

RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN HEADS AND TRUSTEES OF JEWISH ORGANIZATIONS

A Case Study of Jewish Day Schools

DAVID B. FINELL

Director, Herzl Jewish Day School, Denver, Colorado

The dynamic conflict and confrontation that too often exists between heads and trustees of Jewish day schools is the primary cause of administrative turnover and instability in those educational institutions. School heads, trustees, parents, teachers, and the larger Jewish community all play a role in sustaining this troubling dynamic. This article presents recommendations for facilitating collaboration between professional and lay leaders in Jewish day schools.

Some time ago I received an invitation for a lunch meeting from a former colleague in Jewish education. For many years this man had been a teacher and administrator in Jewish day schools. He had always impressed me and other fellow Jewish educators I knew as a well-trained, dedicated professional and a responsible, honest, and hard-working man. He had moved his family from the East Coast to the San Francisco Bay Area on a three-year contract to become the headmaster of a new Jewish day school. I had heard how his contract had been broken by the school's board of trustees after one and one-half years. He had become disillusioned with Jewish education and was now selling life insurance.

We met for lunch and together reflected on how so many other Jewish professionals we knew had experienced serious problems with their respective boards of trustees. I left our meeting with an overwhelming sense of sadness that a man who had once been a dedicated Jewish educator had been driven out of the profession by the dysfunctional dynamics of his school. And my sadness was greatly compounded by the knowledge that he and his school were far from alone.

The partnership between the head and the board of trustees is one of the most important relationships in any Jewish organization. When this relationship is one of mutual trust and support, the organization is run on a collaborative model of leadership. That is to say, it is run in a way that ensures its strength

as an institution. And, indeed, many outstanding Jewish organizations are run in this way.

Conversely, when this relationship is defined by a lack of mutual trust and lack of support, the institution will suffer turmoil and instability. And, sadly, many Jewish organizations are run this way as well.

This article examines the relationship between heads and trustees in the context of the Jewish day school in an attempt to elucidate this larger organizational dynamic. As the Jewish day school movement has grown dramatically in recent years, the problematic relationship that often exists between its lay and professional leaders has become increasingly evident. The dynamic of conflict and confrontation between school heads and trustees is believed to be the primary cause of administrative turnover and of instability in Jewish day schools. Yet, all Jewish institutions—synagogues, Jewish agencies, Hillel Houses, Jewish Community Centers, Jewish preschools, and the like—are subject to the same dynamic.

CONSEQUENCES OF ADVERSARIAL RELATIONSHIPS

There are a number of significant consequences to falling outs between the head of a Jewish organization and its board of trustees. When such conflicts arise at Jewish day schools the most common consequences include the following.

Divisiveness

When a confrontational situation develops between the school head and the board of trustees, divisiveness is generated among the faculty and parent body. People who support the head will be angry with the board for acting in a way that they perceive to be unfair and unethical. Those who have conflicts with the head or who have friends on the board will line up on the other side.

The impact of such situations is also often felt in a wider circle of relationships. Bad morale is generated on the faculty; dysfunctional teachers and administrative staff become empowered in inappropriate ways; and people find the problems generated at the school spilling over into their interactions with other people at the synagogue, preschool, and other settings in the Jewish community. This impact can flow from either direction.

Consider these two examples. At a day school in California the families primarily affiliate with two local synagogues. When the school head's contract was broken by the board it caused serious problems not only at the school but at these two synagogues as well. People who ended up on opposite sides of the situation would not speak to each other in shul. At services and holiday celebrations acrimonious comments and accusations were passed back and forth. The synagogues became a battleground for what had occurred at the school. At a Jewish day school in the Midwest there was a wonderful teacher who had taught there for twenty years. She was an important reason why families sent their children to this school. This teacher's husband had worked for many years at a local synagogue. Due to politics at this synagogue he was not rehired. The couple then had to leave the community. In short, because of a problem at a local synagogue, one of the best teachers at the local Jewish day school was lost.

