

Educational Leaders as Teacher Educators:
The Teacher Educator Institute – A Case from Jewish Education
Barry W. Holtz, Gail Zaiman Dorph, Ellen B. Goldring

This is an Accepted Manuscript of an article published in
Peabody Journal of Education, vol. 72 no. 2 (1997)
available online: http://dx.doi.org/10.1207/s15327930pje7202_9

Introduction

At the heart of contemporary educational reform is the effort to transform the practice of teaching and learning in the classroom. Ideas about teaching's subtle difficulties replace simpler conceptions of teaching as the transmission of knowledge. Indeed, the more that current thinkers reflect upon teaching, the more complex they discover it to be. In the words of McLaughlin and Talbert (1993): "This vision of practice signals a sea change in notions of teaching and learning.... In this view of teaching and learning, teachers' central responsibility is to create worthwhile activities and select materials that engage students' intellect and stimulate them to move beyond acquisition of facts to sense making in a subject area." (p. 2) Simultaneously, as they point out, this new conception "assumes substantial new learning on teachers' part; it requires change not only in what is taught, but also in how it is taught." (p. 2)

How are teachers going to make such changes? Providing opportunities for teachers to grow in new understandings of their practice and developing support for such changes demands radical change in the kinds of professional development planned and offered to teachers. It also requires the field to think in different ways about the role of the educational leader and the leader's connection to issues of teaching and learning.

The term “educational leader” encompasses a variety of roles and activities. Typically, the phrase denotes the school principal, and as instructional leader the principal can play an important role in improving the quality of teaching and learning (Hallinger and Murphy, 1987). Instructional leadership was originally defined in terms of three dimensions of principal job behavior: defining the school mission, managing the instructional program, and promoting a positive school learning climate (Hallinger, 1985). More recently, however, the concept has been expanded to include a broader view of leadership that focuses on establishing and promoting a school context in which teaching and learning can flourish. These new roles for principals include (Goldring and Rallis, 1993):

1. motivating teachers through establishing a problem – solving climate, consensus building and goal setting;
2. incorporating participatory decision – making mechanisms;
3. establishing opportunities for collegial peer contacts and communication;
4. providing recognition and rewards; and,
5. obtaining the necessary resources and supports to sustain processes that enhance teaching and learning.

As we will discuss below, an effective instructional leader, encompassing new roles that focus on teaching and learning, must provide professional development for teachers. This article focuses on a description of a program for developing educational leaders as *teacher educators*, those who plan and provide professional development for classroom teachers. In our conception teacher educators themselves may be school principals, but they can also be master teachers in schools or supervisors located in universities or school boards or districts.

The program that we describe takes place in the context of Jewish education. Its goal is to develop a leadership cadre which is generally missing within the system of Jewish education in

North America. We believe that despite the specificity of the context of Jewish education, the Teacher Educator Institute (TEI) discussed here has important implications for general education as well. With adaptations and adjustments it may serve as a model for developing similar programs for teacher educators who serve in public and independent schools, well beyond our own program's focus.

In recent years a new consensus has been evolving about the nature and purposes of professional development for teachers. The program that we will discuss is based on some of the underlying premises of that view and before we look more closely at the model we have been developing, we will review the conception of professional development that has emerged in the literature of the past fifteen years. Then we will present the particular nature of contemporary Jewish education and will turn to a description of how the TEI program came to be developed. Following upon that, the paper will devote two sections discussing the organization of the TEI program and program's educational orientation. Finally we will address the issue of the relationship of TEI and educational leadership.

Professional Development

Until recently the dominant approach to professional development for teachers has taken the form of one-shot workshops, or at best, short-term passive activities, with limited follow-up (Goldenberg and Gallimore, 1991). The content of such in-service workshops was built upon an assumption that generic strategies are applicable to all participants regardless of the educational setting in which the teacher worked, age of the student in the teacher's class, or subject matter to be taught and learned. Such strategies are based on a "transmission of information" model of

professional development: It is assumed that each teacher would “learn” the latest new techniques and creative activities (that is, these new techniques would be handed over or passed on by the “teacher trainer”) and bring them back to her/his own classroom, making whatever “adjustments” might be necessary (Sparks & Loucks-Horsley, 1989). Teachers in this conception are treated as passive recipients of techniques and practices, rather than “intelligent, inquiring individuals with legitimate expertise and important experience” (Sparks & Loucks-Horsley, 1989, p. 50).

