

AN EVALUATION OF THE HEBREW UNION COLLEGE SCHOOL OF JEWISH COMMUNAL SERVICE

Research on the Occasion of Its 18th Year

GERALD B. BUBIS, D.H.L.

Founding Director of the School of Jewish Communal Service, Los Angeles, California

and

HOLLY HOLLANDER, DEBORAH BURG-SCHNIRMAN, and ESTI LI DAR*

The research described in this article was undertaken to evaluate whether the educational training offered by the HUC School of Jewish Communal Service was responsive to both societal trends and those in the Jewish communal field. It found that its graduates are indeed provided with the Jewish education and identity critical to the field. To ensure that educational training remains relevant, a close partnership between schools and professionals in the field is essential.

Jewish communal service educational programs have proliferated since 1968 when the Hebrew Union College-Jewish Institute of Religion School of Jewish Communal Service (SJCS) was founded in Los Angeles. This article presents the findings of an evaluation of SJCS conducted 18 years after its first graduating class. These findings have field-wide implications, providing insights and cautions for other present and future Jewish communal service educational programs.

There are many models of such educational programs. In one approach, found at the Wurzweiler School of Social Work of Yeshiva University in New York, Jewish aspects of practice are emphasized in the social work curriculum and students receive a masters of social work (MSW) degree. Another model is to offer a double masters

program in social work and Judaic studies leading to a MSW and a masters of arts degree. Such programs are found in Baltimore (University of Maryland School of Social Work and Baltimore Hebrew University under the auspices of the Baltimore Institute for Jewish Communal Service); New York (Columbia University School of Social Work and Jewish Theological Seminary); Cleveland (Case Western School of Social Work and Cleveland College of Jewish Studies); and Columbus (Ohio State School of Social Work and Judaic Studies department). In a variant of that model, Gratz College in Philadelphia offers a certificate program in conjunction with the MSW program at the University of Pennsylvania School of Social Work, and the University of Michigan offers the MSW and a communal service certificate. In yet another educational model, students at the University of Judaism in Los Angeles receive a masters in business administration (MBA) that emphasizes the Jewish community as the primary setting for practice. A final approach is to offer a masters in Jewish communal service, which is done at

*At the time the article was written, all the co-authors were students at the HUC School of Jewish Communal Service.

Research funds for the project upon which this article is based were provided by the president of Hebrew Union College, Alfred G. Gottschalk, through the President's Research Fund.

Brandeis University in Waltham, Massachusetts and at Spertus College in Chicago. SJCS offers a combination of several of these approaches.

Clearly, the existence of so many Jewish communal service educational programs is testimony to the field's need for specially prepared professionals. Yet, is the educational training offered by these programs responsive to changing trends in both general society and the Jewish communal field?

The study reported in this article was designed to answer that question. Conducted by eight members of the 1988 graduating class, its purpose was to explore (1) the alumni's perception of the SJCS program, (2) how the program had met their needs in the field, and (3) to what extent the school had responded to their motivations and met their expectations in choosing this graduate study program.

The study asked alumni three broad questions. Who are the graduates of SJCS? What is the impact of the SJCS program on them? And what influence did attending SJCS have on them as professionals? Additionally, the study attempted to assess the importance of the Jewish component as a reason for attendance, the role of Jewish knowledge in the field, and the effect SJCS had on the alumni's professional Jewish identity.

The study findings confirmed the existence of changing trends in the field—the growing use of technology, the increasing number of women professionals, and a decreasing level of professional satisfaction—to which SJCS must respond. It also confirmed that SJCS provides its graduates with the Jewish education and identity critical to the field, playing a very significant role in their evolution as Jewish communal professionals.

SJCS PROGRAM

SJCS was founded in 1968 in response to a growing awareness of the importance of

Jewish identity and ethnicity and the need to incorporate Jewish components in professional practice.

A new set of priorities for the American Jewish community began to emerge in the late 1960s. The combination of the events associated with the Israeli Six-Day War and a resurgent interest in ethnicity in America led to a heightened American Jewish consciousness. Jewish leaders increasingly began to call for enriching social agencies and to upgrade the Jewish commitment and background of the professional staff (Reisman, 1979, p. 95).

