THE STATE OF JEWISH EDUCATION

Dr. Barry Chazan

It has been a swift century for Jewish education in America. Less than one hundred years ago Jewish education in America was a modest and struggling enterprise; today it encompasses a network of approximately 2500 schools, 50 central agencies, 10 teacher-training institutions, 50 community centers and scores of summer camps spread throughout the United States. To many it seems only a few years ago that Samson Benderly's disciples began to create bureaus of Jewish education in Chicago, Cleveland, Cincinnati, Los Angeles, Boston, New York, and Philadelphia[1] or that Reb Shraga Feivel Mendlowitz initiated his pioneering efforts to create a network of American Orthodox Jewish day schools.[2] Now we are in the waning years of the twentieth century, and the Jewish educational enterprise is a well-established venture with buildings, budgets, and institutional infra-structures.

The path of twentieth century American Jewish education is marked by several prominent dynamics and critical turning points. The 1920's was the era in which the foundations of modern American Jewish education were established. In the late 1930's and early 1940's the day school movement began to develop. The 1950's was the period of the greening of the synagogue supplementary school. The 1970's was an age of remarkable growth for the non-Orthodox day school movement. The highways and byways of contemporary American Jewish education over the years reveal many metamorphoses for a relatively young enterprise; and as we enter the waning years of the century, American Jewish education once again finds itself facing critical choices and options.[3]

This is a particularly opportune time to reflect on some of the major dynamics of Jewish education in the past decade and on their likely implications for the coming years. Our journey along the complicated highway of contemporary Jewish education in the United States will be guided by seven signposts which, I believe, reflect its main themes and motifs now and for the foreseeable future:

1) changing moods and modes
2) the state of curriculum
3) metamorphoses in central and communal agencies
4) the change process and the power brokers
5) personnel
6) Israel
7) the vision

CHANGING MOODS AND MODES

The past quarter century has been an era of great flux in American Jewish education; some institutions have grown; others have declined, and still others have begun to emerge as new forces on the Jewish educational scene. It is a time of movement and turmoil, rather than of quiet and calm. The three prominent change patterns in this decade are: 1) the growth of the day school, 2) the decline of the supplementary school, and 3) the search for new forms.

The Growth of the Day School.

There were 248 day schools in the United States in 1958; in 1988 the number of Jewish day schools is over 500.[4] Enrollment in Jewish day schools has increased 83% during the past thirty years and today more than 100,000 students study in these schools. (It is instructive to note that the growth of day school education not only reflects but exceeds the expansion patterns of private schooling in the United States over the past twenty years[5].) Those who study in day schools constitute 28% of all Jewish students between the ages 3 - 17 who receive any Jewish education.

Day schooling is mainly on the

elementary level: 73% of all day school pupils are enrolled in grades between the pre-primary level and grade 6; 16% are in grades 7-9; and 11% are in grades 10 - 12.

Day school education in the United States has been predominantly Orthodox for the entire century; today 75% of all day schools are Orthodox in nature. However, in the past decade non-Orthodox day schooling has expanded dramatically, and 12% of today's day schools are Conservative, 8% are communal or interdenominational, and 2.5% are Reform.

Day schools vary in size; by public school standards, they are modest institutions, usually encompassing from 100 - 500 students. In 1983, 37% of the day schools had 1 - 100 students; 34% had 100 - 250 students and 19% had 250 - 500 students. Only 9% of U.S. day schools had over 500 students.

While two-thirds of American Jewish day schools are under independent or communal (rather than denominational) sponsorship, the great majority of such schools are nevertheless religious in orientation. (Indeed, two-thirds of the day schools are housed in or near synagogues.) Thus, day school education continues the American Jewish orientation to Jewish education as religious education.

Despite the remarkable growth of the day school in the United States during the past decade, American Jewry still is far behind the world-wide norm of day school education. Approximately 40.1% of all Jewish children in the world who receive Jewish education attend day schools (in some countries the proportion of day school pupils is as high as 90%[6]), as opposed to 28% in the United States (which constitutes the highest percentage in the U.S. in this century). All-day Jewish education in the United States has been the preference of a minority of Jewish families throughout this century and the supplementary school remains the quintessential form of American Jewish education.

The ultimate significance of the growth of day school education in America in the past decade is sociological rather than statistical, and the expansion of the day school may be best understood as a reflection of changing moods and perceptions in American Jewish life. Whereas the day school once symbolized parochialism and religiosity, it now represents a new and attractive model for harmonious integration of Jewish and general life. Young suburban parents in Newton, Denver, St. Louis, Albuquerque, the San Fernando Valley, and South Miami, who once populated America's public schools, are now considering (the previously unthinkable)possibility of sending their own children to an elementary Jewish day school (and they are receiving support and encouragement from their own parents, who in previous decades fought against the establishment of day schools!).

Why has the Jewish day school become a respectable option for mainstream American Jewry in the past decade? First, there clearly is a segment of American Jewry which is concerned with the promulgation of a meaningful Jewish life in America, and which is interested in quality Jewish education for their children[7]. Many of these Jews have become convinced that the supplementary model of Jewish schooling is not a viable vehicle for even minimal Jewish education and have turned to the day school as an alternative.

Second, the day school has made life easier for Jewish parents, children and families. Once it was felt that day school life would involve complex social, psychological, and recreational burdens for children and their families. In fact, it has become apparent that just the opposite is the case; day schooling seems to make daily life easier and more relaxed for everyone. The day school saves the child from going to Hebrew school in the late afternoon (after a full day of general schooling) when everyone is at the park or at Little League practice. The supplementary school student must wake up on Sunday morning and trudge off to Sunday school classes, whereas the day school student (like most of his non-Jewish American peers) is comfortably tucked away in bed or preparing himself for the Bears-Giants game. In the day school, kids study Hebrew, Bible, science, and American history in pleasant buildings during normal school hours in a regular school setting. When they go home, they are free for sports, piano, and hanging out with other kids on the block. The day school day has added a little more childhood to the life of the youngster, more 'together-time' to the lives of Jewish families, and less mileage to the family station-wagon.

Third, the modern day school is now a known and recognizable phenomenon. In the 1950's, middle-class suburban Jews in Woodenton, Long Island in Philip Roth's story "Eli the Fanatic" fought feverishly against the establishment of a "yeshiva" in their community. It was a new and strange creature to them and they had images of strangely dressed adults, pale and un-American looking children, and strange rites taking place in the yeshiva building! In the 1980's, middle class midwestern suburban Jewish families in Cynthia Ozick's novel *The Cannibal Galaxy* felt very comfortable sending their children to a modern Jewish day school called the "Lake Shore Academy". Day schools are located in pleasant suburban neighborhoods and housed in modern school plants which contain all the accoutrements associated with "good" private schools: small classes; modern equipment; well-trained general studies teachers; counseling; parental involvement. They are headed by native-born, well-educated, and well-dressed principals who are often called "headmasters". Day school students play baseball in the schoolyard, ride home on yellow school busses, and do not seem to be any more adjusted or maladjusted than their public school counterparts. The day school is no longer regarded as belonging exclusively to New York City and/or to Orthodox Jewry (just as general private schooling is no longer exclusively Catholic or in the Northeastern States[8]); it has become as middle class and as mainstream Jewish-American as Volvos, jogging, Land's End and L.L. Bean.

The growth of the day school movement is not only an outcome of Jewish factors; it has been equally affected by tumultuous changes in American education over the past two decades.[9]

The first great change in American education has been a dramatic shift in attitudes towards public and private schooling. Once, heterogeneous public education was a great American ideal, and private schooling was regarded as the domain of a small religious and/or economic elite. According to the common school myth, the public school was the best route for immigrants and ethnic minorities to quickly and successfully become part and parcel of the great American dream (and Jews were often regarded as among the best consumers and supporters of public education). However, beginning in the 1960's, the positive myth of the polyglot public school was replaced by images of bussing, over-crowded classes, drugs, and violence. Consequently, many Jewish and non-Jewish parents succumbed to a new myth (the 'private school myth'): the belief that superior, homogeneous private and suburban schools were a more efficient, yet equally American route to "making it" in America. Indeed, since the 1960's, middle-class America has increasingly come to doubt the quality and viability of public education as an educational option for their children, turning instead to suburban or private schools. This dynamic has proven to be a disaster for public education and a boon for the day school.

