immediate identification and education of facilitator- or coach-figures. As I understand it, we have agreed - for reasons that have in part to do with the need to develop the kitchen - to remain temporarily agnostic concerning the desirability of facilitators, our role in identifying and training them, etc. This matter will be re-approached during our January consultation.

WORK PLAN, REMAINDER OF 1995 AND 1996

July - Dec., 1995

1. Further articulate the plan for 1995 and 1996 with attention to the larger conception of the project,, and with special emphasis on what's to go on in the kitchen ((both short- and long-term)). The plan needs to be reviewed carefully both CIJE and Mandel Institute partners to the project..
2. Planning and implementation of seminars we've committed to ((Wexner,, JCC,, Baltimore,, and possibly Atlanta))
3. Conceptualize,, recruit for,, and organize the seminars projected for 1996. These include the January consultation, the principals seminar,, the seminar for the leadership of the affiliated communities..
4. Pilot-projects:: Work-in-settings and systematic efforts to document and analyze ((Pekarsky and Marom))
5. Kitchen-work: To be based on a comprehensive plan to be developed during summer of 1995. The plan will probably include a projected paper by SF and NR dealing with the conditions that made possible the development of Ramah as a vision-driven institution..
6. Module in the fall seminar for principals..

1996

1. January consultation in Jerusalem ((CIJE,, Mandel Institute and selected additional participants))
2. Outstanding commitment: support and/or guide Cleveland's efforts to clarify its goals for Beth Torah
2. Spring principals' seminar
3. Seminar for representatives of new affiliated communities
4. Israel Seminar in July designed to draw in potential leaders and resources ((e.g. Steinberg,, Paley,, Hirsch,, Elaine Cohen,, selected rabbis))
5. Continuing kitchen work ((based on plan that will soon be developed))
6. Continuing pilot project efforts ((along with appropriate documentation,, analysis,, and discussions based on them))

14

0. Other activities as determined based on future deliberations,
especially the January consultation..

items on SF-DM agenda:

- publication of the educated Jew book: report on deliberations and opening chapter work with Scheffler; next steps: SF, DM, scholar by scholar, critical readers; Nessa-Fox writeup of Ramali as part of the publication?; other.

- goals project: go over various documents and decisions; relationship of the goals project and the senior personnel project; Agmon; next steps in "kitchen work"; participation in Wexner; p.e.r.c.;

- the educated Israeli and the educated Jew: report on plans for next year; set time for deliberation; the educated person; visits of scholars next year; Shinitan; etc.

- other: Felix Posen request for translated educated Jew materials;

SP
August
31st
3:30

Door Danny - SF ~~0020~~ LIKE
SF RETURNED FROM MEETING IN NY JURY
PLEASD - ∴ J- TFFHUK- (fir, M. P. R. A. T)
For you F2 sports.

MILWAUKEE
(414) 962-6767
FAX 414-403-
LAWSON

{ Before → Tomorrow morning - Wednesday
7:00 AM OUTING

Danny -
→ Appreciation
About Fiction
→ discussion
→ the choice

→ IF NOT

6:45 AM on Thursday

→ Don't know
→ SORTING...

→ on Jan project

→ on of MS

→ on Jan 1st 1992

→ on Jan 1st 1992

LET'S GETTING
→ association
→ reading list

LG*
clear
TRANSP

most
at not
neutral
of the

- DM# 1/1/92
at 1/1/92

SCHOFFER

An article that explains the sense in which Ramah is a vision-driven institution and the inputs that were necessary for it to come into being.. Draft completed by Dec. 1995; ready to be published or published by Dec. 1996 ((Fox and Rappaport))..

Curricularization of ^{on the} Educated Jew papers for use by North American communities and educating institutions, to be done in fall 1996 ((Pekarsky and Marom)).

Maiden-voyage exploration and analysis of a single ⁽⁷⁾ content-domain culminating in an in-progress report by the end of 1995 ((Marom, Pekarsky, Dorph, and Holtz))..

Development of a to-be-published monograph ((Future as History, or Jewish Lightfoot, or Journey to vision-drivenness, or....)), precise topic to be decided during the January 1996 CIJE/Mandel Institute Consultation; draft completed by Dec. 1996..

Continuing development of a resource-bank of tools, exercises, conceptual maps, etc. a) along lines laid out in Pekarsky's late 1995 essay and refined through internal discussions and through the January consultation; and b) in response to insights and needs emanating from the pilot projects..

Development of a "Working With Institutions on a Goals Agenda Fieldbook", to be part of a curriculum for training institutional guides (Dec. 1996);

✓ ?

GOALS PROJECT WORK PLAN

August 1995 - December 1995

Seminars, Workshops and Consultations

*Before lay and
p. to lay members
- understanding
the plan* 3 Consultations/workshops for lay and professional
leadership of Baltimore's central education agency
around questions of mission and goals. (Sept. - Nov.
1995)
1995,

Seminar for lay and professional educational leaders in p
Cleveland (Nov. 1995))

Consultation to Cleveland's Jewish Education Center
concerning the future of Beth Torah (Nov. 1995))

Module in CIJE's fall Principal's Seminar (Fall 1995))

Two-day consultation to 5 JCCs concerning the goals of
JCC camps (Nov. 1995))

Retreat for some 400 graduates of the Wexner Program
(Dec. 2, 3, 1995))

Consultation with Mandel Institute to plan intensive
January and July Goals Project Seminars (Nov. or Dec.
1995))

Pilot projects

Continuing work in the Agnon School, culminating in a
paper that documents work-to-date and that offers
pertinent analyses and insights concerning the nature
of the work (Marom).

Continuing work with two Milwaukee institutions,
culminating in a paper that documents work-to-date and
that offers pertinent analyses and insights (Pekarsky).

Product development center [yesterday called "the kitchen",
tomorrow probably something else]

A conceptual piece that systematically lays out the
varied kinds of work that needs to be produced in the
Product Development Center (Pekarsky).

Draft of a to-be-published article that explains the

JP

1015 2005-4
Gm
1015 2005-4

! (S)

→ L x m s p l x f
 of
 → CUBIC LIZARD
 ent
 go up to 70
 on a → c
 & *s r w k

7

for
D.F.
outgoing
in 51

Participation in the Summer Seminar for Personnel-Development leaders, with the intent of integrating considerations pertaining to goals into their deliberations (Summer 1996).

Goals Seminars ((on the model of Milwaukee)) in two communities that participated in the summer seminar for new Affiliated Communities ((Fall 1996)).

offt* Seminar for carefully targeted individuals around the Educated Jew articles.. ((Fall, Early Winter 1996))

One or two extended retreats or seminars organized around Mike Rosenak's essay on community goals and led by Mike Rosenak for the lay and professional leadership of North American Jewish communities ((Spring/Fall 1996)).

Pilot-projects

Continuing work with the Agnon School,, culminating in draft of an article summarizing the effort and what is being learned from it ((along dimensions to be determined)) ((Marom)).

Continuing the work begun in fall 1995 with two Milwaukee institutions,, culminating in a progress-report or draft of article that articulates what is being learned ((Pekarsky)).

Two workshops with Milwaukee JCC camp-related lay and professional leadership,, focusing on place of goals in this institution; possibly the beginning of a third Milwaukee-area Pilot Project ((Pekarsky,, January,, February 1996))

Possible Seminar for promising institutional guides ((drawn from participants in the July seminar for senior-senior individuals)), and based on work-to-date in the pilot-projects and in the Product Development Center ((December 1996 or early 1997)). It is hoped that by this time various "seeding the culture" initiatives will have given rise to a clientele for increasing numbers of institutional efforts..

Product development Center

See "Pilot-Project" section for articles to be written as a result of the pilot-project efforts..

Publication of the SF/NR article on Ramah (Dec. 1996)

Draft of to-be-published monograph ((Future as History,, or Jewish Lightfoot,, or the Journey to vision-drivenness,, or....)), precise topic to be determined

during the January 1996 CIJE/Mandel Institute consultation..

Publication of the Educated Jew papers ((Spring 1996))..

Curriculum^Cization^{v/fpGW} of the Rosenak essay,, designed to make it accessible to North American constituencies and helpful to them in their efforts to clarify their own organizing vision and agenda.. ((Fall,, 1996))

A working-paper ((and appendices)) which articulates what is involved in systematically organizing and inventorying a content-domain ((to be determined)), with an eye towards helping client-institutions make progress on a goals-agenda.. This is a continuation of work initiated in 1995..

Continuing Development of a resource-bank of tools, resources,, exercises,, conceptual maps,, etc.: a) along lines laid out in late 1995 ((See Pekarsky's to-be-written essay)) and refined/revised in early 1996 (our January consultation)); and b) in response to insights and needs emanating from the pilot-projects.

COUNCIL FOR INITIATIVES IN JEWISH EDUCATION

*15 East 26th Street, 10th Floor
New York, NY 10010-1579
(212) 532-2360
Fax: (212) 532-2646*

FAX TRANSMISSION COVER SHEET

Date: *August 1, 1995*
To: *Deliver to Daniel Marom or Seymour Fox*
Fax: *9722-662-837*
Re: *please see the attached information per Daniel Pekarsky's request*
Sender: *Debra Perrin*

***YOU SHOULD RECEIVE 6 PAGE(S), INCLUDING THIS COVER SHEET. IF
YOU DO NOT RECEIVE ALL THE PAGES, PLEASE CALL (212) 532-2360.***

MEMO TO: CIJE Steering Committee
FROM: Daniel Pekarsky
RE: Goals Project update
July 25, 1995

INTRODUCTORY

Our experience with the Goals Project to date, carefully examined and richly illuminated during a recent consultation with faculty associated with the Harvard University-Mandel Institute Program of Scholarly Collaboration, has made it possible to refine the project's long-term challenges and immediate tasks. This report is designed to bring you up to date with our thinking and activities.

The imagined future that animates the work of the Goals Project includes the following elements: Jewish educating institutions, encouraged by their communities, are actively engaged in serious deliberation and study designed to deepen their understanding of their central goals; they are working to develop practices that seem adequate to these goals; and they are employing evaluation procedures that make it possible to recognize and diminish the gap between aspiration and outcome. We imagine a future in which the language of vision, goals, and evaluation figures prominently in the discourse and deliberations of educators and lay constituencies, a future in which thoughtful attention to these matters contributes to substantially improved educational practices and outcomes. Three principal emphases have defined our efforts to move towards this imagined future:

THE THREE PRINCIPAL EMPHASES

Seeding the culture. First of all, the Goals Project is an attempt to cultivate a culture in the Jewish community that takes questions of vision, goals, and evaluation to heart, a culture that recognizes that educational and communal well-being depends on a willingness to think critically and regularly about such matters in their relationship to practice. We have informally begun to describe initiatives that are aimed at engendering an hospitable cultural environment as "seeding the culture." The metaphor of "seeding" is intended to suggest that out of this kind of effort some very good things are likely to grow, including the emergence of increasing numbers of institutions, embedded in strongly supportive communities, that approach us with the serious intention of becoming organized around shared and compelling educational goals. As we have discussed on more than one occasion, the word "serious" is critical here; for what we have in mind is not a one-shot "visioning session" but a demanding process that integrates institutional self-study, study of pertinent Jewish texts and conceptions, and careful deliberation concerning "the what" and "the how" of Jewish education. Carried through in the right spirit, this process will give rise to stronger educational practices as well as to institutional cultures which encourage inquiry aimed at continuing self-improvement.