The founding director, Gerald Bubis, summed up the original goals of the program as follows:

A balance was sought in the curriculum between the pragmatic and the idealistic, the cognitive and the emotional, the best that Jewish life might be and the way it is. An attempt was made to begin with the contemporary and move backward in time in trying to understand (1) the Jewish individual and the family, (2) the intellectual and ideological issues confronting her/him as a Jew and as an American, and (3) the community instruments which the Jew has created to encapsulate her/his values, meet her/his needs, and discharge her/his communal obligations (Bubis, 1971, p. 2).

SJCS offers a certificate program in Jewish communal service (JCS), a masters degree in JCS, two joint masters degrees—JCS and Judaic Studies and JCS and Jewish Education through Hebrew Union College in Los Angeles—and three double masters degrees in conjunction with the University of Southern California (USC) in social work, gerontology, and administration. In addition, there are double masters programs—offering the masters in JCS and MSW—available in conjunction with the Schools of Social Work at Washington University in St. Louis and the University of Pittsburgh (and since this study was completed, with San Francisco State University; Table 1).

Table 1.
DEVELOPMENT OF THE SCHOOL OF
JEWISH COMMUNAL SERVICE

1968	School founded
1969	Certificate program in Jewish communal service (summer sessions only)
1971	Masters program in Jewish communal service at HUC
1972	Dual degree in social work and communal service with USC. Joint degree with the School of Education, HUC
1974	Dual degree in social work and communal service with George Warren Brown School of Social Work, Washington University, St. Louis
1975	Dual degree in gerontology and communal service with the School of Gerontology, USC
1982	Dual degree in public administration and communal service with USC, Washington, D.C. campus
1984	Dual degree in social work and communal service with the University of Pittsburgh School of Social Work
1989	Dual degree in social work and communal service with San Francisco State

The components of the core curriculum, which is required of all students, have changed little since the program began, although the number of class hours devoted to them has. All students must take course work on the Jewish family, the American Jewish community, Jewish history (ancient, medieval, and modern), and biblical and rabbinic literature.

Over the years, the number of courses available at SJCS has grown from 9 to between 25 and 30. The curriculum encompasses practice courses in fund raising, administration, lay-professional relations, an Israel-based seminar, Jewish thought and literature, world Jewish communities, group work, and community organization, in addition to the courses at the respective university partners.

STUDY METHODOLOGY

This study was based on a masters thesis conducted by Goldfarb, Lambert, and Schlossberg in 1983. That earlier work was exploratory in nature, examining the SJCS

program in broad terms, and was based on alumni perceptions.

The universe of the present study consisted of all attendees of SJCS since its inception in 1968. Of a possible 360 attendees, 305 were sent questionnaires. The response rate was 63%, producing a total of 180 analyzed responses.

The questionnaire had four sections and included 30 questions about the learning experience in SJCS, the work experience since graduation, specific aspects of the SJCS program, and demographic information. Six questions were open-ended, providing an opportunity for comments from the respondents.

Due to the limitations of a survey-based study—instrument fallibility, subject bias and recall—one must be cautious in interpreting its findings. In addition, the authors are themselves the “producer” and the “products” of the programs that they analyzed, introducing another element of bias. There are no data from other Jewish communal service programs against which the results can be compared. The 60% level of satisfaction used in analysis was thus an arbitrary level, but was concluded to be a sufficiently high level to lay modest claim to the overall success of SJCS and its offerings.

STUDY FINDINGS

Motivations for Attending

From a list of twenty factors, respondents were asked to choose the three factors that most influenced their decision to attend SJCS. Overall, respondents were most attracted to the Jewish nature of the program. “To gain specialized preparation to work in the Jewish community” (71.5%) and the “Jewish content” (55.3%) were two of the three most frequently chosen reasons for attending. The “reputation of the school” was also a primary motivation. The factors of specialized preparation for the field and Jewish content remained significant motivating factors for prospective

students throughout SJCS' history, whereas the program's general reputation became more important in recent years (from 48.6% in the 1968-75 cohort to 76.7% in the 1982-87 cohort). Thus, as SJCS has grown, established varying programs, and sent more alumni into the field, its reputation has become a key factor in attracting students. In addition, as the option of obtaining two masters degrees was first offered in 1977 and then expanded considerably in subsequent years, the "availability of the dual degree" increased in influence as a motivating factor.