The movement towards quality private education was also fueled by the intensified competition for admission into the "best" colleges and universities. Parents increasingly saw elementary and secondary education as "basic training" for acceptance in good colleges, and the small classes, excellent teachers and easy accessibility to faculty in private schools were all regarded as great assets in the fast-lane race for admission to Harvard, Stanford, and MIT.

Attitudes and realities towards the financing of education also changed. In the first half of the century, free compulsory education was regarded as one of the inalienable rights and benefits of life in America, and free public schooling was particularly appealing to a largely immigrant Jewish population struggling to carve out a life in the New World. In the past few decades, the children of these immigrants have become doctors, lawyers and businessmen; they have moved to the suburbs, and they want quality education for their children. Many of the sons and daughters of the public-school immigrant generation are now economically comfortable, and it has become increasingly feasible financially for them to send their children to private schools. In addition, the growing role of the federal and the non-governmental sector in private eduction meant that more money became available for private -- hence day -- schools. While these funds have not been the main resource for the building of Jewish day schools, they have provided valuable ancillary sources of funding and services.

The movement from the

legitimization of private schooling to the acceptability of private Jewish education was a relatively simple process: if private schools, then why not a Jewish private school? The answer was affirmative on the condition that Jewish day schools proved themselves to be superior agencies of general education. Indeed, most of today's day schools have proven to be among the best schools in their communities, both in terms of educational creativity and academic achievements. Thus, private Jewish elementary schooling has proven to have both Jewish and general pay-offs; it contributes to a child's general growth and may also be good for his/her Jewish soul. (On the other hand, high school level day school education has usually been regarded as "too Jewish", and too much of an academic and social risk in the critical pre-college years; hence, the growth of secondary Jewish schooling nowhere parallels that of the elementary day school.[10]) This constellation of general and Jewish forces has resulted in the emergence of the modern private Jewish day school as a unique new late-twentieth century American-Jewish educational format. The new day school world has resulted in new problems, dynamics and challenges (e.g.: How shall these new schools be financed? What kind of personnel is needed for day schools? How should Jewish and general studies be integrated?). The rapid growth of the day school movement in the past decade is impressive; at the same time it has created a host of new problems and complexities in Jewish life.

The Decline of the Supplementary School.

Changing attitudes toward the day school have been paralleled by significant metamorphoses in the world of the synagogue supplementary school. At mid-century, the suburban synagogue supplementary school reigned as the predomininant form of American Jewish education. It had supplanted the urban *talmud torah* and *heder*, and aspired to be the quintessential form of modern American Jewish education. The synagogue supplementary school was the at the epicenter of great educational excitement and investment in its early years, and there were some notable successes in this genre.[11] It remains the predominant form of American Jewish education, and there are some wonderful supplementary schools and supplementary school educators throughout the country. However, the times are changing in the supplementary school world.[12]

The number of Jewish supplementary schools in the U.S. has declined dramatically in the past two decades. In 1983 there were 1861 supplementary schools throughout the United States as compared to a peak of 3153 schools in 1958, and there has been a 58% decline in supplementary school enrollment between 1962 and 1982.[13]

Within the supplementary school world, there has been a significant decrease in the one-day-a-week supplementary school and increase in the three-day-a-week form of part-time education. In 1958, 47.1% of the supplementary schools were 2-5 day-a-week schools and 45.1% were one-day-a-week schools; in 1983, 76% of the schools had 2-5 day-a-week programs, and only 24% were one-day-a-week. Indeed, the general trend for those who receive any Jewish education over the past quarter century reflects a shift towards more time-intensive instruction, both in terms of the relative growth of the day school as well as the relative decline of the one-day-a-week supplementary school.[14]

Supplementary schools are fairly small, religiously-sponsored, elementary institutions. 82% of the population of today's supplementary schools are in the elementary grades, and the overwhelming majority of American Jewry's school-age population drops out of Jewish schooling after *bar mitzvah*. Almost all American supplementary schools today are sponsored by synagogues of the three major denominations (even though there has been some intermittent movement towards the pooling of resources into communal supplementary schools): 36% of supplementary schools are Reform-sponsored, 29% are Conservative-sponsored, and 24% are Orthodox-sponsored. 50% of supplementary schools serve 100 children or less; 27% of the schools serve a school population of 100-250, and 16.7% have over 250 children.

The changes in the supplementary world are not only demographic; they also encompass the areas of: personnel, leadership, funding, and morale. One of the most dramatic changes in this world is the demise of the profession of full-time supplementary school

teacher in America.[15] In 1981/2 - 1982/3, there were 14,621 teachers in supplementary schools; [16] yet 93.6% of these teachers taught less than eleven hours a week (84% of them taught less than seven hours).[17]

Once, principalship of a supplementary school was regarded as the most prestigious type of school leadership position in American Jewish education; today, the day school world with its higher salaries and broader educational responsibilities attracts many of the best and the brightest.

While there has been increased funding for Jewish education in the past decade, its impact has not been felt in the supplementary school world.[18] Indeed, supplementary education today finds great difficulties in supporting innovative and creative new programs.

Generally, a mood of frustration and malaise has gripped the various participants in part-time Jewish education. Principals and teachers feel they do not have enough time or support to do their jobs well. Parents do not see many positive results from "Hebrew school", and they seem to spend much of their time forcing their children to attend. And what about the children? They have to attend classes after school and on Sunday morning, and after the first few years, many begin to find the whole business uninteresting and painful. The part-time school is a uniquely American Jewish educational form now faced with the challenge of reformulation and adaptation.

The Search for New Forms.

One of the most prominent dynamics of the past decade has been the search for new forms of Jewish education outside of the existing school frameworks. This search has emerged from the growing sense of frustration with existing models and from a sense of success with some new alternatives. Heder or Hebrew school does not inspire anything like the excitement of a Russian Jewry protest march in Washington, a Shabbat weekend study retreat, a summer in Israel, a college course in Judaica, an adult education course, a Jewish summer camp, a lecture by Eli Wiesel. Four arenas in particular have emerged as potentially important new Jewish educational networks: a) Jewish pre-school education; b)adult and family life Jewish education; c)the Jewish community center; d)the Israel trip.

a) Jewish pre-school education

In the past decade, a growing number of young Jewish parents have begun to consider early childhood Jewish education as an alternative for their preschoolers, resulting in an increasing number of Jewish preschool programs in synagogues, Jewish community centers, and day schools. Recent research suggests that the years of young parenting have become an increasingly critical Jewish transitional period in the lives of young Jewish adults and their children.[19] Questions about being Jewish loom larger when people begin to have children, causing them to take early childhood Jewish education very seriously.

The first concern of young Jewish parents regarding a preschool is that it be of top educational quality, and Jewish preschools have usually proven themselves to be exemplars of early childhood education. They are run by highly qualified professionals, are located in modern, well-equipped plants, and they guarantee the highest levels of childcare. Although there is as of now no hard data, as one travels throughout local communities across the country, there is the clear sense that Jewishly sponsored early childhood programs are among the best programs of their kind. (In many communities, non-Jews are interested in sending their children to such schools.) Thus, Jewish parents have often sent their children to Jewish preschools simply because they are good schools.

Others have become convinced that the early years are a convenient and relatively non-threatening time to provide some basic Jewish education: holidays, songs, dances, customs. Parents and grandparents take great pride in offspring who have learned the *Ma Nishtana* or *Shma* or *Hanukkah* blessings at their preschool.