Jewish communities are tight-knit communities. When politics get ugly in one place, their impact is commonly felt in other places as well.

Instability

In addition to the general divisiveness that is generated when there are blow-ups between boards and administration, damage is also done to a school by the consequent sense of instability. Families and teachers often leave the school. Other families and teachers may remain, but with cynical attitudes replacing the sense of excitement and support that existed previously. Prospective teachers may be inclined to accept positions at schools that appear to be more stable. Prospective parents may be dissuaded from sending their children to a school that projects an image of internal turmoil and poor management. Potential donors may withhold money if they are supportive of the head, if they generally wish to express displeasure with the way the board is acting, or if they wish to use the withholding of their support as a way of exerting influence during a time of transition.

Recruitment of a New Head

Schools with a bad track record in the area of administrative continuity acquire an unsavory reputation that is hard to shake. Jewish educators are often disinclined to seek employment in a school that has poorly treated their colleagues and friends. Nor are they usually willing to refer colleagues and friends to such a position.

There is a severe shortage of qualified Jewish educators (and Jewish professionals of every kind) in this country. One of the reasons for this shortage is the reluctance to enter a profession with the reputation of not treating its people professionally and ethically. Until Jewish education (and Jewish professional life in general) is seen as stable, supportive, and well-respected, the Jewish community will continue to struggle to attract and retain qualified people.

Far too many people are driven out of Jewish education (and other areas of Jewish professional life) by the dysfunctional dynamics of their organizations. The future of Jewish education, and by extension of Judaism as a whole, is in question if we cannot

attract and retain dedicated and talented Jewish educators and other Jewish professionals.

Children and Jewish Values

Most heads of Jewish day schools have a close relationship with their students. They teach classes and play with students on the yard; lead students in prayer, *Kabbalat Shabbat* observances, and holiday celebrations; speak at their graduations; give them rides home when their carpools get mixed up; put Band-Aids on their cuts; and get to know them as individuals.

When there is an abrupt parting of the ways between the head and the board, one of the results is a sense of loss and disillusionment on the part of the students. When they like and admire someone who serves as a role model, it comes as quite a shock if that person is hurt and treated shamefully. Often trustees are parents of these children or friends of their parents, which compounds the students' sense of confusion and loss. Since trustees are removed from the day-to-day interaction with the students, the impact on the students of the head leaving is rarely considered.

What do children learn when we teach the centrality of Jewish ethics and then treat people unethically? The dissonance between what we profess and how we act can be an extremely rude awakening for both children and adults. If people in Jewish schools are treated with disrespect and insensitivity, we are communicating a very powerful lesson about how people are permitted to behave in the real world.

WHY POLITICS IS THE NAME OF THE GAME

Jewish educators are generally committed and hard-working people who care deeply about their schools. Trustees are also committed, hard-working people who put in countless hours of volunteer time to benefit their schools. Trustees do not receive any financial compensation for the time they give, but serve because they care about their children's school and want to help ensure its growth and

strength. If everyone has such positive motives, why then does politics seem to be the name of the game? Why do heads and trustees so often find themselves in adversarial situations? Which dynamics are operative, and what must be done to improve the situation? It is to these questions that we now turn. This section examines the roles played by school heads, trustees, parents, teachers, and the larger Jewish community in creating and sustaining this troubling dynamic.

School Heads

Jewish educators are trained as educators, not as politicians. Yet, the reality of Jewish professional life is that one's success or failure often depends more on how skillful one is politically than on how creative or dedicated one is educationally. Many Jewish educators run into conflicts with their boards because they lack the political astuteness required to succeed.

The director of a major educational organization once told me: "What is most important for a day school principal? First—be a good politician; second—be a good administrator; third—be a good educator."

Was he right? Granted that all three competencies are needed, should the ability of a Jewish educator to be supported and successful in his or her profession depend more on political savvy than on knowledge and commitment?