The three least frequently chosen reasons for attending SJCS were "cost of education" (5.6%), "quality of field placements" (8.9%), and "quality social work education" (17.9%).

Learning Experience and Satisfaction

Several dimensions of the learning experience were assessed, including course work, skills, and Jewish content within the program. Overall, there was a high level of satisfaction with the learning experience. Comments provided by the respondents suggest that, in a vast majority of the cases, alumni were satisfied with most aspects of the SJCS program.

Respondents were asked about their experience in 28 subject areas, which included both generic communal knowledge and skills areas and specific Jewish content. The generic areas were primarily related to community organization and management: fiscal planning, fund raising, grant writing, research, supervision, programming, administration, community relations, publicity, organizational development, organizational behavior, group work, and human growth and behavior.

Management was cited most often (by 57% of respondents) as an area in which graduates looked to gain more experience and competence. Over 50% of the graduates are in supervisory or management positions by their second or third jobs. One

respondent stated, "I left HUC unprepared in terms of managing an agency and contributing to the management of that agency."

That a majority of the respondents would have liked more planning and fiscal management course work reflects such current trends in the field as the increased use of computers and advanced accounting and budgeting skills and stricter requirements for agency fiscal responsibility. It also reflects the observations of William Kahn (1985) who perceived the management component of social work education to be insufficient and of Bubis et al. (1985) who studied the expectations of executives who hire entry-level professionals.

Interestingly, the percentage of graduates who would have liked to have more planning and fiscal management course work was highest in the cohort from 1975-1981 and lowest in that from 1982-1987. The decrease may be due to the curricular requirement imposed during those later years that all community organization, planning and administration, and public administration students take such planning, budgeting, and fiscal management courses.

In the area of fund raising, 53% of the respondents were satisfied with the amount of course work compared to 41.7% who would have liked more. There was an increasing satisfaction level with the amount of course work in this area by year, probably because a fund-raising class was introduced into the curriculum in 1974.

The majority of the respondents were satisfied with the amount of time devoted to the following subjects: community relations, programming, and research. The satisfaction level did not vary greatly by year of attendance. Overall, the level was above 60% for these non-management subject areas, signifying the strength of this segment of the SJCS program.

One of the particularly important findings was the impact that the variations in the double masters models of education and training had on the educational expe-

rience. More than two-thirds of all dual-degree respondents attended the School of Social Work at the University of Southern California (USC), 9% attended the George Warren School of Social Work (GWB) at Washington University in St. Louis, and an even smaller percentage attended the Schools of Public Administration (PA) or Gerontology at USC. Most of the PA students spend their second year in Washington, D.C.

The educational experience at these programs differed greatly, which was reflected in their responses. The GWB and PA students tended to want more Jewish content, probably because they were only at SJCS for one year and in their year away there were no formal course offerings on Jewish subject matters.

Of all the graduates, the PA students were most dissatisfied with the amount of management course work geared to the Jewish community that was offered; 83% would have liked more offerings in that area. In contrast, most felt their program had too much Jewish content. They also expressed dissatisfaction with a perceived social work bias in their SJCS courses.

Although no statistical conclusions can be drawn from the perceptions of such a small sample of students, the concept of social work as the host profession in Jewish communal service may need to be re-evaluated.

The conflict between the clinical and community organization emphasis at SJCS was also noted by many respondents. SJCS is perceived as oriented toward community organization, and those respondents who were interested in clinical work felt that the program was not receptive to future clinical social workers. One individual wrote, "I often felt that I was 'different' because I was always interested in being a clinician. This goal was not encouraged by the school (SJCS) as they were interested in training for the community agencies." A second commented, "There was tremendous pressure to enter a community organization track. Little option or emphasis was

placed on clinical skills to the detriment of the SJCS program and its students. This was also reflected in the lack of clinical social work faculty on staff."