During the past twenty years, the Jewish pre-school has been transformed from an experiment to a proven success. Generations of parents have had the experience of sending their children to some very lovely and remarkably creative Jewish preschools across America, where they have been cared for by some of the best professionals that American Jewry has produced. Indeed, the Jewish

pre-school experience has proven to be an extremely positive Jewish experience not only for little children, but also for their young parents.

b) Adult and family-life Jewish education

The concern with early childhood Jewish education was paralleled in the past decade by increased interest in post-childhood -- or adult -- Jewish education. A growing body of academic research underscored the common sense maxim that a rich Jewish family life is critical for the development of Jewish identity in the young. Unfortunately, an increasing number of contemporary Jewish families found themselves ignorant of and estranged from rich Jewish family life, and they were unable to serve as a positive force in their children's Jewish growth; hence, concern for Jewish adult and family-life education has increased. Old models of synagogue adult education programs and lectures continue to exist, but they have been supplemented and often superceded by new ventures and experiments. The *havurah* movement has become a mainstream institution of family life education. Regional and national conferences of CJF, JWB, Hadassah, the National Council of Jewish Women, and local federations increasingly include Jewish experiences and programs. National and international Jewish funding agencies are investing in new experiments in adult and family-life Jewish education. Adult trips to Israel are increasingly assuming an educational rather than recreational or philanthropic tone. As American Jewry ages, it is seeking new ways of advancing the Jewish education, not only of its children, but also of its parents and grandparents.

c) Jewish Community Centers

During the past decade, the Jewish community center has launched significant efforts in the area of Jewish education. Throughout the history of the center movement, there have been statements of concern about Jewish education. The original conception of the center as a Jewish agency was influenced by the organic Jewish philosophies of Mordecai Kaplan and Herbert Kallen.[20] Oscar Janowsky's extensive study of JCC's in 1948 affirmed the centrality of the Jewish mission of this institution and this was repeated in reports and studies in the 1960's.[21] Still, there often was the sense that centers served the recreational and health needs of their clientele more than their Jewish concerns, and that Jewish education did not seem to play a major role in the daily lives of the centers.

In the 1980's, the JWB -- the national organization of Jewish community centers -- began a major thrust to intensify the Jewish educational work of centers, which included the issuing of an historic document entitled: *Maximizing the Jewish Educational Effectiveness of JCC's.* [22] This report sparked an intensification of Jewish activities in the center world, encompassing: staff and board study missions to Israel; conferences and seminars focusing on Jewish education; a network of in-service sessions on Jewish topics; the publication of programs, guides, and booklets on Jewish education and Jewish programming by the JWB; the appointment of senior personnel in JCC's whose exclusive responsibilities were for Jewish education; a substantial increase in sessions on Judaism and Jewish education at staff conferences and meetings.[23]

There are many reasons for the intensification of the Jewish focus in the center world: the vision and commitment of a small group of professional and lay leaders; the growing sense that the informal nature of the center makes it particularly conducive to creative Jewish educational activities; and the pragmatic need to find new tasks and functions for an agency in transition. Whatever the motivations, the center world in the 1980's has become preoccupied with the rhetoric of Jewish education.

d) The Israel Experience

After the Six Day War, American Jews began to come to Israel in increasing numbers. While the majority of diaspora Jews have still not visited Israel (the estimate of those who have been to Israel varies from 15-38%), those who have come to Israel seem to have been affected, sometimes significantly, and there is a growing sense that coming to Israel is an extremely important Jewish educational opportunity.[24]

In 1986, in a report submitted to the Jewish Education Committee of the Jewish Agency ("The Israel Experience") it was estimated that "as many as a third of all North American Jews, who have never been to Israel, are

interested in such a visit".[25] The report goes on to suggest that people are willing to spend money and time in Israel programs which go beyond ordinary tourism and rather focus on: family experiences, intensive tours that explore Jewish connections with Israel; and organized visits of like-minded groups. The report suggests that the existing obstacles to the growth of Israel visits (lack of information, cost, quality) could be overcome, and that Israeli educational programs could become a significantly expanded arena of American Jewish life in the next decade. Clearly, then, the Israel trip has emerged not only as a philanthropic mission, but also as a potentially important personal journey into authentic Jewish experiences and growth.

These metamorphoses in existing American Jewish education in the past decade reflect some basic changes in the moods and attitudes of American Jews towards Jewish education. First, America's Jews have become increasingly concerned with the "pay-off" of their existing Jewish educational forms, and they are beginning to demand the same accountability from their Jewish educational institutions that they have come to expect from law, medicine, and general education.[26]

Second, the time and venue of American Jewish education is changing. Whereas Jewish education once took place after school, on Sunday morning and on weekday evenings, it now also occurs at Shabbat family retreats, over five days at a national conference, during two weeks in Israel, or at a "lunch and learn" seminar near downtown offices.

Third, American Jews are affected by new patterns of leisure and aging in America, and there is a growing search for Jewish educational forms which fit comfortably into the new and expanded extra-curricular calendar of American life. Sundays were once a very convenient time for Jewish education; now Sunday classes are in conflict with family outings, ski trips, and weekend vacations as well as with the needs of such non-traditional configurations as blended and single parent families. Previously, Jewish retirees in the North would attend evening adult education classes at the synagogue; today they live in southern Florida and are free for Jewish educational activities throughout much of the day.

Finally, many contemporary Jews may be regarded as consumers for a Jewish educational product which is intelligible, interesting, and which offers some faint glimmer of success. All of these reasons have resulted in the search for new routes and roads for Jewish experience and growth.

THE STATE OF CURRICULUM

Curriculum in American Jewish education is in a moribund state. It is characterized by six traits.

First, there are many educational materials and resources in American Jewish education -- but few people know about them. A detailed survey of American Jewish educational instructional resources reveals the existence of a large and constantly growing collection of "materials": books, pamphlets, instructional units, curricula, filmstrips, tapes, maps, charts, transparencies.[27] Pages upon pages are constantly being churned out by national denominational departments of education, the "big" commercial publishers, and an ever-changing group of smaller publishers, local bureaus, and schools.

At the same time, speak to any Jewish educator and they will say: "we don't have materials!" The reality is that vast amounts of materials have been produced in American Jewish education in the past fifty years, and some of it (especially that produced by the large commercial publishers and the denominational movements), is used extensively in Jewish schools throughout the United States. At the same time, much of the material lies peacefully in storerooms, pedagogic centers, and principals' offices throughout the country; unseen or unused by most Jewish teachers and children. The extensive production process of Jewish educational materials is not paralleled by an equivalent dissemination system. Indeed, in this age of great technological sophistication, American Jewish education has yet to create a viable mechanism for guaranteeing that the vast quantity of educational resources that have been produced over the past fifty years reaches the hands of teachers and the hearts of children.

The second characteristic of Jewish educational curriculum in America is the lack of consensus about what should be taught. With the exception of Orthodox Jewish education, there is no

agreed-upon course of study, no standard curriculum, and no corpus of basic texts for Jewish education. Moreover, there is no general conception of what a graduate of American Jewish education should know or do, beyond the sense that he/she should "feel Jewish" (and there is no clear sense nor consensus about the meaning of "feeling Jewish"). Each principal, rabbi, school and teacher ultimately "makes his or her Shabbos" concerning the contents of Jewish education. Certain subjects have emerged as fairly common in most schools - Bible, Jewish history, Jewish practices, Jewish thought and ideas, Hebrew, Israel, Holocaust - but there are no common educational texts or contents. Some applaud this situation as reflective of pluralism and autonomy; others decry it as educational anarchy and negligence.

The third characteristic of curriculum in American Jewish education is its commitment to capsulization. American Jewish education is increasingly dominated by the attempt to present a brief and concise summary of the great works and ideas of the vast compendium of Jewish knowledge and civilization to the young. The archetypical book in American Jewish education is entitled: "Anthology," "Great Ideas of," "Wisdom of" " Catalog". This is paralleled by a radical turning away from the primary source and text as the central curricular content of Jewish education. Whereas classical Jewish education began with the detailed analysis of the text (from which larger ideas emerged),[28] contemporary (non-Orthodox) Jewish education opts for second-order synopses. The practical result is that the great texts of the Jewish people are increasingly inaccessible to young American Jews.