Schools of Jewish education should offer more extensive training in the political realities of Jewish professional life. Although it is true that experience is the best teacher, more could be done through student placements and mentor programs than is currently the case.

Heads of schools are pulled in too many directions and have too many conflicting constituencies to satisfy. The job description for the head of a Jewish day school is enormous. A school head is responsible to parents, teachers, students, trustees, other Jewish community organizations, secular educational organizations, prospective parents, alumni, and grandparents. Daily he or she

must engage in a balancing act between these different constituencies and between the long-range goals and the immediate crises. Although intellectually most people will acknowledge that the head of a Jewish day school cannot be all things to all people, in reality anything less than this is often just not acceptable to many trustees. *School heads need to be given realistic job descriptions and to work with the board in setting priorities for the school.*

Because there is a severe shortage of qualified Jewish educators, people are sometimes offered positions before they are seasoned enough to handle the job. Public school principals tend to be ten to twenty years older than Jewish day school heads when they assume their first position. When an inexperienced head takes on the leadership of a school before he or she is ready, a conflictual situation with the board often results.

Jewish educational placement agencies, local bureaus of Jewish education, and graduate schools of Jewish education have not seen it as their role to establish and enforce personnel standards. Organized support for schools in dealing with contractual disputes or other serious head/trustee problems has also not been forthcoming. Emphasis has rather been placed on respecting the autonomy of each school to make its own decisions. It has also been felt that the wide diversity of schools in terms of financial resources, size, and orientation precludes any such standards. However, such standards are in place for rabbis specifying a number of years in the field and size of congregation for which one may be considered. Standards are also in place for salaries and benefits, renewal and termination of contracts, and mediation of disputes. These policies are established and enforced by the various rabbinical organizations, and it is to the benefit of both the congregations and the rabbis that such standards are in place. *It is recommended that Jewish educational placement organizations, in conjunction with graduate schools of Jewish education and local bureaus of Jewish education, establish and enforce similar standards and*

policies for Jewish educators.

Finally, due to the shortage of Jewish educators who have received formal training in schools of Jewish education, there seems to be an increasing trend to appoint non-Jewish, secular educators or secular educators who happen to be Jewish to head Jewish day schools and congregational schools. More and more Jewish schools are hiring administrators from secular education. It would be most helpful to have statistical data as to the extent of this trend. *It is also recommended that research be done on precise rates of administrative turnover and the reasons for administrative turnover at Jewish day schools and other Jewish organizations.*

Boards of Trustees

Many Jewish day schools are parent-founded schools. These schools were started by a group of active and committed parents, which wanted to be very involved in running the schools in their early years. Often this pattern of parental involvement carries on into the future. Many schools are never able to truly evolve beyond this model of a lay-led school into one in which lay and professional responsibilities are delineated clearly. Day school boards often suffer from a lack of training. Often they develop organically with little or no outside consultation and no clear set of organizational standards. Trustees may be reluctant to let their "baby grow up."

The most effective response to this dynamic is ongoing board training and school accreditation through the National Association of Independent Schools. It would be valuable to know how many Jewish day schools in the United States are accredited and to statistically correlate rates of administrative turnover in Jewish day schools with rates of accreditation.

People who serve on Jewish day school boards are often quite personally invested in the details of running their school, for a very simple reason—the majority are usually parents in that school. Most Jewish day school boards are parent-run boards. It is most difficult for a board composed primarily of

parent trustees to maintain a sense of objectivity and to act with a long-range view. Parent trustees tend to place a greater priority on making parents and teachers happy than they do on supporting the administration. After all, the school's teachers are their children's teachers; the school's parents are their friends and neighbors. With such a structure it is difficult for micromanagement to be anything but the norm.

One effective way to address this problem is to broaden the membership of the board to include more community representation. Board training combined with significant community representation is probably the most effective approach to addressing the management problems that arise out of a predominantly parent-run board.