Jewish Content

Overall, respondents expressed a high level of satisfaction with the Jewish content of the program. Over 70% of the respondents felt that the amount of course work offered in these areas—Holocaust studies, organization of the American Jewish community, history of Jewish communal service, Jewish history, and Israel/Zionism—was "just about right." The most recent graduates indicated an increased desire for more exposure to Jewish history (from 11.8% in 1969-75 to 33.6% in 1982-87) and Jewish issues (from 20.0% in 1969-75 to 46.6% in 1982-87), even though the number of class hours devoted to Jewish history increased from 30 in 1968 to 75 today. Therefore, as the number of class hours has increased, so have the expectations for even more exposure to that area.

Where Learning Takes Place

The questionnaire asked from which component of the program was knowledge primarily gained. Two questions probed the formation of a Jewish professional identity, whereas other questions explored where most skills and concepts were learned.

Both the "skills I use most" and "understanding myself as a professional" were gained primarily from the field placement, whereas the "concepts I use most" and "began to think about myself as a practicing professional" were learned primarily from the course work (Table 2). In contrast to other alumni, the PA and gerontology students were unanimous in their conviction that the skills they use most were learned through their fieldwork experience. Because these students enter the program with focused expectations, their fieldwork experiences may be related more closely to

Table 2.
WHERE LEARNING TOOK PLACE

	Course Work	Field Work (%)	Both	Number of Respondents
Learned the skills I use most	19.2	65.4	14.6	130
Began to think of myself as a professional	18.7	64.2	15.7	134
Learned the concepts I use most	56.0	22.4	22.9	134
Began to understand issues facing the Jewish community	60.1	17.4	21.7	138
Began to think about myself as a Jewish professional	36.6	41.2	19.1	131
Believe I learned the most overall	41.4	38.3	19.5	133

the work they want to do after graduation than the field placements of social work students.

Both "began to think about myself as a Jewish professional" and "learned the most overall" were gained almost equally from course and fieldwork. Dual-degree students felt that the majority of their learning and self-understanding came from the field where their specific needs were addressed more fully. Thus, the importance of appropriate and focused fieldwork experiences cannot be overemphasized.

Evaluation of Skills Obtained Through the Program

Alumni were asked to evaluate the skills and knowledge they obtained at SJCS and how they helped prepare them for their first job. Fifty percent or more of the respondents would have liked more education in half of the skills listed, including casework and counseling, group work, crisis intervention, assertiveness skills strategies, lobbying, policy formation/analysis, supervision, staff development and training, grant writing, computer skills, human resource development, and public relations/publicity. In comparison to USC alumni, GWB graduates felt less prepared to enter the field, as a larger proportion indicated they lacked a variety of skills. These differences may be attributed to differences in the school's curricula, rather

than to the SJCS component of their training. For instance, GWB students wanted more clinical skills, which are provided by USC's requirement of clinical placements for all first-year students.

The three skills used most often by alumni are working with boards and lay people (40%), administration (27%), and fund raising (22%). The majority of respondents (62%, 60%, and 60%, respectively) felt they had received an adequate education in these three skill areas. Therefore, although there are skill and knowledge areas to which respondents desired further exposure, they did feel adequately prepared in those areas that they used most often in their professional careers.

Most respondents felt that they were well prepared in all of the listed categories of Jewish skills and knowledge—Jewish values, ethics, practice/rituals, ethnic groups, history, literature, family life, organization of the Jewish community, Scripture, contemporary Jewish issues, and sociology and demography of the Jewish people—with the exception of the Hebrew language, which has never been offered at SJCS, and Jewish aspects of emotional issues. GWB alumni desired more Jewish-related skills/courses than USC double masters alumni, perhaps because USC students attend the SJCS program at the Hebrew Union College for a full two years. Overall, alumni appear to be more satisfied with the education relating to Jewish skills

than with the preparation related to secular skills.

Knowledge of the Jewish community, of contemporary Jewish issues, and of Jewish values were the three Jewish content areas most utilized in their work since graduation.

Alumni in the Workplace

One section of the questionnaire elicited information on the graduates' full employment history, including their salaries, job titles, and responsibilities. The great majority of alumni (96%) were employed full-time in a Jewish setting in their first job after graduation. Almost half were entry-level line workers or subdepartment heads. An additional one-third were department heads or regional or unit directors in Jewish agencies. About half of the respondents moved to another community for their first job.