The fourth characteristic of the curriculum field in the past quarter century is its virtual isolation from the academic study of Judaica. The well-documented growth of Judaic studies in America has had little institutional impact on elementary and secondary Jewish education. There have been few substantive joint projects between departments of Judaica and local educational agencies, and new approaches and knowledge in the Jewish humanities and social sciences have not been felt in elementary and secondary classrooms and textbooks.[29] The barriers between elementary and secondary Jewish education and university level Judaic studies have remained firmly drawn, and are infrequently crossed from either side.

Fifth, the activities of curriculum development, evaluation, and revision are a minuscule aspect of contemporary Jewish educational life. There are essentially no full-time professional positions in Jewish curriculum development and evaluation, and there are few full-time institutes with mandates in that area. (Some of the exceptions over the past quarter century have been: The National Curriculum Research Institute of the then AAJE (now JESNA); the Melton Research Center of the Jewish Theological Seminary of America; The Melton Centre for Jewish Education in the Diaspora of the Hebrew University and some bureaus of Jewish education - e.g., New York, Chicago, L.A., Boston.) The infra-structure of American Jewish education has not included a well-funded, well-supported professional agency devoted to research, development and evaluation in curriculum for Jewish education.

Finally, Jewish curriculum development has been influenced sporadically by curricular trends in the field of general education. Jewish curriculum development has not taken place in a vacuum, and such trends as the structures of knowledge movement, the new social studies, cognitive-developmental moral education, values-education, and behavioral objectives have been felt in Jewish education. However, these influences have been short-lived and usually idiosyncratic. Moreover, in recent years the movement has been away from curricular innovation and development and toward staff development and/or innovative programming. Thus, today it is in fact difficult to discuss any dominant general trend in Jewish curriculum development.

METAMORPHOSES IN CENTRAL AND COMMUNAL AGENCIES OF JEWISH EDUCATION

The past decade has been a time of change for several of the central and communal agencies of American Jewry that deal with Jewish education.

Hebrew Teachers' Colleges.
One of the major creations of American Jewish education in the first half of the twentieth century was a group of Hebrew teachers colleges or seminaries which provided post-secondary professional training in Judaica

and pedagogy to young people interested in pursuing careers in teaching.[30] For a time, these institutions flourished both as training institutes for educators and as centers for the academic study of Jewish life and culture. In the past few decades, however, new patterns for the academic study of Judaism and for the professional training of educators have emerged, and this development has dramatically affected the functions, population, and enrollments of teacher training schools. The Hebrew teachers colleges, which emerged in the early to middle part of the twentieth century, have faced new challenges and problems, including: declining enrollments; the emergence of departments of Judaica in general universities; and a shift in patterns of pre-service training away from specialized teacher training schools. (A sign of the times is the fact that almost all of these institutions have removed the word "teachers" from their name; thus, for example, the Boston Hebrew Teachers College is now "The Hebrew College".) Several of these institutions have reformulated their goals and programs and are now concentrating on new communal challenges and needs: adult and continuing education, intensive secondary supplementary schooling; in-service teacher training; community programming; Jewish communal service. These changing patterns have resulted in many new creative ventures; they also reflect dramatic evolutions in patterns of higher Jewish education and Jewish teacher-training.

Professional Progams of Jewish Communal Service. While the Jewish teaching profession seems to be discarding some of its traditional training structures, during the past two decades the world of Jewish communal service has been busy creating new university-based professional training programs. Masters and doctoral programs for Jewish community center workers, Hillel directors, and federation and philanthropic personnel have been established at Brandeis University, Hebrew Union College, The Jewish Theological Seminary and the Columbia School of Social Work, and the Baltimore Hebrew University and the University of Maryland. The champions of these programs have been quite successful in obtaining the necessary academic and communal support to establish and maintain such endeavors, recruit a cadre of students, and help them find their place in the world of Jewish communal service after graduation. These institutions are now firmly established parts of the institutional structure of American Jewish life, and generations of their graduates occupy key positions of professional leadership in the American community.

Moreover, these institutions have increasingly come to see themselves as connected to the venture of Jewish education. They usually are connected in some way to graduate programs of Jewish education and the Jewish growth of their clientele (children or adults) is assumed to be an important dimension of their mission. Thus, these programs constitute a new horizon of professional training in Jewish education.

Bureaus of Jewish Education. Bureaus of Jewish education were one of the innovative creations of the founders of American Jewish education in the 1920's-40s'.[31] They were indigenous educational responses to new Jewish realities in America, and they were influenced by the most progressive American educational thinking of that time. They were set up to be service agencies to the many existing forms of Jewish education, and they pursued a broad range of activities: consultation, curriculum development, high school classes, inter-school programming, in-service programs, licensing. In practice, their main clientele was the mushrooming synagogue-sponsored Jewish supplementary school network.

As we have seen, American Jewish life and education has changed quite dramatically since the 1930's - 1950's, and today's bureaus find themselves confronting new realities and responsibilities. Much of the bureau's work was originally aimed at the rich new network of supplementary schools in the 1940's - 70's. However, the sophisticated approaches to curriculum development, staff training and licensing are increasingly difficult to implement in today's part-time supplementary school world.

The growth of non-Orthodox day schools confronts the bureaus with an entirely new arena of Jewish education, which heretofore had been outside their domain. (Orthodox day schools - which were the bulk of all day schools - had little to do with the bureaus.)

The expanding arenas of early

childhood, adult learning, Jewish education in JCC's, camping, and the Israel experience need professional vision and direction, and bureaus are being called upon to contribute to their growth.

The emergence of the federation in American Jewish life has had great influence on bureau life. Much of bureau funding comes from federations, and hence bureau directors have had to become increasingly involved with the processes and dynamics of federation allocations. Bureaus are increasingly being expected to serve as professional consultants on education to an entire community, and hence their scope of operation is potentially much broader -- and it frequently demands different professional skills. Bureaus are now expected to be not only recipients of Jewish educational funds, but also advocates and spokespeople of the cause of Jewish education on the local and regional scene.

Thus, the decade has been an era in which many bureaus have begun the creative -- and sometimes difficult -- process of re-evaluation and re-definition of their functions and directions.

National Agencies. In 1939 the AAJE (American Association of Jewish Education) was established as a coordinating body of bureaus and other central agencies of Jewish education. (In 1982 it was reconstituted and re-named JESNA -- the Jewish Education Service of North America.) AAJE-JESNA has assumed a wide range of functions throughout its existence, including: the establishment of standards, research, evaluation, licensing, personnel placement, testing and curriculum development. Its role on the national Jewish scene has been increasingly influenced by the tension between the de-centralized and denominational nature of American Jewish education and the emergence of increasingly powerful non-denominational national and regional Jewish agencies. The report of a committee established in the late 1970's by the Council of Jewish Federations to examine the needs and role of the AAJE for the coming decades reflected the desire among some circles of American Jewry to create a national Jewish educational agency which would have the power and style of some of the emergent major American Jewish national agencies. These changes are now in the process of implementation (as reflected, for example, in the recent appointment of a leading academic of American Jewish communal life as Executive Vice-President) and it may well be that JESNA will evolve into a national agency of advocacy, dissemination, and research for American Jewish education.

In addition to re-adjustments in existing Jewish educational agencies, during the last decade we have also witnessed the involvement in Jewish education of agencies that previously had little or no concern with the topic. Local federations have become increasingly preoccupied with Jewish education as expressed by:[32] increased federation allocations to Jewish education;[33] local committees on Jewish education; in-service seminars on Jewish education for federation staff and lay-leaders; and an enhanced presence for the topic of Jewish education at the annual General Assembly.[34] Jewish education clearly has become a major agenda item for American Jewish federations.