Several of CIJE's recent and upcoming activities are organized around this "seeding the

culture" agenda. Pertinent examples include the Jerusalem seminar last summer, the set of 4 seminars held in Milwaukee during the spring, and the upcoming December retreat with the some 400 graduates of the Wexner program. We also view consultations like the one held with the group planning a high school in Atlanta and our upcoming programs with the JCCs and with Baltimore's central agency as opportunities to educate these constituencies concerning the important place of vision and goals in educational deliberation and practice.

As our work has progressed, we have come to recognize that it would be a mistake to "ghetto-ize" the concerns animating the Goals Project by confining them to activities pre-designated as "Goals Seminars." If we are serious about nurturing a goals-sensitive culture among the constituencies that will shape the course of Jewish education, all of CIJE's activities -- for example, in the areas of personnel development and community mobilization -- need to be infused with the concerns that are at the heart of the Goals Project. We have also come to realize that effectiveness in making these concerns come alive for targeted institutions and populations will usually require going beyond talking about the importance of goals, vision, and evaluation; we will also need to engage them in addressing genuine problems and perplexities relating to such matters in relation to their own areas of educational interest. It will be crucial to infuse such discussions with philosophically powerful Jewish conceptions so as to exhibit their capacity to deepen educational deliberations by stimulating serious thinking concerning the aims of Jewish education.

"The kitchen." We have come to refer to "the kitchen" as the backstage where we develop the resources - the materials, the know-how, the conceptualizations -- that are required to be effective in "seeding the culture" and in guiding serious institutional efforts to become organized around clear and compelling goals. Kitchen-work is wide-ranging, and it builds on the substantial and soon-to-be-published work already done under the auspices of the Mandel Institute's Educated Jew Project. It includes, but is not limited to, imaginative publications that make vivid the power of a guiding educational vision and the nature of the journey towards such a vision; continuing efforts to develop materials like those produced through the Educated Jew Project that can be used to raise the level of consciousness among lay and professional constituencies concerning the aims of Jewish education; and a repertoire of strategies that can be drawn on in the effort to encourage institutions to "take the next step" on a goals-agenda. A well-developed library of such resources will also be invaluable in the training of those individuals who will be doing this work.

Developing capacity. The ability of interested institutions to become more vision-driven and goals-sensitive may depend substantially on their being helped along by "coaches" or "guides" who possess the right kinds of aptitudes, skills, understandings, and convictions. Since the requisite expertise is not common, a third emphasis of our project has been on developing the human capacity to work with communities and institutions on a goals-agenda.

This "developing capacity" imperative has pointed us in two directions. One of these directions focuses on "pilot-projects" in which a small number of institutional guides (especially

members of our own staff) work with select institutions on a goals-agenda; carefully studied, their experience will deepen our understanding of the nature of the work that guides need to be doing and will thereby enhance our ability to train other individuals to do this kind of work. The other direction focuses on the identification, recruitment, and training of individuals who show promise of making effective guides.

Our actual work with institutions to date has emphasized the "pilot-projects". The intensive and continuing work of the Mandel Institute's Daniel Marom with Cleveland's Agnon School is a principal example; and Daniel Pekarsky has initiated some efforts in this domain with Milwaukee institutions that participated in the spring Goals Seminars.

It is worth noting in passing that in addition to what these pilot-projects will teach us about the art of helping institutions make progress on a goals-agenda, they are important to our work in a number of other ways. For example, these pilot-projects offer a wealth of information concerning institutions and institutional change; and they will also instruct us about the kinds of resources (texts, strategies, exercises, diagnostic and evaluation tools, etc.) "the kitchen" needs to be producing to help institutions make progress on the goals agenda. Finally, even one successful pilot-project, if suitably documented, analyzed, and packaged, could do wonders for our effort to convey what it means to take on a goals-agenda and the benefits of doing so. Developing such a case-study of a "success-story" may prove a very worthwhile endeavor.

BALANCING THE THREE EMPHASES

Our July meetings with Professors Seymour Fox, Israel Scheffler, and other scholars associated with the Harvard University-Mandel Institute Program of Scholarly Collaboration have helped to clarify and deepen our understanding of the relationships between the three emphases enumerated above. The following general conclusions summarize our judgment as to the most fruitful way to distribute our available energies among these emphases:

1) All three of these emphases continue to seem worthy and need to be simultaneously pursued.

2) In the third area, identified as "Developing Capacity", our immediate work should favor selected pilot-projects, each with a different focus, over an attempt to train a cadre of coaches. Standing behind this judgment is our strong sense that our ability to train individuals to work with institutions will be substantially enhanced through pilot-projects that focus on different dimensions of the work and that give rise to increasingly more fine-tuned and powerful bodies of knowledge and strategic know-how, tailored to different institutional circumstances. This knowledge-base will be an integral part of the curriculum for training others to work with institutions.

3) At the same time, we should begin now to involve in our project senior educators who have

~~the potential to be effective in helping educating institutions become more goals-sensitive, so that at the appropriate moment they can be tapped for this important work. The upcoming seminars for principals and a seminar for senior educators planned for next summer are informed by this concern.~~

CAPSULE SUMMARY OF THE WORK AHEAD

1. Seminars, consultations, and workshops organized around the following:

Seeding the culture: bringing lay and/or professional leaders in the field of Jewish education to an appreciation of the need to take questions of vision, goals and evaluation seriously, thus laying the ground for communal and institutional initiatives. Upcoming examples of such efforts include the projected seminar for the leadership of new Affiliated Communities and a spring seminar for principals organized around the concerns at the heart of the Goals Project.

Initiating some outstanding senior people into the work of the Goals Project and engaging them, as appropriate, in the project's activities. An extended seminar for this constituency, to be developed in collaboration with the Mandel Institute, has been projected for July, 1996.

Honoring commitments we've made (in ways that forward the project's principal goals). Representative activities include a set of sessions developed in cooperation with Baltimore's central agency designed to help the leadership to clarify the agency's central mission and goals; working with Wexner to develop a retreat for the Wexner graduates that is designed to focus their energies on Jewish education in their local communities; and working with teams from a number of JCCs around questions concerning the vision animating their camps.

2. Developing our Understandings and Tools

On-going work aimed at developing a library of resources, materials, strategies, and evaluation tools that will enhance our efforts to do the following: to mobilize Jewish communities in support of the goals-agenda; to help educating institutions become organized around meaningful goals; and to train the personnel to work with these institutions. The analysis and development of this crucial part of our work will be the subject of some high level deliberations at the Mandel Institute scheduled for January, 1996.

3. Pilot Projects

Marom will continue his work with Agnon and Pekarsky will try to finalize an arrangement with one or two other institutions, probably in Milwaukee.

Careful documentation and analysis of the work that goes on in the pilot projects are of critical importance. Along the way, seminars for carefully chosen clienteles designed to analyze this work will be invaluable and will be scheduled as appropriate.

Mandel Institute

מכון מנדל

Tel: 972-2-662-832

טל': 02-662-832 (רב קווים)

Fax: 972-2-662-837

פקס: 02-662-837

דף העברה בפקסימליה

תאריך: <u>17/11/07</u>	אל: <u>077-0777777</u>
מסר הדפוס: <u>1</u>	מאת: <u>17/11/07</u>
מסר הפקס:	

Severe!

ENCLOSED IS A 1/2 PAGE DOCUMENT WRITTEN BY

FEKARSKY FOR THE STORING COMPANY (ITZITZ) IN

ISRAEL. THE DOCUMENT IS A COPY OF THE ORIGINAL WHICH WAS

MAILED. I AM NOT SURE IF THE ORIGINAL IS STILL IN THE

FILE. I AM NOT SURE IF THE ORIGINAL IS STILL IN THE

FILE. I AM NOT SURE IF THE ORIGINAL IS STILL IN THE

FILE. I AM NOT SURE IF THE ORIGINAL IS STILL IN THE

FILE. I AM NOT SURE IF THE ORIGINAL IS STILL IN THE

MEMO TO: CIJE Steering Committee
FROM: Daniel Pekarsky
RE: Goals Project update
July 25, 1995

INTRODUCTORY

Our experience with the Goals Project to date has made it possible to refine the project's long-term challenges and immediate tasks.. This report is designed to bring you up to date with our thinking and activities..

The imagined future that animates the work of the Goals Project includes the following elements: with the encouragement of the communities on which they depend, Jewish educating institutions are actively engaged in serious deliberation and study designed to deepen their understanding of their central goals; they are working to develop practices that seem adequate to these goals; and they are employing evaluation procedures that make it possible to recognize and diminish the gap between aspiration and outcome.. We imagine a future in which the language of vision, goals, and evaluation figures prominently in the discourse and deliberations of educators and lay constituencies, a future in which thoughtful attention to these matters contributes to substantially improved educational practices and outcomes.. Three principal emphases have defined our efforts to move towards this imagined future..

THE THREE PRINCIPAL EMPHASES

Seeding the culture. First of all, the Goals Project is an attempt to cultivate a culture in the Jewish community that takes questions of vision, goals, and evaluation to heart, a culture that recognizes that educational and communal well-being depends on a willingness to think critically and regularly about such matters in their relationship to practice.. We have informally begun to describe initiatives that are aimed at engendering an hospitable cultural environment as "seeding the culture.." The metaphor of "seeding" is intended to suggest that out of this kind of effort some very good things are likely to grow, including the emergence of increasing numbers of institutions, embedded in strongly supportive communities, that approach us with the serious intention of becoming organized around shared and compelling educational goals.. As we have discussed on more than one occasion, the word "serious" is critical here; for what we have in mind is not a one-shot "visioning session" but a demanding process that integrates institutional self-study, study of pertinent Jewish texts and conceptions, and careful deliberation concerning "the what" and "the how" of Jewish education.. Carried through in the right spirit, this process will give rise to stronger educational practices as well as to institutional cultures which encourage inquiry aimed at continuing self-improvement..

Several of CIJE's recent and upcoming activities are organized around this "seeding the culture" agenda. Pertinent examples include the Jerusalem seminar last summer, the set of 4 seminars held in Milwaukee during the spring, and the upcoming December retreat with the some 400 graduates of the Wexner program. We also view consultations like the one held with the group planning a high school in Atlanta and our upcoming programs with the JCCs and with Baltimore's central agency as opportunities to educate these constituencies concerning the important place of vision and goals in educational deliberation and practice.

As our work has progressed, we have come to recognize that it would be a mistake to "ghetto-ize" the concerns animating the Goals Project by confining them to activities pre-designated as "Goals Seminars." If we are serious about nurturing a goals-sensitive culture among the constituencies that will shape the course of Jewish education, all of CIJE's activities -- for example, in the areas of personnel development and community mobilization -- need to be infused with the concerns that are at the heart of the Goals Project.