One educator directed a Jewish day school on the West Coast for seventeen years. She was well respected and admired for her skill as a Jewish educator and for the way she built her school into a fine institution. However, at one point a few influential trustees began pushing for combined classes at each grade level. The head of the school did not feel this was an appropriate direction for the school. Battle lines were drawn—on the board, on the faculty, and throughout the parent body. The situation became divisive, and in the end the head left the school. Feelings of bitterness and hurt remain to this day. The question is, How in the life of a Jewish day school (or of any Jewish organization), do we amicably and constructively raise difficult issues and, once raised, bring them to a constructive resolution? Certainly there are ways to do so. But it requires an investment of time, money, and commitment on the part of each organization in order to reach that point. The reality is that most Jewish organizations have a very long way to go in developing clear internal guidelines for dealing constructively with concerns and difficult issues.

Another issue that is at the heart of head-trustee conflicts is that of divergent value systems. The operative value system of trustees tends to be Western and secular. Money talks, and the stridency of its voice is often a key factor in deciding who will and who will

not be asked to serve on the board.

The child is at the center of the school, and the program is developed around the needs of the child. Children are the *raison d'être* of the educational enterprise. Whereas money is at the center of the business world and businesses are developed around the goal of making money, schools are structured as communities of people.

The point is not that one system is inherently better or worse than the other. Each system serves an essential need. The point is that they are different systems. Each system has its own vocabularies and its own priorities. This basic difference strongly influences how educators and trustees approach each other as lay and professional leaders.

When trustees approach the management of a school in the same way they approach operating their business, law firm, or medical practice, there will be fertile ground for misunderstandings. So too when a school head fails to realize that there is an important business aspect to running a school effectively, trouble will usually follow. Consider these two examples of this difference in value systems and perspectives.

A Jewish day school had an outstanding teacher who was having an extremely stressful year. She walked into the head's office just before Pesach and quit on the spot. She said she would not be able to finish the school year. The teacher and the head spoke for some time about the stress she was experiencing. The head suggested that an extended Passover break might give her some much-needed time to rest, regain her perspective, and finish the year on a good note. The teacher thought it over and agreed to take some extra vacation time at Pesach. The teacher and her husband went to Hawaii for two weeks, and she returned with the energy needed to allow her to finish the year.

When the director informed the president of the board and the chairman of the school's personnel committee of the situation and how it had been addressed, they were furious. Both of these men were attorneys, and they felt the primary issue was that the teacher contract only allowed for a certain amount of

paid leave. They felt that the head had exceeded his authority by approving more paid leave time than the contract allowed. For the head, on the other hand, there were two very different primary considerations: (1) allowing the students to finish the last three months of the school year with the teacher whom they knew and liked, rather than with a substitute or a succession of substitutes, and (2) extending himself to this teacher in a supportive way and letting her know that she was valued.

To the trustees the integrity of the contract was primary. To the head the integrity of the children and of the teacher was primary. Each party approached the situation with a different set of values and priorities.

Another example: At a Jewish day school on the West Coast there were two brothers. One was in first grade, and the other one was in third grade. A small group of very vocal parents in the school had concerns that off-campus these children were engaging in sexually aggressive behavior toward other young children. Although there had been no problems in school these parents wanted the children expelled from the school. A great deal of pressure was placed on the board and the administration toward this end. The teachers and the head did not want to expel these two children. But what was most revealing was the way the situation was discussed at the faculty level versus the board level. Whenever the teachers discussed the situation, one heard such comments as

- "These children are behaving fine at school and are deserving of our support."
- "I can work with these children—they have made enormous progress academically and socially."
- "These children are part of the school community—we cannot abandon them because of the political pressure of some dysfunctional parents."

At the board level one heard such comments as the following:

- "What is our liability if we keep them or if we expel them?"
- "I've got people calling me every day and demanding to know what we are doing to address their concerns."
- "I know people who are threatening to take their children out of the school if we do not act decisively."
- "News of this situation has spread all over the community and is damaging the reputation of the school."