This approach to professional development grew out of a particular view of teaching. It emphasized teachers transmitting information and children listening and remembering. It did not seriously address either the needs of children as learners or the specific qualities of the subject matters to be taught.

The newer approach to professional development, on the other hand, has been influenced by the view of teaching and learning characterized as "teaching for understanding" (Cohen, McLaughlin, & Talbert, 1993). This view of teaching moves us away from a more traditional image of teaching as “telling and learning as listening” to a vision of practice referred to by Deborah Meier (quoted in Little, 1993) as "learning as telling, teaching as listening."

This conception of teaching requires that we think differently about what teachers need to know and be able to do, and it demands therefore that we think differently about the contexts and content of professional development. If we are to take issues of learners and subject matter seriously, generic techniques of teaching appropriate to all ages and subjects will be inadequate to the task. In the same manner, professional development programs that promulgate such views will not succeed in improving classroom practice. Thus, it is argued, we will need to create a

variety of new strategies and supports to enhance and deepen teachers' learning and guide them through experimentation and the real struggles that accompany change. Professional development must itself reflect, promote and support the kind of teaching and learning that we hope to foster. (National Foundation for the Improvement of Education [NFIE], 1996).

Beyond focusing on the way children learn and the subject-specific nature of pedagogy (Kennedy, 1991), the literature on professional development has found that teachers have been best able to make significant changes in their teaching practices in the context of professional learning communities. In such communities, the emphasis switches from experts transmitting skills to teachers to teachers studying the teaching and learning processes (Little, 1993; Lord, 1994; McLaughlin, Talbert, 1993). Teachers have opportunities to voice and share successes and exemplars, doubts and frustrations. They learn to raise concerns and critical questions about their own teaching and about their colleagues' teaching.

As Judith Warren Little (1993) has suggested, changing teaching will require not only changing our image of teachers' work but also developing a culture compatible with the image of teacher as "intellectual" rather than teacher as "technician." Professional development, according to this view, is an essential and indispensable process that will need to be integrated into the life of educational institutions, woven into the very fabric of teachers' work, and not seen as a frill that can be cut in difficult financial times or because of overprogrammed schedules (Darling-Hammond & McLaughlin, 1996).

A variety of conditions (McDiarmid, 1994) have been singled out as critical for supporting this new approach to professional development. These conditions suggest a need for creating opportunities and structural regularities that do not presently exist in most educational settings.

To name just three of those delineated by McDiarmid:

1. *Critical Collegueship*: Teachers need opportunities to work with colleagues, both in their school building and beyond it. They need to be part of larger learning communities that provide support and access to new ideas and knowledge. Making changes in teaching practices is hard work. Change does not always go smoothly and often includes frustration, backsliding and failure. When stressing the challenges of changing one's teaching practice, Deborah Meier has suggested the analogy of "changing a tire on a moving vehicle," an analogy that speaks to the difficulty one encounters as one continues "to move" while engaged in repair work. After all, professional development is not a pre-service activity. It takes place in the same time frame in which one is engaged in doing the work.

Research (Lord, 1994; McLaughlin & Talbert, 1993) indicates that teachers who have made effective changes in their practice belong to active professional communities that not only support and encourage new practice but also enable teachers to engage in constructive criticism. A logical place to develop such collegueship is within the context of the school in which one is teaching. Here, teachers can develop ways of working and talking together. But, the research argues, we also need ways to create community for teachers beyond their own schools so that teachers of the same subject matters and teachers of the same age children can learn together. (Little, 1993; Pennell & Firestone, 1996)

Transforming schools into learning communities for faculty as well as for students sounds like a reasonable suggestion – and yet, it is a formidable challenge. Critical collegueship among teachers could indeed be the first step. Two clear prerequisites to meaningful collegial collaboration are time and the involvement and support of the educational leadership of the institution.

2. *Time*: Teachers need time to become involved in the sometimes protracted process of changing roles and practice. To attain time and mental space, professional development must be redefined as a central part of teaching. It can no longer be an “add-on,” tacked on to the school day, week or year. It must be woven into teachers' daily work. Schools with serious commitment to professional development for their teachers have experimented with a number of different strategies for finding regular time including a weekly extended lunch time of two hours; pre-school meetings; and starting "regular classes" at noon once a week (McDiarmid, 1994, pp. 27-8).