"The kitchen." We have come to refer to "the kitchen" as the backstage where we develop the resources - the materials, the know-how, the conceptualizations -- that are required to be effective in "seeding the culture" and in guiding serious institutional efforts to become organized around clear and compelling goals. Kitchen-work is wide-ranging: it includes, but is not limited to, imaginative publications that make vivid the power of a guiding educational vision and the nature of the journey towards such a vision; continuing efforts to develop "Educated Jew" materials that can be used to raise the level of consciousness among lay and professional constituencies concerning the aims of Jewish education; and a repertoire of strategies that can be drawn on in the effort to encourage institutions to "take the next step" on a goals-agenda. A reasonably well-developed library of such resources will be invaluable in working with institutions and in the training of those individuals who will be doing this work.

Developing capacity. The ability of interested institutions to become more vision-driven and goals-sensitive may depend substantially on their being helped along by "coaches" or "guides" who possess the right kinds of aptitudes, skills, understandings, and convictions. Since the requisite expertise is not common, a third emphasis of our project has been on developing the human capacity to work with communities and institutions on a goals-agenda.

This "developing capacity" imperative has pointed us in two directions. One of these directions focuses on "pilot-projects" in which a small number of institutional guides (especially members of our own staff) work with select institutions on a goals-agenda; carefully studied, their experience will deepen our

understanding of the nature of the work that guides need to be doing and will thereby enhance our ability to train other individuals to do this kind of work. The other direction focuses on the identification, recruitment, and training of individuals who show promise of making effective guides.

Our actual work with institutions to date has emphasized the "pilot-projects". Daniel Marom's intensive and continuing work with Cleveland's Agnon School is a principal example; and Daniel Pekarsky has initiated some efforts in this domain with Milwaukee institutions that participated in the spring Goals Seminars.

In addition to what these pilot-projects teach us about the art of helping institutions make progress on a goals-agenda, they are important to our work in a number of other ways. For example, these pilot-projects offer a wealth of information concerning institutions and institutional change; and they will also instruct us about the kinds of resources (articles, strategies, exercises, tools, etc.) "the kitchen" needs to be producing to help institutions make progress on the goals agenda. In addition, even one successful pilot-project, if suitably documented, analyzed, and packaged, could do wonders for our effort to convey what it means to take on a goals-agenda and the benefits of doing so. Developing such a case-study of a "success-story" may prove a very worthwhile endeavor.

BALANCING THE THREE EMPHASES

Based on our experience to date, our recent deliberations with the Mandel Institute and with the Philosophy of Education Research Center at Harvard can be understood as an attempt to clarify and deepen the relationships between the three emphases enumerated above and to determine the most fruitful way to distribute our available energies among them. Our general conclusions were 1) that all three of these emphases continue to seem worthy and need to be simultaneously pursued, and 2) that in the third area, identified as "Developing Capacity", our immediate work should favor selected pilot-projects over an attempt to train a cadre of coaches. Standing behind this conclusion is our increasingly strong sense that our ability to train individuals to work with institutions will be enormously enhanced as a result of what we will learn through selected pilot-projects, especially when combined with parallel efforts "in the kitchen" to develop a library of pertinent and accessible conceptualizations, strategies, and materials. At the same time, 3) we should begin now to involve in our project senior educators who have the potential to be effective in helping educating institutions become more goals-sensitive, so that at the appropriate moment they can be tapped for this important work. The upcoming seminars for principals and the seminar for senior educators planned for next summer are informed by this concern.

CAPSULE SUMMARY OF THE WORK AHEAD

1. Seminars, consultations, and workshops organized around the following:

Seeding the culture: bringing lay and/or professional leaders in the field of Jewish education to an appreciation of the need to take questions of vision, goals and evaluation seriously, thus laying the ground for communal and institutional initiatives. Upcoming examples of such efforts include the projected seminar for the leadership of new Affiliated Communities and a spring seminar for principals organized around the concerns at the heart of the Goals Project..

Initiating some outstanding senior people into the work of the Goals Project and engaging them, as appropriate, in the project's activities.. An extended seminar for this constituency has been projected for July, 1996.

Honoring outstanding commitments we've made (in ways that forward the project's principal goals).. Representative activities include a set of sessions developed in cooperation with Baltimore's central agency designed to help the leadership to clarify the agency's central mission and goals; working with Wexner to develop a retreat for the Wexner graduates that is designed to focus their energies on Jewish education in their local communities; working with teams from a number of JCCs around questions concerning the vision animating their camps; and working with the Jewish Education Center of Cleveland to help clarify what might be an appropriate set of goals for Beth Torah, a supplemental school focusing on Hebrew that is shared by three Conservative congregations.

2. Developing our Understandings and Tools

On-going work aimed at developing a library of resources, materials, strategies, and evaluation tools that will enhance our efforts to do the following: to mobilize Jewish communities in support of the goals-agenda; to help educating institutions become organized around meaningful goals; and to train the personnel to work with these institutions.. It is crucial that we not side-step this part of our work!

3. Pilot Projects: Marom will continue his work with Agnon and Pekarsky will try to finalize an arrangement with one or two other institutions, probably in Milwaukee.

From: Daniel Pekarsky at ☎ 668-233-4844
To: Mandel Institute at ☎ 011-972-2-662837

87-29-95 11:11 pm
0 612 of 612

Careful documentation and analysis of the work that goes on in the pilot projects are of critical importance. Along the way, seminars for carefully chosen clienteles designed to analyze this work will be invaluable and will be scheduled as appropriate.

SUMMARY OF HOFFMANN-HOLTZ-PEKARSKY-MAROM CONFERENCE CALL
July 24, 1995

The need to develop a report for the CIJE Steering Committee necessitated deferring this summary of our conversation; so I apologize in advance if I have failed to reconstruct it adequately.

TOWARDS CONCRETENESS AND DIVISION OF LABOR

The background to our conversation was a document purporting to summarize decisions made at the end of our July deliberations and suggesting a work-plan designed to carry out these decisions. Before discussing that document concretely, Pekar3ky, based on an earlier conversation with Marom, sketched out what in very practical terms this work-plan might look like. The sketch tried to identify what Marom and Pekar3ky would be doing, both individually and together. Focusing on them was not meant to suggest that others would not be actively involved; but it was a nod to the reality that they will be central to the effort. Below is the division-of-labor Pekar3ky proposed:

MAROM

1. Agnon Pilot-project

- a) Continue working with Agnom;
- b) Document everything pertinent that happens;
- c) Analyze the experience ((through reflective reports, through discussions with Pekar3ky, and through periodic consultations and seminars organized around concerns and questions emanating from this work.

2. Kitchen-work

- a) Dig into the work in the kitchen with a fairly narrow but doable effort that has the potential to illuminate the nature of kitchen work.

The challenge would be to pick a movement within contemporary Jewish life (e.g. Reform, Conservative, or non-denominational "community institutions") and an area (say, "Hebrew" or "Israel" or "Prayer"), and do an inventory of pertinent resources that already exist and that would be useful in working with institutions in that movement in this area; develop additional materials, maps, etc., making use of the 5 levels we've discussed and the grid as appropriate.

- b) Curricularise the Rosenak material ((with Pekar3ky))

3. Educated Jew Project

a) Finish the book.

b) Curricularize the Educated Jew materials for use by communities and institutions (with Pekarsky)

c) Organize a conference around the Educated Jew Project for a carefully chosen clientele.

4. Help to plan the January and July seminars, to be held in Israel.

5. Participate to the extent possible in other seminars we will be holding across the year in the United States.

PEKARSKY

1. Plan and facilitate the various seminars and workshops planned for the coming year.

2. The kitchen

a) Develop a fleshed-out conceptualization of the work that needs to be done.

b) Do work focused on another movement that is parallel to Marom's effort to develop a thorough understanding of a particular domain (like "Israel") possibly the Conservative movement.

c) Conceptualize and develop proposals for substantial publication-projects along the lines of "The Future As History" or a Jewish Sarah Lightfoot book.

d) Work with Marom on curricularizing the Rosenak and the Educated Jew materials.

3. Pilot-projects

a) Work with Marom to document and analyze his work at Agnon.

b) Identify and begin working in a pilot-project site.

REACTIONS TO THE PROPOSAL

What do we mean by "maps" and "mapping"? We have used such terms a lot when referring to the kitchen-work. What exactly do we have in mind?

There is in fact some unclarity here, and achieving clarity concerning this is one of the challenges of Pekarsky's initial "kitchen-assignment" (which is to conceptualize the kitchen-

work). But it is worth noting that the unclarity surrounding the "mapping" language is not a symptom of empty rhetoric; rather, the term is richly suggestive! It points us towards "logical maps" which exhibit the relationships between, say, curriculum and pedagogy to conceptions of the aims of Jewish education and to more fundamental beliefs concerning the nature of Jewish existence; and it also points us to "strategic maps" which suggest different routes we can take when confronted with particular institutional circumstances. Pekarsky's initial piece on the kitchen will need to clarify these and other meanings of "mapping".

Where in the plan is there provision for educating the kinds of individuals who came to the Jerusalem Goals Seminar? The Seminar for the Leadership of Affiliate Communities is intended for a comparable constituency.

In this connection, a suggestion was made that perhaps we should be encouraging more institutional teams to attend this seminar than had been present in Jerusalem; Agnon seems to have greatly benefitted from the circumstance that both its president and its principal were in attendance. In response to this, a concern was raised about our running the risk of not having the human capacity to meet the demand for help with a goals-agenda that might come our way from "turned-on" institutions. This discussion was not pursued in this conversation.

What's the purpose of the Summer 1996 Seminar in Jerusalem? Does this represent an effort to train coaches? The idea behind this seminar is to bring into the culture of the Goals Project some exceptionally talented individuals whose outlook and background make it likely that they will be sympathetic to our work and possibly able to contribute to it. They will be invited without preconceptions concerning whether or how they will be involved with our project beyond the seminar. It is conceivable that some might be engaged to do "culture-seeding" work; others kitchen-work; others pilot-projects; and others nothing at all. All of this we will have to see as we move along. In general terms, though, the intent is to create capacity for the Goals Project by bringing more people into our conversation, thereby also seeding the field with more people who speak the language of the Goals Project.

Don't forget the front-line educators! Based on his recent work with Agnon, DM urged us that as we think about the constituencies to work with, we should not forget that unless educators who are involved in day-to-day efforts at education get actively engaged (and in relation to their own work) with the concerns the Goals Project is concerned with, our success will be limited. This means that as we try to shape initiatives aimed at principals and teachers (for example, the Cleveland-Milwaukee initiative), we should find ways to encourage meaningful attention to goals. [In the case of principals, one of the challenges may be to help them find ways to engage their teachers

in thinking productively about such matters.]]

Does the work-plan allow for on-going efforts to refine the overall direction and conception of the project? Very much so! Note, for example, the consultation in Jerusalem projected for January of 1996. Perhaps, though, the work-plan itself needs to reflect this critical dimension of our work.