As these examples point out, these approaches are quite divergent. Yet, both can play an important role in effective school management. The welfare of the children should be the primary responsibility of the professional staff, but they also need to be aware that a school is a political system. Issues of finance and policy should be the primary responsibility of the trustees. However, they also need to be aware of the centrality of every child in that school.

The key is to find common ground by all parties working together in a spirit of mutual collaboration and respect. Different value systems, and the different vocabularies and priorities that flow out of those systems, can create severe misunderstandings and animosities, or they can work together to establish a more comprehensive model of school management.

Finally, trustees are usually not at the school very often. The information they receive about the school is often second-hand or limited to the class in which their child is enrolled. Since people tend to share concerns more readily than they do positive feedback, trustees tend to develop a "cops" view of reality. Their perspective tends to be skewed toward the negative.

The small victories and incremental successes, which to the teachers and the head constitute the heart and soul of the school, are usually not noticed by the trustees. If there is a problem of any kind, however, they will often hear about it in short order. It is of little interest to most trustees, for example, that the teachers and head have identified a child with

a learning disability and have begun to address her special learning needs effectively. However, a trustee will usually care very deeply about the outspoken parent who is very unhappy with the way the head handled his concern about his child's class placement.

It is important for trustees to make the time to visit the school each year and for heads to encourage such visits. It is also important for the head to make the time to keep the board informed about the small victories and incremental successes of the school. The challenge for the head is keeping board members informed about some of the details of school life without encouraging the board to move increasingly into micromanagement. The challenges for the trustee are supporting the head in the face of the inevitable criticisms and gossip, directing people to the proper place to address their concerns, and forming opinions based on first-hand knowledge alone.

Parents

Judaism places a very high premium on quality education, and Jewish parents can be very involved and supportive of their child's school. They can also be very demanding and make inappropriate demands. Without procedures in place by which concerns may be addressed constructively, parents may go to board members directly when there is a concern. This problem is particularly acute in Jewish day schools that have predominantly parent-run boards and can place trustees in the difficult position of having to balance responsiveness to parental concerns with support for the professional staff. *Schools need to have clearly established grievance procedures for parents, and these procedures need to be followed consistently.* The psychic health of the school will largely depend on how well such procedures are designed and implemented and how consistently they are followed.

Another contributing factor to this dynamic is that education is not a highly valued profession in the United States. Jewish administrators are often not well respected by

the parents of their respective schools. As a colleague once told me, "There are parents who will always think they know more than you because they are more financially successful than you." Sad to say, but some parents who are successful in their own profession may sometimes feel they are entitled to treat Jewish educators with a lack of respect. It is important for trustees to stand behind the head and protect him or her from verbal attacks by parents. Failure to do so sends a clear message to the head and to the parent body that the board does not support or value the head.

Combined with the cultural emphasis on education is the high cost of Jewish day school education. Parents in Jewish day schools pay a great deal of money for their children's education, and some unfortunately feel that they are entitled to say what they want and to act as they please.

Healthy schools have clear structures in place to allow parental input to be expressed constructively through proper channels. Dysfunctional schools let parents have the run of the house under the guise of openness and accessibility.

For example, at a Jewish day school in California the kindergarten teachers and the director decided that a particular child needed to be held back in kindergarten. This conclusion came after months of close observation of the child and discussions with the child's parents. The parents were not supportive of the decision. While the decision to retain the child was under the purview of the professional staff at this school, the president of the board did not want the parents of this child to be upset. She was concerned that the parents would leave the school. The parents of the kindergarten student called the president and requested an opportunity to address the board of trustees. There was no established procedure for dealing with such a situation, and so the president agreed to this request. The parents came to the board meeting and for forty-five minutes criticized the teachers and director for their alleged incompetence.