Other national Jewish agencies have also entered the world of Jewish education. The American Jewish Committee has an ongoing publication program on research and trends in Jewish education and it conducts periodic discussion forums on the topic. The JWB engages full-time staff to deal with Jewish education, and it has produced numerous Jewish educational guides, resource materials, and programs in recent years. Hadassah has an active Education Department with skilled lay and professional leadership, and has intensified the Jewish and Israel contents of its study programs. The National Council of Jewish Women has recently produced a series of educational materials on Jewish values as part of their workshop programs for local chapters. CAJE (Coalition for the Advancement of Jewish Education), a grassroots American Jewish educational network created in the 1970's, is today an important barometer of the spirit and concerns of contemporary Jewish educators.

Indeed, we are currently witnessing a realignment of the traditional division of institutional responsibility for Jewish education among American Jewish agencies. This process is not without pain and dissension. Agencies which once had exclusive responsibility for Jewish education must now share the stage with agencies which previously had completely shunned the topic. Jewish education is now a concern of more American Jewish agencies

than at any other time in the twentieth century.

CHANGE AND POWER IN JEWISH EDUCATION

How does change take place in Jewish education and who are the power brokers charting its course?

The local and decentralized nature of American Jewish education has shaped the dynamics of Jewish educational change throughout the twentieth century. There is no central agency, department, or ministry of American Jewish education which has legislative or judicial powers. Schools ultimately "belong" to the population they serve, and the consumers are owners of their school systems. Thus, parents and school boards have much impact on the flow and direction of American Jewish schools. Rabbis, principals, and teachers are also important local power brokers in that they guide and implement the directions such schools will take. Children are the ones who have to undergo it all, and, as many a teacher knows, they are very often the ultimate forces in deciding the fate and future of an educational program. Thus, the first prominent power broker of Jewish education is the consumer.[35]

A second force in American Jewish education is a small group of professionals who have periodically exerted great influence on the direction of the system. Sometimes, the influence has been that of a teacher on a student or a principal on a school -- a Henry Goldberg in Brooklyn or a Shraga Arian in Albany. Periodically, there have been individuals who have shaped the education of an entire system or movement -- Gamoran in Reform Jewish education, Dushkin in the bureaus, and Reb Shraga in the day schools. Occasionally, a community of like-minded professionals (such as the Conservative movement's Educators Assembly in the late 1950's and early 1960's) have served as a force of influence. Sometimes professional leadership for the cause of Jewish education has come from surprising directions, viz., the emergence of Jewish community centers and of university training programs in Jewish communal service as champions of Jewish education.[36]

The third source of power in American Jewish education has been a small cadre of lay leaders who have emerged in each generation to champion the cause of Jewish education (the Schoolmans, Lowns, Grusses, Hornsteins, Meltons, Mandels). Some of these lay leaders have been well educated Jews committed to the continuation of a Jewish tradition which they know so intimately; others have been unhappy with the deficiencies in their own Jewish education and have decided to guarantee that future generations do not repeat their mistakes. These lay leader power brokers have sometimes aligned themselves with traditional educational agencies (the AAJE/JESNA, the Commissions of Jewish Education of the respective denominations); more recently, they seem to be opting for more autonomous frameworks and foundations through which to channel their support. The new lay leaders are intelligent, tough, and committed to making major changes in the area of Jewish education.

This is not the end of our story; the day school principal, the local rabbi, and the wealthy lay leader have affected Jewish education, but so have John Lennon, Richard Nixon, Bruce Springsteen, Ollie North, Don Mattingly, and the Grateful Dead! Jewish education takes place within a larger social context, and the general life of America's Jews greatly affects what happens in Jewish education. Thus, Jewish life in the past two decades was shaped as much by such phenomena as Watergate, Contragate, "Zionism is Racism," Skokie, Jesse Jackson, Pollard, and Vietnam as it was by new Jewish textbooks and innovative curriculum projects. American Jewish education is influenced as much by the larger canvas of American culture and life, as it is by Jewish colors and strokes.

Change in Jewish education over the past decade has ultimately been a nonsystematic weave of diverse human, institutional, and blind forces. Its over-riding characteristic has been its reactive rather than proactive nature. American Jewish education has had no systematic blueprint of desired directions and practical strategies; instead, it has responded with much good will and commitment to the crises and dilemmas of the here-and-now. It is a system rooted in the solution of today's dilemmas rather than tomorrow's possibilities.

PERSONNEL

Once a delegation of learned men was sent out to examine schools. They came to a town and said to the townspeople: "Bring us the keepers of the city." They brought them the magistrate and the police officials. "These are not the city's keepers" said the rabbis. "Who then are?", the townspeople asked. "The city's keepers are the teachers who reflect on Torah day and night" said the rabbis.

In the higher scheme of things, the teachers are the city's keepers; in the past decade, the city has been having problems maintaining and perpetuating a cadre of high-level city keepers.

It is estimated that there are approximately 45,000 teachers in Jewish schools throughout the world, and 63% of these teachers are in the United States.[37] This population is today generally American-born and/or trained (75% of day school and 86% of supplementary school teachers), and the era of the reign of the Eastern European rebbe or *melamed* in Jewish education has ended. The most prominent non-native Jewish educator is the Israeli (either the emissary from Israel, of which there were a total of 697 of all types -- teaching, youth work, communal work -- in 1983, and a much larger group of Israelis living "temporarily" or permanently in the United States). Estimates as to the number of Israelis in Jewish education vary greatly, but the figure is probably somewhere between 16-26%.

Generally, there is an unevenness in the educational backgrounds of Jewish educators. Approximately 66% of today's Jewish educational force has completed general university studies and 60% have completed some college level Judaic studies. Principals usually have good Jewish and general backgrounds. Day school teachers tend to be much better Jewishly educated than their supplementary school counterparts (whereas 27% of day school teachers are ordained rabbis and 55% have a college level Jewish education, over 50% of supplementary school teachers have completed no Jewish education beyond high school), while supplementary school teachers generally have a better general education. There is great divergence, and no unified standards exist in the profession today.

In the early 1980's, salaries of Jewish teachers averaged around $18,500 for full-time teachers in day schools, $9,000 - 11,000 for teachers in supplementary schools and mid-$50,000's for center executives and school principals.[38] (While these figures have increased in recent years, they have not expanded proportionally beyond general inflation rates.) Average salaries of Jewish teachers and line center workers were below those of general teachers ($24,559) and were significantly lower than other Jewish professionals' (Jewish principals, center executives, rabbis, and professionals in national agencies). Moreover, the economic precariousness of the profession of Jewish education is further underscored by the fact that Jewish teachers generally do not enjoy basic benefits programs -- health care, pension, sabbatical, childcare.

Inadequate salaries, limited or non-existent fringe benefits, low status, and lack of communal support have helped to foster a spirit of *ennui* and *malaise* in the Jewish teaching profession over the past decade. There are moments of excitement and enthusiasm (e.g., an annual CAJE Conference, a new curriculum project), but the world of the Jewish teacher reflects much doubt and frustration. The malaise is not exclusively financial; it is ultimately about the larger dilemma of professional dignity. Many Jewish educators take their mission as keepers of the city very seriously, and they are frustrated and saddened to see the low regard in which they are currently held by the city.

The state of the profession is further complicated by great ambiguity and chaos in pre-and in-service professional training. Several of the once-popular routes of teacher training no longer exist. The path travelled by the Eastern European *rebbe* and the European *maskil* is no more, and the more recent route of the Jewish teacher training college has also changed. Consequently, today's prospective teachers pursue a series of diverse routes to reach their place in the classroom: university departments of Judaica; yeshivot in America and Israel; and departments of education at general universities. While these changes are not necessarily negative, they do imply that Jewish education, in contra-distinction to medicine, law, or general education, has little supervision or control over the professional growth of its students.