In the second job, a slightly larger percentage (7%) were working outside of the Jewish community. Salaries rose as responsibilities increased, and a smaller percentage relocated for their second job. For the third job, a larger percentage of respondents no longer worked in Jewish settings and the number required to relocate decreased further (Table 3). Over 80% of the respondents were still working for Jewish agencies after five years in the field.

Alumni with a clinical orientation moved out of Jewish communal work to a greater degree than those with a community organization perspective. This movement toward private practice is directly opposed to the stated goal of SJCS, which is to educate professionals to work in the field of Jewish communal service. This trend, which is not limited to SJCS, is a challenge for the field because the need for clinically educated practitioners in Jewish family agencies remains imperative.

In recent years, there has been a marked movement from the Jewish Community Center to the federation as the setting for the first job (32% worked for the JCC ver-

Table 3.
PERCENTAGE OF RESPONDENTS WHO
RELOCATED FOR EMPLOYMENT

	Overall	Male	Female	Number of Respondents
First job	45	58	35	171
Second job	42	57	30	136
Third job	29	35	25	86
Fourth job	16	24	10	38

sus 9% for federation in the cohort from 1968-75, as compared to 10% for the JCC versus 23% for the federation in the 1982-87 cohort; Table 4). This movement is even more pronounced as the respondents move to their second and third jobs and the length of time from graduation increases.

Issues Related to Gender

In this survey, the female respondents tended to follow gender lines when choosing a professional track. A majority opted for the clinical concentration in social work, whereas men were more likely to choose community organization and public administration when pursuing a dual degree.

Although more women than men now enter the SJCS program, their career histories have reflected Ozawa's (1976) characterization of the social work profession as a male-controlled domain in which women have the status of a minority group.

Table 4.
SHIFT IN FIRST JOB SETTINGS BY
YEAR OF ATTENDANCE

Job Setting	1968-75	1976-81 (%)	1982-87
JCC	32	19	10
Federation	9	24	23
Family service	15	11	15
Health setting	0	3	1
Community relations	12	5	4
Synagogues	15	11	11
Hillel	0	5	8
Other	17	22	27
	N = 34	N = 63	N = 71

Table 5.
LACK OF SATISFACTION WITH PREPARATION FOR WORK AS RELATED TO GENDER

	Percentage Desiring More Emphasis		Number of Respondents
	Male	Female	
Casework and counseling	44.6	54.9	70
Group work	43.9	54.1	71
Crisis intervention	45.6	70.2	85
Assertive skills and strategies	44.3	63.5	82
Advocacy	36.1	45.4	62
Community organization	33.3	21.3	43
Leadership development	57.1	44.1	81
Fund raising	47.8	34.0	65
Meeting with representatives of community agencies	21.4	11.7	26

The efforts of female social workers to advance socially, politically, and economically have not yet earned them complete access or participation at the executive level, even in the clinical setting. According to Rosenberg (1979) and Bubis (1983), Ozawa's characterization of the social work profession applies to Jewish communal service as well. Women are similarly underrepresented in higher levels of management in the Jewish community.

The survey findings bear out Ozawa's and Rosenberg's observations. Overall, 44% of the male respondents hold executive or subexecutive positions in comparison to only 19% of the female alumni. Of all the executives surveyed, 72% were male and only 28% female.

The need for specific types of knowledge and skills reflects these employment trends (Table 5). Men appear to use their management skills more frequently than women and would have liked more preparation in community organization, leadership development, and fund raising. In contrast, women use clinical skills more often than men. Nearly one-fourth of the women, in contrast to only 10% of the men, indicated that the skills they use most often were casework, counseling, and group work. In addition, more women than men indicated that they would have liked more preparation in assertive skills and strategies (63.5% versus 44.3%) and advocacy (45.4% versus

36.1%). Traditionally, assertiveness in women has been negatively perceived.