The point is that everyone needs to be able

to express concerns. However, if the proper lines of communication are not clear and are not followed, one does not have openness and accessibility; rather one has chaos and undermining. Trustees who "speak to anyone, anytime, about anything" may feel they are being open and accessible, but in fact they are doing their school a great disservice.

Jewish day schools are tight-knit communities, which generates support and mutual caring. At the same time gossip and rumors make the rounds very quickly. Sometimes comments or incidents (alleged or real) make the rounds in distorted and exaggerated ways. There is the parent trustee who once disseminated unfounded rumors about a gay teacher in an effort to get him fired. There is the parent who once spread a rumor among the parent body that the head of the school had lied on his resume when he had applied for the position. There is the child who was driven out of a school by gossip parents spread about his alleged behavior during play dates at friends houses. Such gossip and rumor spreading on the part of parents are very destructive to a school community or to any Jewish institution.

Since such situations can often lead to conflicts between the head and the board, *it is advisable for schools to develop codes of parent conduct. Such codes serve as a guide for dealing with parental behavior that is destructive to people at the school.* Such a code also ensures that the head and the board will be dealing with these situations in a unified manner.

Finally, there is the issue of religious diversity. In most Jewish day schools there exists a wide range of religious observance. This is true even in schools that affiliate with one of the branches of Judaism. Although such diversity is extremely valuable in helping to create a more pluralistic Jewish environment, it can also be a source of conflict between parents, heads, and trustees. Parents from diverse levels of religious observance can pull a school down diverse philosophical paths and prevent a coherent religious position from emerging. This is often seen most

clearly around such issues as the wearing of *kippot*, *tefillah*, *kashrut*, and the amount of time in the school day devoted to Hebrew and Judaic studies. *It is important for schools to have a clear philosophical position on these issues and to have clear policies based on that position.* Without a clearly articulated and consistently followed religious/philosophical orientation, the head will inevitably run into conflicts with parents and trustees over these issues.

The Jewish Community

Large segments of the Jewish community in the United States still are very ambivalent about supporting Jewish day school education. The vast majority of Jewish parents in the United States still send their children to public schools. The funding priorities of the Jewish community also reflect this ambivalence.

Without substantive support for day schools it is an impossible struggle to keep tuition affordable while balancing the budget. This financial reality has put day school tuition beyond the reach of many families. And at the same time heads are placed in a difficult situation with their trustees. The head is ultimately responsible for balancing the budget, but often this is impossible because of the lack of substantive support received for Jewish day schools by the Jewish community. The subsequent financial pressures are often a source of much conflict between heads and trustees.

Teachers

Jewish day schools have two distinct faculties—general or secular teachers and Hebrew/Judaic teachers. Often their training and their teaching backgrounds are quite different. The amount of contact hours with students can vary, as can how classroom usage is structured. There are cultural differences between Israeli and American teachers as well. These differences can set the stage for some interesting faculty dynamics.

Secular studies teachers, especially if they

are not Jewish, may come to feel that they are "strangers in a strange land." They may come to resent the amount of time taken up by Hebrew and by Judaic studies and the seemingly endless parade of Jewish holidays and observances. They may resent having to share "their" classrooms and bulletin board space with other teachers. Israelis may seem volatile, negative, and abrasive to them. The secular studies faculty may look down on what often seems to be inadequate training or experience of some of the Hebrew or Judaic teachers. And they may resent the fact that many of their colleagues on the Hebrew/Judaic studies faculty do not seem to be committed to ongoing education through attending workshops and conferences.

Conversely, Hebrew and Judaic studies teachers may feel that, although their curriculum supposedly constitutes the *raison d'être* of the school, they are often treated like second-class citizens. In many schools less hours are devoted to Hebrew and Judaic studies than to secular subjects, or those subjects are relegated to the afternoon hours. Many Hebrew or Judaic studies teachers must teach more than one grade level and move from classroom to classroom to do so. They may feel that they are given less space to put up materials and display student work in the classroom. Israelis may find American teachers to be superficial, easily offended, and less than direct.