Marom's participation in seminars in the U.S. It will be important to think through Marom's travel-schedule in relation to our seminars and to try to coordinate his trips with the seminars at which his availability would be the most useful.

Does movement-linked kitchen-work involve working with denominational bodies? When DP speaks of tackling a content-area in the context of the Conservative movement ((drawing on the expertise of Barry and Gail)), this could be heard as an overly-ambitious effort to get involved in active work with the denominations. But at least at this stage of our work, DP wants to do something much more preliminary - something that does not involve, though it might provide groundwork for, work with denominational groups.

Synchronizing our language usage: "community". Alan expressed some concern that we've begun using the term "community" in too many senses, thereby breeding some confusion. He suggested we limit the term to geographic Jewish communities under the organizational leadership of Federations.

Need for sub-categories. It was suggested that in developing our work-plan it might be useful to discriminate between on-going commitments and one-time commitments.

Analysis of pilot-project data: involve the participants! The view was expressed that we would do well to include pilot-project participants in analyzing what is happening with pilot-projects. For example, Ray Levi's input could be invaluable, and this should be taken into account when we plan opportunities to examine the Agnon experience.

THE MOST MAJOR CONCERNS EVOKED BY THE PROPOSED DIVISION OF LABOR

The general thrust of the proposed plan seemed congenial to the participants in our conference call. But two general concerns were raised:

1. If we look at the work that's been projected for Marom and Pekarsky in this conversation, is there anything significant that's been dropped from what we seem to have agreed to during our deliberations in Cambridge in NY? (Our intuitive sense is that the answer is "No," but we agreed that it would be important for Pekarsky to review the proceedings of our sessions with this in mind prior to our next conference

call.)

2. The proposed set of activities seems very ambitious, particularly given the fact that Pekarsky and Marom are both heavily committed in other arenas.

One possibility would be to prioritize the various tasks and to put aside or defer some of them -- for example, the effort to curricularize the Rosenak material for use in North American communities.

Another possibility, and one that seemed to make some initial sense, was to accept this formulation of the plan but to regard it as a plan that would be completed not in a year but in a year and a half -- in Dec. of 1996. In view of Pekarsky's greater availability for a period beginning in January of 1996, this might make the plan more readily achieved.

SOME FINAL POINTS

1. Alan let us know that Rosenak may be available to work with various constituencies in the United States. We all thought that this would be great. We should be thinking carefully about how to optimize the use of his time so that it will forward our principal efforts. Further information concerning his availability would be very valuable; perhaps Marom or Hoffmann could clarify this.

2. DP mentioned that as a result of the Chaggin and CCJEE commitments he would be missing a lot of UW classes and expressed some concern about getting to Israel for a fall meeting with Fox and Marom. He wondered about the possibility of a meeting around Dec. 20. Marom responded that he will be in the U.S. in the fall and perhaps the meeting that had been proposed for Jerusalem could be held in the States.

3. DP and ADH agreed about the need to talk together about the possibility of a DP leave-of-absence from the UW in the fall of 1996. Given the bureaucraties involved, this discussion should take place soon.

4. Pekarsky agreed to develop a brief summary of where we had gone in this conversation, with attention to anything important that the proposed plan leaves out. This summary should be faxed to all of us in preparation for our next conference call on August 4 (8:30 a.m., Madison-time; 1 hour later in New York, and 8 hours later in Jerusalem).

Sorry for any omissions or misinterpretations, but I trust you'll catch them.

OUR NEXT MEETING

Note that, in general, our discussion left intact the activities identified with Pekarsky and Marom that were discussed at the beginning of our meeting. I suggest that our next meeting try to do the followings

1. A report from Pekarsky re: the relationship between this proposed plan and what we agreed to in our NY/Cambridge deliberations..
2. Reactions to the summary of our discussion offered in this document..
3. Achieving closure on this, or a revised, plan.

MEMO TO: CIJE Steering Committee
FROM: Daniel Pekarsky
RE: Goals Project update
July 25, 1995

INTRODUCTORY

Our experience with the Goals Project to date has made it possible to refine the project's long-term challenges and immediate tasks. This report is designed to bring you up to date with our thinking and activities.

The imagined future that animates the work of the Goals Project includes the following elements: Jewish educating institutions, encouraged by their communities, are actively engaged in serious deliberation and study designed to deepen their understanding of their central goals; they are working to develop practices that seem adequate to these goals; and they are employing evaluation procedures that make it possible to recognize and diminish the gap between aspiration and outcome. We imagine a future in which the language of vision, goals, and evaluation figures prominently in the discourse and deliberations of educators and lay constituencies, a future in which thoughtful attention to these matters contributes to substantially improved educational practices and outcomes. Three principal emphases have defined our efforts to move towards this imagined future.

THE THREE PRINCIPAL EMPHASES

Seeding the culture. First of all, the Goals Project is an attempt to cultivate a culture in the Jewish community that takes questions of vision, goals, and evaluation to heart, a culture that recognizes that educational and communal well-being depends on a willingness to think critically and regularly about such matters in their relationship to practice. We have informally begun to describe initiatives that are aimed at engendering an hospitable cultural environment as "seeding the culture." The metaphor of "seeding" is intended to suggest that out of this kind of effort some very good things are likely to grow, including the emergence of increasing numbers of institutions, embedded in strongly supportive communities, that approach us with the serious intention of becoming organized around shared and compelling educational goals. As we have discussed on more than one occasion, the word "serious" is critical here: for what we have in mind is not a one-shot "visioning session" but a demanding process that integrates institutional self-study, study of pertinent Jewish texts and conceptions, and careful deliberation concerning "the what" and "the how" of Jewish education. Carried through in the right spirit, this process will give rise to stronger educational practices as well as to institutional cultures which encourage inquiry aimed at continuing self-improvement.

Several of CIJE's recent and upcoming activities are organized around this "seeding the culture" agenda. Pertinent examples include the Jerusalem seminar last summer, the set of 4 seminars held in Milwaukee during the spring, and the upcoming December retreat with the some 400 graduates of the Wexner program. We also view consultations like the one held with the group planning a high school in Atlanta and our upcoming programs with the JCCs and with Baltimore's central agency as opportunities to educate these constituencies concerning the important place of vision and goals in educational deliberation and practice.

As our work has progressed, we have come to recognize that it would be a mistake to "ghetto-ize" the concerns animating the Goals Project by confining them to activities pre-designated as "Goals Seminars." If we are serious about nurturing a goals-sensitive culture among the constituencies that will shape the course of Jewish education, all of CIJE's activities -- for example, in the areas of personnel development and community mobilization -- need to be infused with the concerns that are at the heart of the Goals Project. We have also come to realize that effectiveness in making these concerns come alive for targeted institutions and populations will usually require going beyond talking about the importance of goals, vision, and evaluation; it will be critical that we also lead them to identify and begin addressing genuine problems and perplexities relating to such matters in relation to their own areas of educational interest.

"The kitchen." We have come to refer to "the kitchen" as the backstage where we develop the resources -- the materials, the know-how, the conceptualizations -- that are required to be effective in "seeding the culture" and in guiding serious institutional efforts to become organized around clear and compelling goals. Kitchen-work is wide-ranging; it includes, but is not limited to, imaginative publications that make vivid the power of a guiding educational vision and the nature of the journey towards such a vision; continuing efforts to develop materials like those developed through the Educated Jew Project that can be used to raise the level of consciousness among lay and professional constituencies concerning the aims of Jewish education; and a repertoire of strategies that can be drawn on in the effort to encourage institutions to "take the next step" on a goals-agenda. A reasonably well-developed library of such resources will be invaluable in working with institutions and in the training of those individuals who will be doing this work.

Developing capacity. The ability of interested institutions to become more vision-driven and goals-sensitive may depend substantially on their being helped along by "coaches" or "guides" who possess the right kinds of aptitudes, skills, understandings, and convictions. Since the requisite expertise is not common, a third emphasis of our project has been on developing the human capacity to work with communities and institutions on a goals-agenda.

This "developing capacity" imperative has pointed us in two directions. One of these directions focuses on "pilot-projects" in which a small number of institutional guides (especially members of our own staff) work with select institutions on a goals-agenda; carefully studied, their experience will deepen our understanding of the nature of the work that guides need to be doing and will thereby enhance our ability to train other individuals to do this kind of work. The other direction focuses on the identification, recruitment, and training of individuals who show promise of making effective guides.

Our actual work with institutions to date has emphasized the "pilot-projects". Daniel Marom's intensive and continuing work with Cleveland's Agnon School is a principal example; and Daniel Pekansky has initiated some efforts in this domain with Milwaukee institutions that participated in the spring Goals Seminars.

In addition to what these pilot-projects teach us about the art of helping institutions make progress on a goals-agenda, they are important to our work in a number of other ways. For example, these pilot-projects offer a wealth of information concerning institutions and institutional change; and they will also instruct us about the kinds of resources (articles, strategies, exercises, tools, etc.) "the kitchen" needs to be producing to help institutions make progress on the goals agenda. In addition, even one successful pilot-project, if suitably documented, analyzed, and packaged, could do wonders for our effort to convey what it means to take on a goals-agenda and the benefits of doing so. Developing such a case-study of a "success-story" may prove a very worthwhile endeavor.

BALANCING THE THREE EMPHASES

Based on our experience to date and our recent deliberations with the Mandel Institute and the Philosophy of Education Research Center at Harvard, we have clarified and deepened the relationships between the three emphases enumerated above. The following general conclusions summarize our judgment as to the most fruitful way to distribute our available energies among these emphases:

1) All three of these emphases continue to seem worthy and need to be simultaneously pursued.

2) In the third area, identified as "Developing Capacity", our immediate work should favor selected pilot-projects, each with a different focus, over an attempt to train a cadre of coaches. Standing behind this judgment is our strong sense that our ability to train individuals to work with institutions will be substantially enhanced through pilot-projects that focus on different dimensions of the work and that give rise to increasingly fine-tuned tools and understandings. Especially when these pilot-projects are combined with parallel efforts in

the kitchen" to develop a library of pertinent and accessible conceptualizations, strategies, and materials, they offer an invaluable opportunity to build content-knowledge and strategic know-how tailored to different institutional circumstances. This knowledge-base will be an integral part of the curriculum for training others to work with institutions.

3) At the same time, we should begin to involve in our project senior educators who have the potential to be effective in helping educating institutions become more goals-sensitive, so that at the appropriate moment they can be tapped for this important work. The upcoming seminars for principals and the seminar for senior educators planned for next summer are informed by this concern.

CAPSULE SUMMARY OF THE WORK AHEAD

1. Seminars, consultations, and workshops organized around the following:

Seeding the culture: bringing lay and/or professional leaders in the field of Jewish education to an appreciation of the need to take questions of vision, goals and evaluation seriously, thus laying the ground for communal and institutional initiatives. Upcoming examples of such efforts include the projected seminar for the leadership of new Affiliated Communities and a spring seminar for principals organized around the concerns at the heart of the Goals Project.