In-service training is also devoid of over-all planning and supervision. Numerous in-service programs exist throughout the country: one-day institutes; ongoing seminars; summer institutes; visiting lectures; study at local universities. Israel has entered the arena of short and long-term in-service training in a serious way (summer institutes of the World Zionist Organization and the universities, the year-long Senior Educators program, the Jerusalem Fellows program); however, what characterizes all these programs is their lack of co-ordination in any systematic long-term growth plan. In-service training is programmatically rich but poor in terms of a hierarchical training plan.

The level of Jewish knowledge of the Jewish educator has become a growing concern in the past decade. It has become abundantly clear that educational sophistication is a critical asset in the field of Jewish education; however, it cannot replace Jewish knowledge and commitment. As we have seen, some Jewish educators are very knowledgeable; too many, however, are not. In the poem "The Wonder Teacher," Cynthia Ozick describes a *melamed* who was a painfully inadequate pedagogue, but his Jewish passions and personality enabled him to work miracles. American Jewish education is looking for some wonder teachers.

I must quickly add that at the very moment you are reading this essay, some wonder teachers in classrooms across North America are performing miracles. There does exist a cadre of native-born, Jewishly educated, and professionally sophisticated Jewish educators in contemporary America. They can be found directing day schools in Newton and Swampscott, teaching classes in Kendall and Paramus, guiding the Jewish programming of centers in Chicago, running a Hebrew school in Denver, and directing a summer camp in Conover. America has shown that it can produce Jewish educators who are very Jewish, very professional, and very able to touch the hearts and souls of young and old. The current challenge is to significantly expand the ranks of that saving remnant.

ISRAEL

A new kid has moved onto the block of American Jewish education in the past decade - the State of Israel. Since declaring statehood, Israel has always been concerned with American Jewish education; however, this concern has blossomed into a passion in the past decade. Existing Israeli agencies traditionally responsible for diaspora Jewish education have expanded and professionalized their activities (e.g., the Education and Culture, Youth and Hehalutz, and Youth *Aliyah* departments of the World Zionist Organization). In addition, a host of new national, academic, and autonomous agencies devoted to diaspora Jewish education have developed in Israel in the past decade: The Pincus Fund; The Joint Fund for Jewish Education; the Jewish Education Committee of the Jewish Agency; the Melton Centre for Jewish Education in the Diaspora of the Hebrew University; the Jaime Constantiner Chair and the Department of Jewish Education at Tel-Aviv University; the Center for Jewish Education at Bar-Ilan University; the Shalom Hartman Institute; The Melitz Center for Jewish-Zionist Education; the Gesher Educational Foundation; the Jerusalem Fellows; the Senior Educators Program; Yad V'Shem Education Department; the Diaspora Museum Education Department.

The emergence of these institutions has been accompanied by the mobilization of new funds for innovative diaspora Jewish educational projects; the creation of new educational materials; and the provision of new study opportunities in Israel. Today, potential Jewish teachers can pursue long-term academic programs at Israeli universities and yeshivot; experienced teachers can spend a sabbatical year in specialized educational study at the Hebrew University (the Senior Educators Program); senior personnel can undergo intensive one-to-three year advanced training for key leadership positions in Jewish education (the Jerusalem Fellows); and Jewish community center staff can attend intensive two-to-three week study seminars especially tailored to their professional needs.

The growth of the "Jewish education in the diaspora" industry in Israel has been accompanied by the emergence of a new generation of Israeli professionals who are increasingly assuming responsibility for Israel's involvement in diaspora Jewish education. Some are immigrants from America, Canada, South Africa, and Latin America who are familiar with the milieu

from which they have come and whose professional lives have been associated with Jewish education. Others are native born Israelis who have been abroad on *shlichut* or extended study leaves and who have made the conscious decision to pursue diaspora Jewish education as their professional careers. We are currently witnessing the demise of older patterns of production and dissemination of "made-in-Israel" educational materials for Diaspora schools, and the emergence of more sophisticated and co-operative educational approaches in curriculum development, in-service training, and staff development. Indeed, the new generation of Israeli-based diaspora Jewish educators reflects the emergence of both a more cooperative educational perspective and a more Jewish people-centered ideological world-view.

The new role of Israel in diaspora Jewish education is not without its difficulties. First, there is always the possibility that approaches, materials, and programs produced in Israel might not reflect a sound understanding of the realities and needs of the local American Jewish child and community. Second, ideological issues periodically continue to cloud joint efforts between Israel and diaspora, (particularly the concern about imposition of a Zionist historiography on diaspora Jewish education). Finally, the history of Israeli and North American educational relations is checkered; there have been some wonderful joint ventures and efforts and some disastrous ones. Thus, the new boy on the block is welcome, but he has yet to prove himself.

VISION

Education is fueled by one of two forces; either the struggle for survival or the vision of the good. Throughout much of its life, American Jewish education has been very much defined by the former, i.e., concern about the preservation of some sense of Jewishness for a very Americanized Jewish population. The adult Jewish community has been very concerned with the mobilization of its Jewish educational system to combat the threats of assimilation, inter-marriage, and Jewish illiteracy, and they have asked Jewish teachers and educators to fight this battle for them.

Occasionally, there have been a few Jewish educators who have seen their task as *shaping* the direction of American Jewish life, rather than being *shaped* by it. These educators were guided by a *vision* of what Judaism and American Jewry could become, rather than being driven by the struggle for survival per se. The founders of the Orthodox day school movement were not seeking comfortable absorption; they were attempting to carve out a Jewish life style in America which they believed to be consistent with a Jewish vision of the world. The founders of the Camp Ramah movement were attempting to create a modern Hebrew religious culture and world-view for contemporary non-Orthodox American youngsters. The founders of the new Reform day schools believe that Judaism is a creative living force that can complement and enrich a good general education. Looking back on the past fifty years, we find some remarkable examples of Jewish educators who have developed innovative Jewish educational programs to present Judaism as an exciting, positive and personally meaningful world-view. Such a visionary approach sees Jewish education as beyond socialization and defense; it sees it as ideology and belief.

During the past decade, the Jewish educational community has been thirsty for vision. Jewish education has devoted most of its energies in this period to solving immediate problems (funding, staff, programs); at the same time, there has been concern about the lack of vision and of great voices in the realm of Jewish education.[39] Some of the veteran visionaries have retired or passed on, and others have become weakened by the draining battles in the trenches. The new visionaries have often become tempered by the toughness of the battle and they frequently have become very cautious. Thus, while Jewish education seems to be a mature and relatively well-equipped ship, it is not always clear where it is sailing or who is its captain.

WHERE TO NOW?

"Round and round she goes and where she stops nobody knows." The story of American Jewish education in the past half-century is a saga of many paths, and it is not presently clear where the roads are leading. However, the signposts that we have erected clearly indicate that American Jewish education is at a major crossroads and will look different in the coming decades.

The history of American Jewish education is, in fact, a story of

striking malleability and change in a relatively short time span. Thus, the system that exists today is not inextricably bound by current forms, and today's structures will not necessarily be tomorrow's institutions.

What then can we say about the likely face of Jewish education in the next decades?

The new map of American Jewish education will include the continuity of some of its existing forms, as well as significant metamorphoses in others. The day school is here to stay, and it is no longer exclusive to one geographic area or denominational group in America. At the same time, the day school is a flower which has not yet fully bloomed. Some friendly critics suggest that the typical day school is an amalgam of good private education and the old-style supplementary school, housed under one roof. The day school movement has established itself; now it will have to deal with a host of emergent new educational issues, e.g.: 1) the relationship between the teaching of Jewish and general culture; 2) the day school as a total educational community encompassing areas such as adult education, Shabbat and holiday activities, and summer programming; 3) the training of a new generation of day school teachers; 4) the expansion of secondary day school education.