This comment may be typical of the experience of women once they enter the field: "HUC built me up too much. Despite the fact that I am an HUC/GWB grad and I was trained as a professional Jewish communal service worker, my colleagues treat me as they treat every other young woman. As a matter of fact, I feel as if I, as a trained Jewish communal professional, am before my time in the field."

Debt

The high level of indebtedness among alumni proved to be a significant finding of the study. The level of debt is exorbitant and is growing. It currently is in excess of \$3 million.

Almost 80% of the respondents had loans from HUC, and many had them from other institutions as well. Upon graduation, one-quarter of the respondents had loans from HUC of between \$5,000 to \$10,000, and another 25% had loans of \$10,000 or more. A majority of respondents also had Guaranteed Student Loans of \$10,000 or more. The SJCS program is particularly expensive because most students in the dual-degree program attend two private universities. Although SJCS offers a substantial amount of loans, scholarships, and stipends, cost is still a deterrent. In fact,

"cost of education" was the least frequently indicated reason for attending SJCS.

IMPLICATIONS FOR THE FIELD

This study raised a great deal of questions essential to the continued growth and well-being of the Jewish communal field. What is the definition of Jewish communal service? Does it mean simply working in what we call "the field," or does it also include those social work clinicians in private practice? Are there particular degrees or knowledge bases that would exclude or include members in the field? Does it include those with specialized Jewish knowledge? Must one even be Jewish, and if so, to what degree should Judaism be practiced? Can Jewish communal service even be considered a true profession, as some claim? Has it contributed to the body of knowledge independent of closely related disciplines? Continued open discussion of these questions is essential to determine the boundaries of the profession.

Another set of questions in the survey concerned the relation of the field to the agency setting in which the graduates were employed. To what extent does the Jewish nature of the setting determine whether its professionals are Jewish communal workers? The converse must also be asked. Can one work in a non-Jewish setting and still define oneself as a Jewish communal worker?

This study raised the very important question of whether social work should continue to be the host profession in Jewish communal service. A related issue is the value of each of the degrees accepted by the profession as suitable education. Is a specialized degree for the field, such as the Masters of Arts in Jewish Communal Service necessary, and how does it differ from the MSW?

The survey responses clearly indicate that SJCS is educating the "Jewish" in Jewish communal service, but that there is a need for knowledge and skills beyond the social work orientation. The increasing complexity of Jewish organizational structures and

budgets and the concomitant need for more sophisticated management and fiscal accounting skills, the requirement for computer literacy, and the increasing amount of technical knowledge needed in the management levels in Jewish communal service all mandate the expansion of the curriculum beyond social work. *Therefore, to continue to educate professionals with the knowledge bases needed to enter the field, schools of Jewish communal service must give greater attention to the more technical and managerial aspects of Jewish communal service.*

The reciprocal side of this issue must also be addressed, as a significant number of clinical social work respondents expressed some dissatisfaction with the perceived community organization bias of the SJCS program. Reisman (1979) traces the conflict between the clinical and community organization aspects of social work back 100 years when the field was professionalized. Both Reisman (1979) and Levine (1982) emphasize the need to integrate both aspects into practice. *Therefore, schools of Jewish communal service need to maintain a strong commitment to all areas of service within the Jewish community. If they wish to attract students with a variety of career goals, the schools have the responsibility to encourage all Jewish communal options and must be careful not to indicate that one form of Jewish communal service is more important than another. That is, if the clinical social work placement is made possible through course work and field placement, then the school must follow through on this commitment in all aspects of its programs.*

Finally, a basic question that must be addressed is whether SJCS can be all things to Jewish communal service. Clinical social work students were dissatisfied with the relevance of the course offerings to their area of study, PA and community organization students wanted more emphasis on technical and managerial skills, and students who were on the HUC campus for only 14 months were less satisfied with the

amount of Jewish content received.

The findings of this research imply a reciprocal responsibility between the field and the schools of Jewish communal service. *Therefore, Jewish communal educational programs must work with professionals in the field to reach an agreement about what comprises the minimum education standards for the profession. Just as other professional graduate schools have several "track" options within their programs, schools of Jewish communal service might explore such options in order to meet the field's diverse needs.*

In addition, there must be a mutual understanding of the importance of the partnership between the field and the schools. This partnership will enable the Jewish community to benefit from academic knowledge and research and will enable the schools, through knowledge of professional trends and feedback from the communal agencies, to maintain their relevancy and vitality.