Initiating some outstanding senior people into the work of the Goals Project and engaging them, as appropriate, in the project's activities. An extended seminar for this constituency has been projected for July, 1996. Honoring commitments we've made (in ways that forward the project's principal goals). Representative activities include a set of sessions developed in cooperation with Baltimore's central agency designed to help the leadership to clarify the agency's central mission and goals; working with Wexner to develop a retreat for the Wexner graduates that is designed to focus their energies on Jewish education in their local communities; and working with teams from a number of JCCs around questions concerning the vision animating their camps.

2. Developing our Understandings and Tools

On-going work aimed at developing a library of resources, materials, strategies, and evaluation tools that will enhance our efforts to do the following: to mobilize Jewish communities in support of the goals-agenda; to help educating institutions become organized around meaningful goals; and to train the personnel to

work with these institutions. It is crucial that we not side-step this part of our work!!

3. Pilot Projects

Marom will continue his work with Agnom and Pekarsky will try to finalize an arrangement with one or two other institutions, probably in Milwaukee.

Careful documentation and analysis of the work that goes on in the pilot projects are of critical importance. Along the way, seminars for carefully chosen clienteles designed to analyze this work will be invaluable and will be scheduled as appropriate.

MEMO TO: CIJE Steering Committee
FROM: Daniel Pekarsky
RE: Goals Project update
July 25, 1995

INTRODUCTORY

Our experience with the Goals Project to date has made it possible to refine the project's long-term challenges and immediate tasks. This report is designed to bring you up to date with our thinking and activities.

The imagined future that animates the work of the Goals Project includes the following elements: Jewish educating institutions, encouraged by their communities, are actively engaged in serious deliberation and study designed to deepen their understanding of their central goals; they are working to develop practices that seem adequate to these goals; and they are employing evaluation procedures that make it possible to recognize and diminish the gap between aspiration and outcome. We imagine a future in which the language of vision, goals, and evaluation figures prominently in the discourse and deliberations of educators and lay constituencies, a future in which thoughtful attention to these matters contributes to substantially improved educational practices and outcomes. Three principal emphases have defined our efforts to move towards this imagined future.

THE THREE PRINCIPAL EMPHASES

Seeding the culture. First of all, the Goals Project is an attempt to cultivate a culture in the Jewish community that takes questions of vision, goals, and evaluation to heart, a culture that recognizes that educational and communal well-being depends on a willingness to think critically and regularly about such matters in their relationship to practice. We have informally begun to describe initiatives that are aimed at engendering an hospitable cultural environment as "seeding the culture." The metaphor of "seeding" is intended to suggest that out of this kind of effort some very good things are likely to grow, including the emergence of increasing numbers of institutions, embedded in strongly supportive communities, that approach us with the serious intention of becoming organized around shared and compelling educational goals. As we have discussed on more than one occasion, the word "serious" is critical here: for what we have in mind is not a one-shot "visioning session" but a demanding process that integrates institutional self-study, study of pertinent Jewish texts and conceptions, and careful deliberation concerning "the what" and "the how" of Jewish education. Carried through in the right spirit, this process will give rise to stronger educational practices as well as to institutional cultures which encourage inquiry aimed at continuing self-improvement.

Several of CIJE's recent and upcoming activities are organized around this "seeding the culture" agenda. Pertinent examples include the Jerusalem seminar last summer, the set of 4 seminars held in Milwaukee during the spring, and the upcoming December retreat with the some 400 graduates of the Wexner program. We also view consultations like the one held with the group planning a high school in Atlanta and our upcoming programs with the JCCs and with Baltimore's central agency as opportunities to educate these constituencies concerning the important place of vision and goals in educational deliberation and practice.

As our work has progressed, we have come to recognize that it would be a mistake to "ghetto-ize" the concerns animating the Goals Project by confining them to activities pre-designated as "Goals Seminars." If we are serious about nurturing a goals-sensitive culture among the constituencies that will shape the course of Jewish education, all of CIJE's activities -- for example, in the areas of personnel development and community mobilization -- need to be infused with the concerns that are at the heart of the Goals Project. We have also come to realize that effectiveness in making these concerns come alive for targeted institutions and populations will usually require going beyond talking about the importance of goals, vision, and evaluation; it will be critical that we also lead them to identify and begin addressing genuine problems and perplexities relating to such matters in relation to their own areas of educational interest.

"The kitchen." We have come to refer to "the kitchen" as the backstage where we develop the resources - the materials, the know-how, the conceptualizations -- that are required to be effective in "seeding the culture" and in guiding serious institutional efforts to become organized around clear and compelling goals. Kitchen-work is wide-ranging: it includes, but is not limited to, imaginative publications that make vivid the power of a guiding educational vision and the nature of the journey towards such a vision; continuing efforts to develop materials like those developed through the Educated Jew Project that can be used to raise the level of consciousness among lay and professional constituencies concerning the aims of Jewish education; and a repertoire of strategies that can be drawn on in the effort to encourage institutions to "take the next step" on a goals-agenda. A reasonably well-developed library of such resources will be invaluable in working with institutions and in the training of those individuals who will be doing this work.

Developing capacity. The ability of interested institutions to become more vision-driven and goals-sensitive may depend substantially on their being helped along by "coaches" or "guides" who possess the right kinds of aptitudes, skills, understandings, and convictions. Since the requisite expertise is not common, a third emphasis of our project has been on developing the human capacity to work with communities and institutions on a goals-agenda.

This "developing capacity" imperative has pointed us in two directions. One of these directions focuses on "pilot-projects" in which a small number of institutional guides (especially members of our own staff) work with select institutions on a goals-agenda; carefully studied, their experience will deepen our understanding of the nature of the work that guides need to be doing and will thereby enhance our ability to train other individuals to do this kind of work. The other direction focuses on the identification, recruitment, and training of individuals who show promise of making effective guides.

Our actual work with institutions to date has emphasized the "pilot-projects". Daniel Marom's intensive and continuing work with Cleveland's Agnon School is a principal example; and Daniel Pekarsky has initiated some efforts in this domain with Milwaukee institutions that participated in the spring Goals Seminars.

In addition to what these pilot-projects teach us about the art of helping institutions make progress on a goals-agenda, they are important to our work in a number of other ways. For example, these pilot-projects offer a wealth of information concerning institutions and institutional change; and they will also instruct us about the kinds of resources (articles, strategies, exercises, tools, etc.) "the kitchen" needs to be producing to help institutions make progress on the goals agenda. In addition, even one successful pilot-project, if suitably documented, analyzed, and packaged, could do wonders for our effort to convey what it means to take on a goals-agenda and the benefits of doing so. Developing such a case-study of a "success-story" may prove a very worthwhile endeavor.

BALANCING THE THREE EMPHASES

Based on our experience to date and our recent deliberations with the Mandel Institute and the Philosophy of Education Research Center at Harvard, we have clarified and deepened the relationships between the three emphases enumerated above. The following general conclusions summarize our judgment as to the most fruitful way to distribute our available energies among these emphases:

1) All three of these emphases continue to seem worthy and need to be simultaneously pursued.

2) In the third area, identified as "Developing Capacity", our immediate work should favor selected pilot-projects, each with a different focus, over an attempt to train a cadre of coaches. Standing behind this judgment is our strong sense that our ability to train individuals to work with institutions will be substantially enhanced through pilot-projects that focus on different dimensions of the work and that give rise to increasingly fine-tuned tools and understandings. Especially when these pilot-projects are combined with parallel efforts "in

the kitchen" to develop a library of pertinent and accessible conceptualizations, strategies, and materials, they offer an invaluable opportunity to build content-knowledge and strategic know-how tailored to different institutional circumstances. This knowledge-base will be an integral part of the curriculum for training others to work with institutions.

3) At the same time, we should begin to involve our project senior educators who have the potential to be effective in helping educating institutions become more goals-sensitive, so that at the appropriate moment they can be tapped for this important work. The upcoming seminars for principals and the seminar for senior educators planned for next summer are informed by this concern.

CAPSULE SUMMARY OF THE WORK AHEAD

1. Seminars, consultations, and workshops organized around the following:

Seeding the culture: bringing lay and/or professional leaders in the field of Jewish education to an appreciation of the need to take questions of vision, goals and evaluation seriously, thus laying the ground for communal and institutional initiatives. Upcoming examples of such efforts include the projected seminar for the leadership of new Affiliated Communities and a spring seminar for principals organized around the concerns at the heart of the Goals Project.

Initiating some outstanding senior people into the work of the Goals Project and engaging them, as appropriate, in the project's activities. An extended seminar for this constituency has been projected for July, 1996. Honoring commitments we've made (in ways that forward the project's principal goals). Representative activities include a set of sessions developed in cooperation with Baltimore's central agency designed to help the leadership to clarify the agency's central mission and goals; working with Wexner to develop a retreat for the Wexner graduates that is designed to focus their energies on Jewish education in their local communities; and working with teams from a number of JCCs around questions concerning the vision animating their camps.

2. Developing our Understandings and Tools

On-going work aimed at developing a library of resources, materials, strategies, and evaluation tools that will enhance our efforts to do the following: to mobilize Jewish communities in support of the goals-agenda; to help educating institutions become organized around meaningful goals; and to train the personnel to

work with these institutions. It is crucial that we not side-step this part of our work!!

3. Pilot Projects

Marom will continue his work with Agnon and Pekarsky will try to finalize an arrangement with one or two other institutions, probably in Milwaukee.

Careful documentation and analysis of the work that goes on in the pilot projects are of critical importance. Along the way, seminars for carefully chosen clienteles designed to analyze this work will be invaluable and will be scheduled as appropriate.

To: Mandel Institute
From: Daniel Pekarsky

Date: 7-29-95
Page 001 of 012

From: Daniel Pekarsky at 60862232404041
To: Kandel Institute at 6116912922682697807

87-29-95 11:06 pm
602 of 012

MEMO TO: Daniel Marom
FROM: DP

Attached you will find a draft-summary of our conference-call the other day; I haven't yet had a chance to see a hard copy of it or to review it carefully -- which I hope to do when I get back to Madison.

I am also enclosing a draft of the short piece that I've been asked to submit to the Steering Committee of CIJE for our August meeting.

Please also show these to Seymour. By the way, I think Seymour ended up leaving the U.S. without picking up from the NY office the summary of the meeting that eventuated in decisions and a work-plan (the meeting held in Gail's house on 7/16. Can you arrange for him to get a copy of that summary?

If I'm not mistaken, you and I are scheduled to speak on Sunday evening 11:30 pm my time (=Monday, 7:30 am your time).. As of now, I haven't had a chance to review the Agmon-piece you sent me, but I will have read it before we speak. I would have gotten to it sooner but I was buried by the assignment to prepare the document for the Steering Committee. Talk to you soon.

DP

SUMMARY OF HOFFMANN-HOLTZ-PEKARSKY-MAROM CONFERENCE CALL
July 24, 1995

The need to develop a report for the CIVE Steering Committee necessitated deferring this summary of our conversation; so I apologize in advance if I have failed to reconstruct it adequately.