The supplementary school will undergo radical changes as American Jewry enters the nineties.[40] The Sunday and afternoon forms of supplementary school which met the needs of mid-century suburban American Jewish life, are increasingly problematic for late twentieth century Jewry. A new part-time educational system will need to fit into the yearly schedule of American life and education, and at the same time, provide qualitatively (if not quantitatively) rich Jewish experiences to young people. The "new" supplementary school will have to maximize its use of winter breaks, spring vacations, February recess, summers, Jewish holidays, weekends, and the "campus" of Israel to do its job. Most American Jews probably will continue to opt for a more minimal rather than maximal Jewish education for their young; at the same time, they will demand that this education be well defined, enjoyable, and offer some possibility of success.

New forms of Jewish education which reflect the social, ecological, and demographic realities of late-twentieth century Jewry are likely to emerge in the coming decades. The old Jewish urban neighborhoods, alive with the sounds and fragrances of Shabbat and holidays, are no more, and new "neighborhoods" of this sort will have to be created. The Jewish community center might well become the hub of such a new "Jewish neighborhood." A child may learn spoken Hebrew better by playing basketball at the center after school "in Hebrew" than by sitting for long hours in the Hebrew school classroom trying to memorize verb conjugations. A Sunday morning ceramics class may do a better job of teaching Jewish art than a lecture on the subject. A Saturday oneg shabbat may teach more about Shabbat than a frontal lecture in Hebrew school on Tuesday.

Weekend retreats and national conferences are becoming increasingly important Jewish educational moments. Five days at the General Assembly of the CJF at a hotel in Washington, Chicago, or Miami is an intensive hothouse of Jewish living. The Israel pilgrimage or seminar is an intense dose of total Jewish living. The traditional times and settings for Jewish education are changing, and we shall have to learn to utilize the exciting new options that lie before us.

The area of Jewish communications is still in its infancy. The revolution in television, cable, and computers has still not fully penetrated Jewish life. There is a respectable world of Jewish publishing; however, it is not clear to what extent the bulk of American Jewry is touched by Jewish print (books, magazines, press, newsletters) or what the potential for the growth of the market might be. Are we ready for an exciting Jewish family magazine? Is a high quality national newspaper a pipe dream? Is a weekly specialized Jewish newsletter realistic? It is not clear if the current deficiencies in these areas are consequences of market, vision, or initiative.

The movement of Jewish education out of classrooms into these new settings will lead to new institutional divisions of responsibility. We have already witnessed the increasing involvement in Jewish education of organizations which previously had little or no connection with this sphere. This process will continue, and it will result in much creativity, as well as much

inter-institutional tension over "turf." Indeed, the next decades may be an era of great shifts in institutional self-definition and division of labor. We shall see the demise of some agencies and the birth of new ones. (Some of the institutions that had power in Jewish education twenty years ago no longer exist or have lost much of their influence, whereas agencies that didn't even exist then have risen to the fore today.) It will take great courage to be able to bury what has no longer become functional and give birth to what is now needed.

The growth of a revitalized American Jewish educational system in the next decades may very much depend on the ability of the Jewish community to generate new models of central and communal Jewish educational agencies. One of the great debates within the Jewish educational community in the formative years of the 1930's-40's was whether to create strong central agencies of Jewish education or to evolve a network of consultative service bureaus.[41] The latter approach won and has prevailed for half a century, with the result that American Jewish education has never had powerful central organizations. It may well be time to create agencies of Jewish education having the power, calibre, and scope of the federations, philanthropic agencies, and defense organizations. The time may be ripe for a strong, well-funded, professional Jewish educational network which, once and for all, begins to tackle the problems of: curriculum development, professional pre- and in-service training; research; and funding.

One of the most immediate issues confronting Jewish education is the crisis of personnel. This is currently a major agenda item in Israel as well as in North America, and it is receiving much attention from several public and private bodies. The challenge is clear: to create a cadre of professional Jewish educators who have the wisdom and skills to conduct a system of high educational quality and of authentic Jewish content. These educators must be of the highest quality both in terms of their Jewish and professional educational abilities,and they must be remunerated on par with the highest salaried Jewish professionals in the country. Part of the re-organization of Jewish education will require creation of new professional positions. For example, the traditional categories of federation worker, bureau director, principal, teacher, center worker, and camp director may change dramatically, and entirely new combinations and positions may emerge by the 1990's, e.g.: "community director of education" (instead of bureau director), "community Judaica resource expert" (perhaps in connection with an academic appointment), "annual scholar-in-residence from Israel" (instead of *shaliach*), "director of adult Jewish education", "community Jewish educator" (instead of teacher).

The emergence of Israel as a new force in Jewish education has only begun. Israel offers a remarkable on-site laboratory for innumerable Jewish educational experiences, and *no* Jewish education should exclude this remarkable Jewish campus. Moreover, the rich resources of Israel (personnel, institutions, professional experience) must be fully utilized to help deal with the broad array of problems and challenges confronting Jewish education in the coming decades. It is time to organize a bilateral Jewish educational community composed of American and Israeli Jewish educators to work together throughout the coming years in order to dramatically improve Jewish education.

Finally, we must begin to re-focus on the inner core and spirit of the enterprise of Jewish education. We must once again remind ourselves that Jewish education is related to affecting the minds, hearts, and daily lives of young and old children. We must return to a vision of education committed to people, rather than to denominational loyalties; to the growth of minds and souls rather than to the expansion of institutional empires; to lasting commitments to Jewish sources rather than passing tastes of "Jewishness". Judaism as a world view and education as the concern for the child must once again assume their rightful roles as the linchpins of Jewish education, and educators of vision and courage must emerge as central forces in American Jewish life.

The agenda of American Jewish education in the next decade encompasses both immediate issues of funding, staff-development, and curriculum, as well as more basic questions of vision and direction.[42] The current deliberations of professionals and lay leaders will have long-range ramifications for future generations of Jewish education and life. We may be

walking down primrose paths -- or toward dead ends. The path we take is in our very hands; while we shall not complete the task, we are surely not free to desist from confronting the challenge of creating a Jewish educational system in the next decades which will strengthen the future of our people and touch the souls of our young.

NOTES

1. Nathan Winter. Jewish Education in a Pluralist Society: Samson Benderly and Jewish Education in the United States. (New York: New York University Press,1966).

2. Doniel Zvi Kramer. The Day Schools and Torah Umesorah (New York: Yeshiva University Press, 1984), pp. 7-15.

3. The dynamics and changes in American Jewish education have been periodically summarized over the years in a series of monographs on the state of American Jewish education by prominent and astute observers of the Jewish educational scene. Some of the best of these summaries have been written by: Alexander Dushkin, Samuel Dinin, and Walter Ackerman. See: Shiveley Hachinuch, Jewish Education, and The American Jewish Yearbook.

4. Statistical references in this paper are based on several sources and analyses which have appeared in the past decade in Jewish Education, The American Jewish Yearbook, and publications of the Board of Jewish Education of Greater New York. The most comprehensive source of statistics on Jewish education is a series of studies produced by the Project for Jewish Educational Statistics of the Division of Jewish Demography and Statistics of the Hebrew University's Institute of Contemporary Jewry and Jewish Education Service of North America (JESNA). The following studies have been produced: H.S. Himmelfarb and S. DellaPergola. Enrollment in Diaspora Primary and Secondary Schools, Late 1970's (Jerusalem, 1982); S. DellaPergola and N. Genuth. Jewish Education Attained in Diaspora Communities, Data for 1970's (Jerusalem, 1983); N. Genuth, S. DellaPergola, and A. Dubb. First Census of Jewish Schools in the Diaspora 1981/2 - 1982/3 (Jerusalem, 1986). The Jewish Education Service of North America, Inc. (JESNA) publishes a newsletter called TRENDS which presents relevant data and statistics about Jewish education in North America.

5. Enrollment patterns in private schooling expanded from 10% of American school-aged children in the 1960's to 12.5% in 1982 and is expected to reach 15% by the end of the decade. "Private Elementary and Secondary Education, 1983: Enrollment, Teachers and Schools" National Center for Education Statistics Bulletin, December, 1984. Susan Abramowitz and E. Ann Stackhouse. The Private High School Today (Washington: U.S. Department of Education, Office of Educational Research and Improvement, 1980), pp.1-6; James Coleman, Thomas Hoffer, and Sally Kilgore. High School Achievement (New York: Basic Books, 1982), Chapter 2.