Further, there is a need for the organized Jewish community to provide financial support for those entering the field. Serious consideration must be given to subsidization of schools of Jewish communal service or of the students attending them. The cost of obtaining the education and training needed to work in the Jewish community is very high and is not in proportion to the future salaries that this education and training will bring.

Respondents commented repeatedly on the low status and low pay of Jewish communal service professionals. What is the value of the profession to the community and to those employed within it? Should professionals be accorded a special status within the community and receive services from it, such as reduced membership rates at the Jewish Community Center? Could a community forum be created to initiate discussions of the need for services to Jewish communal professionals from the community?

The reciprocal side of the question—what the professional owes the community

—is also important. To what extent can or should the professional be a model to his or her community? What does the community expect from its professionals? According to Bubis (1980, p. 232), "We have no right to have Jewish expectations for others if we do not have them for ourselves. Role modeling can be enhanced through organizations of which the workers are part by virtue of the resolution passed and the actions taken by the organization with regard to the various concerns that confront us."

Perhaps the graduates' apparent lack of satisfaction with the field is due to the lack of understanding of the mutual expectations between the field and the professional. *Therefore, there is a need for professionals and lay leaders to redefine regularly the expectations each has of the other.*

This survey indicated that, as the years after graduation increase, so does the movement from the profession of Jewish communal service. To a degree, this mobility reflects the limitations of the Jewish community in satisfying its professionals in the long run. Such limitations include the low salaries, the need for relocation to achieve upward mobility, and the long hours required for success. *Therefore, if the field is to retain workers, there must be a willingness to compensate them for their dedication to their work. These matters need further exploration: paying higher salaries, encouraging upward mobility within the same community, and limiting the demands made on professionals and in turn the number of hours required to complete their work.*

The experience of women in the field also deserves serious consideration. Increasing the status of women is crucial, as they are now entering the field of Jewish communal service in much greater numbers than men. *Therefore, more effort must be made to increase the percentage of women in executive positions.* Providing family supports, such as maternity/paternity leave, child care, and guaranteeing reasonable working hours, would lessen the adverse

impact of working in the field on the family life of both men and women, thereby increasing their motivation to invest themselves in Jewish communal service.

CONCLUSION

Many questions regarding the professional identity of Jewish communal service workers and the definition of the field of Jewish communal service remain unanswered. A close partnership between Jewish communal service educational programs and the field is needed to help answer these questions, to inform practice with academic knowledge and research, and to ensure that the schools remain relevant and vital.

REFERENCES

- Bubis, Gerald. (1971). The birth of a school. *Central Conference of American Rabbis Journal*, p. 2.
- Bubis, Gerald. (1976). Professional education for the Jewish component in casework practice. *Journal of Jewish Communal Service*, 50, 270-277.
- Bubis, Gerald. (1980). The Jewish component in Jewish communal service. *Journal of Jewish Communal Service*, 56, 232.
- Bubis, Gerald. (1983). Women in leadership. *Journal of Jewish Communal Service*, 59, 238.
- Bubis, Gerald, Phillip, Bruce A., Reitman, Steven A., & Rotto, Gary S. (1985). The consumer report: Hiring of entry-level Jewish communal workers. *Journal of Jewish Communal Service*, 62, 103-107.
- Kahn, William. (1985). Jewish communal service and the professional today and tomorrow. *Journal of Jewish Communal Service*, 62, 241.
- Levine, Eric. (1985). Jewish professional-professional Jew: Commitments and competencies for a Jewish mission. *Journal of Jewish Communal Service*, 62, 40-48.
- Ozawa, Martha. (1976) Women and work. *Journal of Social Work*, 21, 445-462.
- Parker, M.W., Chynoweth, G., Blankinship, D., Zaldo, E., & Matthew, M. (1987). A case for computer applications in social work. *Journal of Social Work Education*, 23, 57.
- Reisman, Bernard. (1979). The Jewish component in the training program of Jewish communal workers. *Journal of Jewish Communal Service*, 58, 95-102.