TOWARDS CONCRETENESS AND DIVISION OF LABOR

The background to our conversation was a document purporting to summarize decisions made at the end of our July deliberations and suggesting a work-plan designed to carry out these decisions. Before discussing that document concretely, Pekarsky, based on an earlier conversation with Marom, sketched out what in very practical terms this work-plan might look like. The sketch tried to identify what Marom and Pekarsky would be doing, both individually and together. Focusing on them was not meant to suggest that others would not be actively involved; but it was a nod to the reality that they will be central to the effort. Below is the division-of-labor Pekarsky proposed:

MAROM

1. Agnon Pilot-project

- a) Continue working with Agnon;
- b) Document everything pertinent that happens;
- c) Analyze the experience ((through reflective reports, through discussions with Pekarsky, and through periodic consultations and seminars organized around concerns and questions emanating from this work.

2. Kitchen-work

- a) Dig into the work in the kitchen with a fairly narrow but doable effort that has the potential to illuminate the nature of kitchen work.

The challenge would be to pick a movement within contemporary Jewish life (e.g. Reform, Conservative, or non-denominational "community institutions") and an area (say, "Hebrew" or "Israel" or "Prayer"), and do an inventory of pertinent resources that already exist and that would be useful in working with institutions in that movement in this area; develop additional materials, maps, etc., making use of the 5 levels we've discussed and the grid as appropriate.

- b) Curricularize the Rosenak material (with Pekarsky)

3. Educated Jew Project

a) Finish the book.

b) Curricularize the Educated Jew materials for use by communities and institutions ((with Pekarsky))

c) Organize a conference around the Educated Jew Project for a carefully chosen clientele.

4. Help to plan the January and July seminars, to be held in Israel.

5. Participate to the extent possible in other seminars we will be holding across the year in the United States.

PEKARSKY

1. Plan and facilitate the various seminars and workshops planned for the coming year.

2. The kitchen

a) Develop a fleshed-out conceptualization of the work that needs to be done.

b) Do work focused on another movement that is parallel to Marom's effort to develop a thorough understanding of a particular domain ((like "Israel")); possibly the Conservative movement.

c) Conceptualize and develop proposals for substantial publication-projects along the lines of "The Future As History" or a Jewish Sarah Lightfoot book.

d) Work with Marom on curricularizing the Rosenak and the Educated Jew materials.

3. Pilot-projects

a) Work with Marom to document and analyze his work at Agnon.

b) Identify and begin working in a pilot-project site.

REACTIONS TO THE PROPOSAL

What do we mean by "maps" and "mapping"? We have used such terms a lot when referring to the kitchen-work. What exactly do we have in mind?

There is in fact some unclarity here, and achieving clarity concerning this is one of the challenges of Pekarsky's initial "kitchen-assignment" (which is to conceptualize the kitchen-

work)). But it is worth noting that the unclarity surrounding the "mapping" language is not a symptom of empty rhetoric; rather, the term is richly suggestive! It points us towards "logical maps" which exhibit the relationships between, say, curriculum and pedagogy to conceptions of the aims of Jewish education and to more fundamental beliefs concerning the nature of Jewish existence; and it also points us to "strategic maps" which suggest different routes we can take when confronted with particular institutional circumstances.. Pekarsky's initial piece on the kitchen will need to clarify these and other meanings of "mapping"..

Where in the plan is there provision for educating the kinds of individuals who came to the Jerusalem Goals Seminar? The Seminar for the Leadership of Affiliate Communities is intended for a comparable constituency..

In this connection, a suggestion was made that perhaps we should be encouraging more institutional teams to attend this seminar than had been present in Jerusalem; Agnon seems to have greatly benefitted from the circumstance that both its president and its principal were in attendance.. In response to this, a concern was raised about our running the risk of not having the human capacity to meet the demand for help with a goals-agenda that might come our way from "turned-on" institutions.. This discussion was not pursued in this conversation..

What's the purpose of the Summer 1996 Seminar in Jerusalem? Does this represent an effort to train coaches? The idea behind this seminar is to bring into the culture of the Goals Project some exceptionally talented individuals whose outlook and background make it likely that they will be sympathetic to our work and possibly able to contribute to it.. They will be invited without preconceptions concerning whether or how they will be involved with our project beyond the seminar.. It is conceivable that some might be engaged to do "culture-seeding" work; others kitchen-work; others pilot-projects; and others nothing at all.. All of this we will have to see as we move along.. In general terms, though, the intent is to create capacity for the Goals Project by bringing more people into our conversation, thereby also seeding the field with more people who speak the language of the Goals Project..

Does the work-plan allow for on-going efforts to refine the overall direction and conception of the project? Very much so! Note, for example, the consultation in Jerusalem projected for January of 1996.. Perhaps, though, the work-plan itself needs to reflect this critical dimension of our work..

Marom's participation in seminars in the U.S.. It will be important to think through Marom's travel-schedule in relation to our seminars and to try to coordinate his trips with the seminars at which his availability would be the most useful..

Does movement-linked kitchen-work involve working with denominational bodies? When DP speaks of tackling a content-area in the context of the Conservative movement ((drawing on the expertise of Barry and Gail)), this could be heard as an overly-ambitious effort to get involved in active work with the denominations.. But at least at this stage of our work,, DP wants to do something much more preliminary - something that does not involve,, though it might provide groundwork for,, work with denominational groups..

Synchronizing our language usage:: "community".. Alan expressed some concern that we've begun using the term "community" in too many senses,, thereby breeding some confusion. He suggested we limit the term to geographic Jewish communities under the organizational leadership of Federations..

Need for sub-categories.. It was suggested that in developing our work-plan it might be useful to discriminate between on-going commitments and one-time commitments..

THE MOST MAJOR CONCERNS EVOKED BY THE PROPOSED DIVISION OF LABOR

The general thrust of the proposed plan seemed congenial to the participants in our conference call.. But two general concerns were raised::

1. If we look at the work that's been projected for Marom and Pekarsky in this conversation,, is there anything significant that's been dropped from what we seem to have agreed to during our deliberations in Cambridge in NY? ((Our intuitive sense is that the answer is "No," but we agreed that it would be important for Pekarsky to review the proceedings of our sessions with this in mind prior to our next conference call..))

2. The proposed set of activities seems very ambitious,, particularly given the fact that Pekarsky and Marom are both heavily committed in other arenas.

One possibility would be to prioritize the various tasks and to put aside or defer some of them -- for example,, the effort to curricularize the Rosenak material for use in North American communities.

Another possibility,, and one that seemed to make some initial sense,, was to accept this formulation of the plan but to regard it as a plan that would be completed not in a year but in a year and a half == in Dec. of 1996. In view of Pekarsky's greater availability for a period beginning in January of 1996,, this might make the plan more readily achieved..

SOME FINAL POINTS

1. Alan let us know that Rosenak may be available to work with various constituencies in the United States. We all thought that this would be great. We should be thinking carefully about how to optimize the use of his time so that it will forward our principal efforts. Further information concerning his availability would be very valuable; perhaps Marom or Hoffmann could clarify this.

2. DP mentioned that as a result of the Chaggim and CIJE commitments he would be missing a lot of UW classes and expressed some concern about getting to Israel for a fall meeting with Fox and Marom. He wondered about the possibility of a meeting around Dec. 20. Marom responded that he will be in the U.S. in the fall and perhaps the meeting that had been proposed for Jerusalem could be held in the States..

3. DP and ADH agreed about the need to talk together about the possibility of a DP leave-of-absence from the UW in the fall of 1996. Given the bureaucraties involved, this discussion should take place soon.

4. Pekarsky agreed to develop a brief summary of where we had gone in this conversation, with attention to anything important that the proposed plan leaves out. This summary should be faxed to all of us in preparation for our next conference call on August 4 (8:30 a.m., Madison-time; 1 hour later in New York, and 3 hours later in Jerusalem)..

Sorry for any omissions or misinterpretations, but I trust you'll catch them.

OUR NEXT MEETING

Note that, in general, our discussion left intact the activities identified with Pekarsky and Marom that were discussed at the beginning of our meeting. I suggest that our next meeting try to do the following:

1. A report from Pekarsky re: the relationship between this proposed plan and what we agreed to in our NY/Cambridge deliberations.

2. Reactions to the summary of our discussion offered in this document.

3. Achieving closure on this, or a revised, plan.

MEMO TO: CIJE Steering Committee *LONG AGO*
FROM: Daniel Pekarsky
RE: Goals Project update
July 25, 1995

INTRODUCTORY

Our experience with the Goals Project to date has made it possible to refine the project's long-term challenges and immediate tasks.. This report is designed to bring you up to date with our thinking and activities..

The imagined future that animates the work of the Goals Project includes the following elements:: with the encouragement of the communities on which they depend,, Jewish educating institutions are actively engaged in serious deliberation and study designed to deepen their understanding of their central goals; they are working to develop practices that seem adequate to these goals; and they are employing evaluation procedures that make it possible to recognize and diminish the gap between aspiration and outcome.. We imagine a future in which the language of vision,, goals,, and evaluation figures prominently in the discourse and deliberations of educators and lay constituencies,, a future in which thoughtful attention to these matters contributes to substantially improved educational practices and outcomes.. Three principal emphases have defined our efforts to move towards this imagined future..

THE THREE PRINCIPAL EMPHASES

Seeding the culture.. First of all,, the Goals Project is an attempt to cultivate a culture in the Jewish community that takes questions of vision,, goals,, and evaluation to heart,, a culture that recognizes that educational and communal well-being depends on a willingness to think critically and regularly about such matters in their relationship to practice.. We have informally begun to describe initiatives that are aimed at engendering an hospitable cultural environment as "seeding the culture.." The metaphor of "seeding" is intended to suggest that out of this kind of effort some very good things are likely to grow,, including the emergence of increasing numbers of institutions,, embedded in strongly supportive communities,, that approach us with the serious intention of becoming organized around shared and compelling educational goals.. As we have discussed on more than one occasion,, the word "serious" is critical here; for what we have in mind is not a one-shot "visioning session" but a demanding process that integrates institutional self-study,, study of pertinent Jewish texts and conceptions,, and careful deliberation concerning "the what" and "the how" of Jewish education.. Carried through in the right spirit,, this process will give rise to stronger educational practices as well as to institutional cultures which encourage inquiry aimed at continuing self-improvement..

*Not sure
about
this
discussion*

This "developing capacity" imperative has pointed us in two directions. One of these directions focuses on "pilot-projects" in which a small number of institutional guides (especially members of our own staff) work with select institutions on a goals-agenda; carefully studied, their experience will deepen our

From: Daniel Pekarsky at 608628322044004
To: Mandel Institute at 6118972522662887807

32 87-29-55 11:16 pm
DD 012 of 012

understanding of the nature of the work that guides need to be doing and will thereby enhance our ability to train other individuals to do this kind of work.. The other direction focuses on the identification,, recruitment,, and training of individuals who show promise of making effective guides..