6. Nitza Genuth, Sergio Dellapergola, Allie Dubb. First Census of Jewish Schools in the Diaspora, 1981/2 - 1982/3, p. 35.

7. Charles Silberman. A Certain People (New York: Summit Books, 1985). Steven M. Cohen. American Modernity and Jewish Identity (New York: Tavistock, 1983).

8. Bruce Cooper, "The Changing Demography of Private Schools: Trends and Implications" in Education and Urban Society, Vol. 16, No. 4 (August 1984), pp. 429-442.

9. Diane Ravitch. The Troubled Crusade: American Education 1945-1980 (New York: Basic Books, 1983).

10. Statistical Highlights of Jewish Schooling in the United States, p.4.

11. Barry Chazan, "The Transformation of the Synagogue Supplementary School" in The American Synagogue in Historical Perspective. Jack Wertheimer, editor (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987).

12. The Board of Jewish Education of Greater New York has recently completed a comprehensive two and a half year study of the supplementary school: Jewish Supplementary Schooling: An Educational System in Need of Change (New York: BJE, 1987).

13. Alvin Schiff. Jewish Education at the Crossroads. Prepared for the North American Consultation of the World Leadership Conference, Jerusalem, 1984 (reprinted by the Board of Jewish Education of Greater New York), p.4.

14. "Trends in Jewish Education" American Jewish Yearbook 1960 (New York: American Jewish Committee and Jewish Publication Society, 1961); Statistical Highlights of Jewish Schooling in the United States, p.2.

15. Susan Shevitz. The Deterioration of the Profession of Jewish Supplementary School Teaching: An Analysis of the Effects of Communal Myths on Policy and Program. Qualifying paper, Harvard Graduate School of Education, 1983.

16. Aron and Bank estimate the number of teachers in supplementary schools as closer to 20,000. See: Isa Aron and Adrianne Bank, "Jewish Teacher - Today and Tomorrow" Jewish Education, LV, 1 (Spring, 1987), p.11 (see footnote #2).

17. Allie A. Dubb, Sergio DellaPergola. First Census of Jewish Schools in the Diaspora 1981/2 - 1982/3: United States of America (Jerusalem: Institute for Contemporary Jewry,1986), p.59.

18. The recent study of supplementary schools conducted by the Board of Jewish Education of Greater New York may prove to be a major impetus for new recommendations and investments in this area.

19. Steven M. Cohen, "Outreach to the Marginally Affiliated: Evidence and Implications for Policymakers in Jewish Education" Journal of Jewish Communal Service, Winter 1985, LXV, 2.

20. Mordecai Kaplan, "The Jewish Center and Organic Community Organization" The Jewish Center (June, 1935), pp. 2-10; Horace Kallen, "The Dynamics of the Jewish Center" in: Judaism at Bay (New York: 1932), pp.221-227.

21. Oscar Janowsky. The JWB Survey (New York: The Dial Press, 1948).

22. Maximizing Jewish Educational Effectiveness of Jewish Community Centers (New York: JWB, 1984), 20 pp.

23. Jewish Educational Needs Assessment Kit (New York: JWB, 1986); Jewish Education Planning Guide (New York: JWB, 1986); Jewish Education Think Tank Report (New York: JWB, 1986).

24. Janet Aviad. Return to Judaism (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1982); Simon Herman. American Students in Israel (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1970).

25. The Israel Experience: Educational Programs in Israel. A Summary Report Submitted to the Jewish Education Committee of the Jewish Agency by Nativ Policy and Planning Consultants (June, 1986), p.12.

26. Sharon Feiman-Nemser and Annette Weinshank. Accountability in Jewish Education (New York: American Jewish Committee, 1985).

27. The extent of this collection of materials is evident when one visits some of the larger pedagogic resource centers, e.g., at JESNA's National Educational Resource Center (NERC), the University of Judaism in Los Angeles or the Board of Jewish Education in New York or the Library and Pedagogic Centre of Jewish Educational Materials of the Hebrew University's Melton Centre for Jewish Education in the Diaspora on Mt. Scopus in Jerusalem.

28. Elliot Dorff, "Study Leads to Action" Religious Education LXXV, 2 (March-April, 1980), pp.171-192.

29. There have been some interesting exceptions, e.g.: the work of the Melton Research Center in New York and projects at the Ohio State University, Queens College, Brandeis University, Tel Aviv University and the Hebrew University. See the following volume: Seymour Fox and Geraldine Rosenfield (editors). From the Scholar to the Classroom: Translating Jewish Tradition into Curriculum (New York: Melton Research Center, 1977).

30. See the following study of the origins of America's Hebrew teachers colleges: Oscar Janowsky. The Education of Amercian Jewish Teachers. Boston: Beacon Press (1967). Louis Hurwich.

Hebrew Teachers Colleges in U.S. Jewish Education 22 (Winter): 73 - 96 (1950).

31. Abraham Gannes. Central Community Agencies for Jewish Education (Philadelphia: Dropsie College, 1954).

32. Philip Bernstein. To Dwell in Unity: The Jewish Federation Movement in America Since 1968 (Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society,1984), pp.107-110.

33. Federation Allocations to Jewish Education, 1980-1984, Council of Jewish Federations, 1985.

34. Jewish Education at the CJF General Assembly 1986 (N.Y.: CJF and JESNA,1987)

35. Samuel Heilman. Inside the Jewish School: A Study of the Cultural Setting for Jewish Education (New York: American Jewish Committee, 1983).

36. Barry Shrage (formerly Associate Director, Jewish Community Federation of Cleveland, now Director, Combined Jewish Philanthropies, Boston), "From Experimentation to Institutionalized Change: An Action Plan for Jewish Continuity" (draft, February, 1987).

37. Data for this section is drawn from: research being conducted for the Project for Jewish Educational Statistics of the Division of Jewish Demography and Statistics of the Hebrew university's Institute of Contemporary Judaism; Barry Chazan. Personnel in Jewish Education (Jerusalem: World Leadership Conference for Jewish Education, 1984); Saul Wachs. The Jewish Teacher: Professional Status (New York: American Jewish Committee, 1984); Bernard Scotch. A Profile of Today's Jewish Center Worker (New York: Florence G. Heller - JWB Research Center, n.d.).

38. Alvin Schiff, "The Jewish Teacher Today and Tomorrow" Jewish Education, LV, 1 (Spring, 1987), p.6; Bessie Pine and Edward Kagen. JWB Statistical Reports: Professional Salaries and Personnel Trends in Jewish Community Centers and Ym - YWHA's 1980-1987 (1987).

39. The crisis of the 1970's was previewed in prophetic fashion in Walter Ackerman's retrospect of Jewish education in the 1960's: "Jewish Education - For What?" American Jewish Yearbook, Vol.70 (New York and Philadelphia: American Jewish Committee and Jewish Publication Society, 1969).

40. "The Jewish Supplementary School in the 1990's" Jewish Education, L,4 (Winter, 1982).

41. This is a discussion which emerges both in the lines and between the lines of articles on Jewish education and proceedings of the annual national conferences on Jewish education in the 1930's and 1940's. See particularly: Alexander Dushkin, "A Jewish Education System: A Plea for Organic Unity" Jewish Education, IV, 2 (April, 1932); Alexander Dushkin, "Towards an American Jewish Education" Jewish Education, XIII, 1 (April, 1941); Alexander Dushkin, "The Community Principle in Jewish Education" Jewish Education, XVII, 2 (February, 1946).

42. It is interesting to note that current discussions of Catholic private education encompass many of the same issues herein discussed: Anthony Bryk, Peter Holland, Valerie Lee, Ruben Carriedo. Effective Catholic Schools: An Exploration (Washington: National Catholic Educational Association, 1984).