Because of these differences faculty conflicts are common in Jewish day schools. A head has the Herculean task of bringing unity and collaboration to the faculty and of making everyone happy. In many schools teachers readily bring grievances to board members. Again, *without clear grievance procedures that are enforced and followed, it is easy for dysfunctional dynamics to emerge. Trustees must support their head in his or her dealing with faculty problems.*

Another situation that can lead to problems between teachers and heads and then spill over into the head's relation with the board occurs when teachers are also parents in the school. Many Jewish day schools have

parents on their faculty because parents who are knowledgeable, committed Jews often send their children to Jewish day schools. These parents constitute a pool of talent that heads frequently draw upon, especially since there is such a severe shortage of qualified Jewish teachers. *More intense efforts aimed at the recruitment and training of Jewish teachers needs to be made a priority by the Jewish community.*

Sometimes these parent/teachers serve on the board of trustees, various board, or school committees or are friends with current trustees. The lines of appropriate communication become very vague when people wear too many hats. When problems arise with the school, it is all too easy for such teachers to speak with other parents or with trustees about the situation. And it is most difficult for another parent or a trustee to turn a deaf ear to juicy inside information coming from a friend who is a teacher at their child's school. The result of this situation will inevitably be conflict between head and teacher and head and trustee.

It needs to be acknowledged that male/female dynamics can also play a role in relations between heads and teachers and subsequently affect relations between heads and trustees. In many Jewish day schools the head is male, and the majority of the teachers are female. A faculty of women can come to resent a male boss, regardless of how inclusive and nonsexist he may be. Conflicts of this nature will often bring about trustee involvement if for no other reason than their legal implications.

Teachers can generate conflict between trustees and heads because they hold a good deal of power. The degree of support exhibited by the faculty for the head—both informally and in the head's formal evaluation—will determine whether or not the head is offered a contract. Most trustees see returning qualified teachers as the higher priority. It is these very teachers who have taught (or are currently teaching) children of trustees. Often relationships between individual trustees and teachers have been built over many

years as the trustees' children have moved through the school. Teachers who have been at a Jewish day school for a long time are often well known and well liked. If a head does not stay in the good graces of such teachers, the board will usually throw its support behind the teachers and undermine the authority of the head. The outcome is an acrimonious parting of the ways between the head and the school, with the ensuing negative results discussed earlier.

As emphasized earlier, *a commitment to ongoing board and faculty training is essential if such dynamics are to be avoided.*

CONCLUSION

Positive collaboration between professional and lay leaders in Jewish institutions is an essential component of effective organizational management. Jewish organizations that are well run at both the lay and the professional levels reap the rewards of stability, growth, and excellent reputation.

Unfortunately, conflict between heads and trustees in many Jewish organizations seems to be the prevailing dynamic. This article has attempted to elucidate some of these dynamics by focusing on the relations between heads and trustees in Jewish day schools. Trustees and heads certainly play the major roles when conflicts emerge between lay and profes-

sional leaders. However, day school parents, teachers, and even the values and priorities of the larger Jewish community can also play an important role in engendering conflict between trustees and heads. Suggestions for effectively addressing these dynamics have also been presented and include

- accreditation
- clearly defined grievance procedures
- developing a clear philosophical orientation
- codes of parental conduct
- greater community representation on boards
- data research
- developing and enforcing standards
- ongoing board and faculty training

It is hoped that, by bringing these dynamics out into the open for honest discussion, the Jewish community may begin to address them more effectively. If this is not done Jewish organizational life will most assuredly continue to be plagued by high rates of administrative turnover, institutional instability, and dysfunctional organizational relationships. It is time for Jewish organizations to get their house in order. The importance of healthy Jewish organizational life to the future continuity of the Jewish people demands no less.