Our actual work with institutions to date has emphasized the "pilot-projects".. Daniel Marom's intensive and continuing work with Cleveland's Agnon School is a principal example;; and Daniel Pekarsky has initiated some efforts in this domain with Milwaukee institutions that participated in the spring Goals Seminars..

In addition to what these pilot-projects teach us about the art of helping institutions make progress on a goals-agenda, they are important to our work in a number of other ways.. For example,, these pilot-projects offer a wealth of information concerning institutions and institutional change;; and they will also instruct us about the kinds of resources (articles,, strategies,, exercises,, tools,, etc..) "the kitchen" needs to be producing to help institutions make progress on the goals agenda.. In addition,, even one successful pilot-project, if suitably documented,, analyzed,, and packaged,, could do wonders for our effort to convey what it means to take on a goals-agenda and the benefits of doing so. Developing such a case-study of a "Success-story" may prove a very worthwhile endeavor..

BALANCING THE THREE EMPHASES

Based on our experience to date,, our recent deliberations with the Mandel Institute and with the Philosophy of Education Research Center at Harvard can be understood as an attempt to clarify and deepen the relationships between the three emphases enumerated above and to determine the most fruitful way to distribute our available energies among them.. Our general conclusions were 1) that all three of these emphases continue to seem worthy and need to be simultaneously pursued,, and 2) that in the third area,, identified as "Developing Capacity",, our immediate work should favor selected pilot-projects over an attempt to train a cadre of coaches.. Standing behind this conclusion is our increasingly strong sense that our ability to train individuals to work with institutions will be enormously enhanced as a result of what we will learn through selected pilot-projects,, especially when combined with parallel efforts "in the kitchen" to develop a library of pertinent and accessible conceptualizations, strategies,, and materials.. At the same time,, 3) we should begin now to involve in our project senior educators who have the potential to be effective in helping educating institutions become more goals-sensitive, so that at the appropriate moment they can be tapped for this important work.. The upcoming seminars for principals and the seminar for senior educators planned for next summer are informed by this concern..

5
2nd 8/22/87
OUT
6/22/87
V. H. J. T.
FOR DO
ORDERED
WITHIN
20-30
"STREET
TWO
WANT

CAPSULE SUMMARY OF THE WORK AHEAD

1. Seminars, consultations, and workshops organized around the following:

Seeding the culture: bringing lay and/or professional leaders in the field of Jewish education to an appreciation of the need to take questions of vision, goals and evaluation seriously, thus laying the ground for communal and institutional initiatives. Upcoming examples of such efforts include the projected seminar for the leadership of new Affiliated Communities and a spring seminar for principals organized around the concerns at the heart of the Goals Project.

Initiating some outstanding senior people into the work of the Goals Project and engaging them, as appropriate, in the project's activities. An extended seminar for this constituency has been projected for July, 1996.

Honoring outstanding commitments we've made (in ways that forward the project's principal goals). Representative activities include a set of sessions developed in cooperation with Baltimore's central agency designed to help the leadership to clarify the agency's central mission and goals; working with Wexner to develop a retreat for the Wexner graduates that is designed to focus their energies on Jewish education in their local communities; working with teams from a number of JCCs around questions concerning the vision animating their camps; and working with the Jewish Education Center of Cleveland to help clarify what might be an appropriate set of goals for Beth Torah, a supplemental school focusing on Hebrew that is shared by three Conservative congregations.

2. Developing our Understandings and Tools

On-going work aimed at developing a library of resources, materials, strategies, and evaluation tools that will enhance our efforts to do the following: to mobilize Jewish communities in support of the goals-agenda; to help educating institutions become organized around meaningful goals; and to train the personnel to work with these institutions. It is crucial that we not side-step this part of our work!

3. Pilot Projects: Marek will continue his work with Agnon and Pekarsky will try to finalize an arrangement with one or two other institutions, probably in Milwaukee.

From: Daniel Pekarsky at 608623322044004
To: Mandel Institute at 01109129726826672807

87-29-95 11:11 pm
012 of 012

Careful documentation and analysis of the work that goes on in the pilot projects are of critical importance. Along the way,, seminars for carefully chosen clienteles designed to analyze this work will be invaluable and will be scheduled as appropriate.

Mandel Institute

מנדלמכון מנדל

Tel: 972-2-662832

Fax: 972-2-662837

To: BARRY H. LITZ

Date: 25/7/95

From: D. MARON

No. of Pages: 6

Fax Number: (311) 532 2646

פקט נשלח

Dear Barry:

Keeping with your request at Harvard, I am enclosing here M. Eraut's article on "Selecting Educational Objectives" taken from "The International Encyclopedia of Curriculum," edited by Arie Lewy, (Oxford, Pergamon Press, 1991). I have marked off the reference on page 329 to the research of Stake and Gooler which points to lay decisionmakers in education not having basic necessary background knowledge to decide between emphases on math vs. athletics in the curriculum, etc. Following this lead, I looked at some of their other research and found other similar points. I'll try to get it to you once I dig it up. I hope this is enough for the meantime.

As I mentioned on the phone yesterday, I would like to consult with you on aspects related to the educated Jew publication and the challenge of making it accessible and compelling to a diverse audience. I hope your silence afterwards did not mean that you are opposed to this. What I would like is to speak to you on the phone in order to get your first impressions, to explain to you some of the challenges and the constraints here and then to arrange for another phone call once you have had time to think about it. Altogether it would add up to an hour or two of your time and perhaps a bit more of your thinking. Please let me know if this is acceptable and what would be a good time and place to phone you.

Thankyou,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to be 'DM' or 'Daniel Marom', written over the typed name.

Daniel Marom

- Madans G F, Woods E N, Nuttal R L 1973 A causal model analysis of Bloom's taxonomy. *Am. Educ. Res. J.* 10: 253-62
- Merrill M D 1971 Necessary psychological conditions for defining instructional outcomes. In: M D Merrill (ed.) 1971 *Instructional Design: Readings*. Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey
- Matfessell N S, Michael W B, Kirsner D A 1970 Instrumentation of Bloom's and Krathwohl's taxonomies for the

- writing of educational objectives. In: Kibler R J, Banker L L, Miles D J (eds.) 1970 *Behavioural Objectives and Instruction*. Allyn and Bacon, Boston, Massachusetts
- Ragsdale C E 1950 How children learn motor types of activities. *Learning and Instruction*. 49th Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, Washington, DC
- Simpson E J 1966 *The Classification of Educational Objectives, Psychomotor Domain*. University of Illinois, Urbana, Illinois

Selecting Educational Objectives

M. R. Eraut

It is not uncommon for the problem of selecting and justifying objectives to be concealed by the simple declaration that objectives are derived from aims. Since statements of aims and statements of objectives are usually produced for different purposes and different audiences, it would be naive to expect total consistency between the two. Moreover, the claim that objectives are simply derived from aims diverts attention from three critical issues with which curriculum developers have to contend. First, aims are not the only possible source of objective. In theory there is no limit to the number of places where people may find ideas for objectives. In practice, existing curriculum traditions probably serve as the major source. Second, there are no generally agreed or universally applicable procedures for deducing objectives from aims (Hirst 1973). Third, while aims may be used to justify the educational value of a particular objective, they often cannot determine the relative value of two alternative or competing sets of objectives, each of which appear consistent with the aims.

This article confines itself to three questions:

- (a) What are the sources of objectives? From where can people get ideas for objectives they wish to consider for inclusion?
- (b) How might the inclusion of an objective be justified?
- (c) What guidance is available for tackling the problem of priorities?

II. Sources of Objectives

Hirst (1973) criticizes Tyler and others for failing to distinguish the sources of curriculum objectives from the grounds for their justification. The most frequently used sources are not Tyler's (1949) primary sources—the learners, contemporary life, subject specialisms, or even the philosophy of education—but secondary sources such as current practices and well-known curriculum traditions. So the process of formulating objectives is likely to be one of selecting goals from these practices and traditions and translating them into an appropriate linguistic form. Consultations with educators, parents, students, and the local community often

provide useful information on preferences but seldom suggest any newer types of objective. However, there are occasional deliberate attempts to look beyond current practice and traditions; and some of these have had considerable impact. The curriculum reform movement of the 1960s sought to bring the curriculum into line with new views of academic knowledge by enlisting the support of eminent scholars. The planning of vocational courses seeks to reflect the changing structure of the job market. Social education is altered to include new conceptions of adult roles—that of women, for example. Even the curriculum traditions themselves get reconstructed and reconceptualized by great thinkers like Bruner and Freire. These occasions for fundamental curriculum change are fewer than many would like; and the rethinking of the curriculum is a worthy candidate for financial support. But it is also important to recognize when such rethinking is not taking place, so that tradition-based curriculum development is not hampered by the mistaken idea that all objectives have to be derived from primary sources—a task whose difficulty and complexity will be apparent from the ensuing discussion.

Many curriculum practices and traditions leave their objectives unstated and implicit, but there have also been many attempts to translate them into the language of objectives or to develop new courses with an objective-based approach. Hence there are many well-documented lists of objectives that can be used as secondary sources. Short subject-specific lists may be found in official curriculum documents, in textbooks, in examination syllabi, and in books on subject teaching. Longer lists may be found in the teaching manuals of individualized programmes, in the massive compilations of objectives prepared under the auspices of the Russell Sage Foundation (Kearney 1953, French et al. 1957) and in the Instructional Objectives Exchange (Popkum 1974). Using such secondary sources has three problems. They are variable in quality, their contextual or cultural specificity may not be immediately apparent, and selection from lists is likely to lead to a fragmented curriculum. These problems would be significantly reduced if such lists were used not as main sources but as supplementary sources after the first attempt at

objective formulation had already been completed.

2. The Justification of Objectives

Leaving aside technical considerations such as clarity, the justification of an objective is based on two kinds of argument—feasibility and desirability (Bloom et al. 1981). Both are necessary. Feasibility arguments are normally based on evidence from practice, and they are often dependent on there being sufficient similarity of student population and interest for the transfer of experience to be valid. The criteria will be much tighter when mastery is being sought than when the objectives are of a more expressive variety; but even in the latter case it will still have to be argued that something of value is likely to occur. While feasibility arguments should not be used to prevent intelligent experiments, there is an equal danger that experiments will be treated as if they were bound to succeed.

Desirability arguments are of two main kinds: evidence of expressed preferences and arguments from basic values—the former concerns who thinks an objective is desirable, the latter concerns why it should be thought desirable. Techniques for collecting expressed preferences have been reviewed by Stake (1970), and their usefulness for selection is discussed below. The procedure is commonly referred to as needs assessment, but this designation is misleading because it takes an argument from basic values to establish that a preference is also a need. Pratt (1980) provides a useful summary of the issues involved in justification.

What, then, are the basic values on which arguments for the desirability or worthwhileness of an objective can rest? Combining a number of authors' suggestions gives four major categories in which such values may be said to reside—occupational practice, roles in society, cultural and academic knowledge, and the interests of the learners. Objectives relating to occupational practice can be justified in terms of national manpower needs, in terms of local needs for particular kinds of knowledge and skills, or an individual's need to be able to work with application. Sometimes these needs come into conflict as when doctors get sucked away from rural to urban areas or a subsistence farmer's education is based on the occupational requirements of industry. Often the technical problems of establishing occupational needs are greater than is commonly assumed. Job analysis techniques are well-developed only for lower level skills and tend to ignore important aspects of human relations. Manpower forecasting is a notoriously chancy activity. Thus arguments from occupational practice are likely to meet five major problems: (a) the large number of different occupations; (b) variations within the same occupation between different work contexts; (c) the changing nature of occupations; (d) the limitations of job analysis; and (e) uncertainty as to whether the student will spend any time in the occupation for which he or she is being prepared.

Roles in society include citizenship, membership of a local community, family life, and so on in addition to the occupational roles already discussed. This is controversial territory. First, there is considerable argument about what would be an appropriate role model. Second, there is evidence that most educational systems prepare students differentially according to their socioeconomic and cultural status—this is often a latent rather than an intended function of schooling. Then third, it is argued that many objectives in this area should not be taught in schools because they are the responsibility of the home, the church, or the local community.

Much that is found in the "role in society" category can also be subsumed under the heading of "cultural knowledge", a term to which curriculum thinkers are often attracted but whose implications have yet to be fully worked out. Thus it has been used both in the context of justifying attention to the arts and humanities and in the context of preparing students to live in a multicultural society. When one also considers many students' strong interest in youth culture, the potential for conflicting interpretations and priorities becomes even greater. Within the sphere of academic knowledge, arguments are better articulated but still not resolved. For example, there is considerable dispute as to whether generalizable and transferable thinking skills exist across disciplines; and even as to whether it is feasible to separate thinking processes from conceptual content within a discipline in the manner claimed by some curriculum theorists. Arguments from within a subject are likely to be based on notions of key concepts, on the position of an objective in some important learning hierarchy, or on induction into the ways of thinking in the discipline. Thus an objective's utility is defined in terms of its contribution to the further study of the subject. Otherwise some other form of justification would be invoked.

Arguments based on the learners' interests are of two main types. The motivational argument rests on what students are claimed to be interested in, while the needs argument rests on what is claimed to be in the children's interests. The two are combined if it is asserted that it is basic value for children to enjoy themselves or to have a wide range of interests. Otherwise the motivational argument is merely a means to ends which have to be justified on other grounds. Many authors have suggested lists of children's needs that can serve as basic values for curriculum justification. Pateman (1978) for example suggests eight: "to be able to survive; to get or stay healthy; to be able to work with application; to enjoy themselves; to have a sense of their own worth; to be able to relate to others; to understand the world in which they live; and to be able to participate in its major institutions." While some of these would be catered for under the other headings—occupational practice, roles in society, academic and cultural knowledge—they might receive a radically different emphasis in that other justificatory context. Moreover, Pateman suggests that

some of these basic needs are virtually ignored in formal schooling. In spite of their prominence in educators' discussions about the aims of education, personal development objectives tend to get overwhelmed by more academic and vocational considerations.

Another area of need in the learners' interests category is the need to make the most of the educational process itself. This involves developing such skills as note taking, learning from books, working with others, preparing for and taking examinations, and so on. Even in higher education it is increasingly acknowledged that these skills should no longer be taken for granted but need to be incorporated into the formal curriculum.

3. Selecting Objectives: The Problem of Priorities

The wider the range of possible objectives considered—and many argue that it should be very wide indeed—the greater becomes the problem of selection. There are so many forms of justification that the value judgments involved in selection can never be resolved by reference to some single underlying principle. This does not prevent an appropriately designated group of experts or representatives from arriving at a compromise plan and gaining sufficient political support to get it adopted; but it does limit the degree to which issues can be settled by rational argument. Moreover, the technical problems of collecting evidence of people's preferences in order to guide such a debate are considerable. Stake and Gooler (1971) present a three-dimensional design for a study of people's educational priorities based on:

- (a) the audiences whose preferences are being sought;
- (b) different indicators of priority, namely—importance, time allocation, cash allocation, and vigour of efforts to remediate;
- (c) a dichotomy between the "real"—what they think are the current priorities—and the "ideal"—what they would like the priorities to be.

This last dimension is particularly important in view of evidence that parents can be greatly mistaken about the "real", especially at the elementary level (Becher et al. 1981), and may therefore argue from premises that are demonstrably false. In practice, however, Stake and Gooler encountered three major obstacles. First, they found that teachers and citizens had a great deal of difficulty in thinking about the curriculum as a whole:

They appear to be devoid of the information needed to make judgments about the importance of the work of even a major subdivision of the curriculum, such as the science department or the athletic department. They do not know what the total effort to teach social responsibility is, and they feel most uncomfortable making even the crudest estimate of resources that might best be allocated to it.

Second, they found it impossible to give absolute priority information that was meaningful. It does not

make sense to argue about the ideal allocation of time to mathematics without continual reference back to the status quo. Then, third, there is so much redundancy in the total education system that things are taught many times and in many ways. How can one assign a teaching time to an objective, when other objectives are also being taught at the same time?

These difficulties explain why planning a whole curriculum *ab initio* is rarely attempted. Instead piecemeal reform is found whenever someone can justify some change and mobilize the necessary support. Perhaps the most that can be expected is a series of attempts to narrow what Goodlad (1974) has called the "education gap" between the human race's noblest view of what it might become and the conventional wisdom that motivates current practice. But this is to assume that agreement can be reached on the nature of the gap, and that Goodlad's aspirational perspective can still command political support when the emphasis is shifting towards efficiency and effectiveness.

Within a single subject, the problem of selecting objectives becomes more manageable because people can at least conceptualize the task. However, rival forms of justifications still exist. "A" may be more feasible, "B" more enjoyable, "C" more immediately useful, and "D" more important for the development of advanced thinking in the subject. Moreover, it is not uncommon for a subject to be included because it is argued to be useful, but then planned as if utility were no longer an important criterion. The introduction of classification schemes for objectives has probably helped people to examine the emphasis and level of teaching in addition to the content balance. Though such schemes cannot create new principles for choosing priorities, they can at least make it easier to recognize those that are already there; and they may even suggest some interesting alternatives. All this, of course, depends on the schemes being judiciously chosen and their limitations being recognized.

Bibliography

- Becher T, Eraut M, Knight J 1981 *Policies for Educational Accountability*. Heinemann, London
- Bloom B S, Madaus G F, Hastings J T 1981 *Evaluation to Improve Learning*. McGraw-Hill, New York
- French W et al. 1957 *Behavioral Goals of General Education in High School*. Russell Sage Foundation, New York
- Goodlad J 1974 Program development: Identification and formulation of desirable educational goals. In: Blaney J et al. (eds.) 1974 *Program Development in Education*. Education-Extension Centre for Continuing Education, University of British Columbia, Vancouver, British Columbia
- Hirst P H 1973 Towards a logic of curriculum development. In: Taylor P H, Walton J (eds.) 1973 *The Curriculum: Research Innovation and Change*. Ward Lock, London, pp. 9-26
- Kearney N C 1953 *Elementary School Objectives: A Report Prepared for the Mid-century Committee on Outcomes in Elementary Education*. Russell Sage Foundation, New York
- Pateman T 1978 Accountability, values and schooling. In:

- Becher T, Maclure S (eds.) 1978 *Accountability in Education*. National Foundation for Educational Research, Slough, pp. 61-94
- Popham W J 1974 Curriculum design: The problem of specifying intended learning outcomes. In: Blaney J et al. (eds.) 1974 *Program Development in Education*. Education-Extension Centre for Continuing Education, University of British Columbia, Vancouver, British Columbia
- Pratt D 1980 *Curriculum: Design and Development*. Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, New York
- Stake R E 1970 Objectives, priorities and other judgment data. *Rev. Educ. Res.* 40: 181-212
- Stake R E, Gooler D T 1971 Measuring educational priorities. *Educ Technol.* 11: 44-48
- Tyler R W 1949 *Basic Principles of Curriculum and Instruction*. University of Chicago Press, Chicago, Illinois

Curriculum Content

F. M. Connelly and D. J. Clandinin

The term curriculum content refers to particular facts, ideas, principles, problems, and so on, included in a course of studies. Any specific content items may serve different instructional goals, and, conversely, any given goal may be served by different content items. The conceptualization of the content of a particular course, the selection of content items, and their organization into a coherent course of study are the major content-related problems in developing curricular materials.

It should be noted, however, that some curriculum theorists use the term "curriculum content" in the sense of problem areas, subjects, or disciplines included in a course of studies. Nevertheless, an increasing trend may be observed in contemporary curriculum literature to use this term in the context of dealing with a single course of study.

1. Conceptualization of Content

Researchers, policy makers, and curriculum planners will conceptualize content differently depending on their definitions of the term curriculum. Conceptualization, like selection, treated below, is both a theoretical and practical problem. Some believe that conceptualization is essentially a logical and theoretical problem and it is true that the concept of content may be enhanced by such considerations. For example, the application of ideas in a theory of knowledge to the conceptualization of content will enhance definitions of content specified in knowledge terms. Likewise, the application of ideas from experiential philosophy will enhance definitions of content specified in personal terms. But the ultimate choice over which of these definitions to adopt, whatever their theoretical support, rests both upon personal preference and upon political considerations associated with the curriculum in question.

Personal preferences constitute, in effect, a value base for choosing a definition. Political considerations refer to the dynamics of complex curriculum situations where different stakeholders have different, legitimate claims upon the curriculum. In the development of a history curriculum, for example, a group of parents may define history in terms of the meaning it has for their

children; trustees may define it in terms of its social significance; and local university professors may define it in terms of the discipline of history. The political resolution of these competing claims will be an important factor in how history is conceptualized for this curriculum.

2. Selection of Content

As with the problem of conceptualization, the selection of content is both a theoretical and practical problem. If the problem of conceptualization has not been thought through prior to the actual selection process, then selection will be confounded by the issue of conceptualization. If the conceptualization problem has been treated, there remains the problem of choice of detail. For instance, if the content of a history curriculum is defined in terms of historical knowledge, there remains the problem of what view of knowledge and what specific knowledge to include. "Chronological" accounts of history, "epoch" accounts of history, "great people" accounts of history, and the like are all possible. Likewise, the cultural perspective on history will remain as an element of choice. For example, many critics at present believe that history curricula give a biased representation to certain cultural groups. The apparently simple choice of photographic and diagrammatic material reflects views which effectively modify the understanding to be obtained about a certain cultural group and its place in history.

The choices are theoretical in that they may appeal to historical fact and to theory of knowledge but they are also political and personal. It may be shown that the historical research on which the curriculum is based was conducted with a certain political orientation and bias towards a particular cultural group. Or, it may be that in an effort to enhance or downgrade the status of a cultural group, local government, the press, and other groups may have "shaped" the historical record. Accordingly, a certain event interpreted negatively in one decade may be interpreted positively in another.

Choices are also personal in that, when a selection is finally made, it reflects the views of the person or