3. *Leadership*: Teachers need the support and advice of an educational leader who understands issues of teaching and learning and what it takes to change teachers' roles and practice in their classrooms and in the school (McLaughlin & Marsh, 1978). It is clear, for example, that reorganizing the schedule of a school to accommodate this kind of professional development requires the support of the leader of an educational enterprise. This support cannot be present only in the form of lip service and superficial restructuring moves. Only in settings where principals are involved in professional development does teaching practice really change (Little, 1989; Loucks & Zacchei, 1983). At the most straightforward level, educational leaders need to value this enterprise; initiate, plan, develop and evaluate initiatives in their own institutions; work with their teachers to develop appropriate individual professional development plans; and work to advocate for particular programs that might best be offered across institutions or outside of the school, such as those that extend and deepen teachers' subject matter knowledge.

Professional development always takes place within a particular educational culture. The program we will discuss is located in the world of Jewish education, which has its own unique characteristics and challenges. A few introductory remarks about the field will help delineate the background that gave rise to the Teacher Educator Institute.

Jewish Education Today

Jewish education takes place in a variety of settings in North America. Its ultimate goal is to help transmit the culture of the Jewish people from one generation to the next. For many this is viewed as an explicitly *religious* culture; for others it is seen as primarily a secular and ethnic heritage. Jewish education, from the vantage point of either of those perspectives (and obviously there are many points of view in between), is concerned with creating meaningful encounters for children (and adults as well) with a diverse body of ideas, values and practices. It seeks at once to transmit an intellectual tradition and a set of attitudes and emotional dispositions.

Throughout this article we use the word “system” when speaking of Jewish education. But readers should note that system is a rather loose (and perhaps misleading) word to describe this context. Indeed, perhaps the single most important fact about Jewish education in North America is that it is a *voluntary* enterprise. No one is required to participate and at any give time, close to half of the Jewish children in the United States are not receiving a Jewish education (Kosmin, *et al.*, 1991; Lipset, 1994). With that proviso understood, there are, however, certain systemic features in place: schools, professional teachers, professional principals, Boards or Bureaus of Jewish education, training institutions and degree programs for teachers and principals, established routes of financial support through tuition and philanthropy, curriculum

materials published both by educational institutions and commercial publishers, etc.

Nonetheless, the majority of teachers and principals in the Jewish system do not have formal training comparable to that of teachers and principals in the general sector (Council for Initiatives in Jewish Education, 1994; Goldring, Gamoran, & Robinson, 1996).

Formal¹ Jewish education is conducted primarily within two frameworks. One will be easily recognizable by most readers of this journal-- the independent school (usually called a “day school”) which is similar to most American private or parochial schools. The schools are identified with each of the “denominations” of contemporary Jewish life. In addition there are schools which are considered “community” or transdenominational day schools, though the majority of day schools even today are identified denominationally as “Orthodox.” Such schools usually have a two-track curriculum of Jewish and general subjects required of all students. The balance differs from school to school, but, with the exception of the Ultra-Orthodox community, schools tend to spend around 35 to 55 percent of instructional time in the Judaica and Hebrew language areas. The Ultra-Orthodox schools have an even more intensive program of Jewish studies (Heilman, 1992).

The second approach to Jewish education, far more common than day schools, goes by a

¹ That is, education that takes place in schools or school-like settings. There is also a considerable range of non-formal Jewish education, much of which is particularly appropriate for religious and ethnic identity formation. This would include Jewish camps, community centers, teenage youth groups and organized trips to Israel or historical sites in Eastern Europe. Professionals in the field of Jewish education often view the non-formal domain as particularly successful in attaining the goals of affect, personal growth and allegiance to faith or peoplehood. Indeed, the serious Jewish summer camp-- mixing, play, study and religious practice-- is considered one of the finest achievements of 20th century Jewish education. For a description of one exemplary camp and the influence of major figures such as Joseph Schwab on the camp's development, see Fox & Novak (1997).

variety of names. “Supplementary school”, “Hebrew school,” “religious school,” “synagogue school,” “Sunday school,” and “congregational school” are the most common terms. Although there was once a variety of contexts for such schools, in general today the “supplementary school” (we will use this name for convenience throughout) is a school-like program that meets within individual congregations from one to three times a week-- on Sunday mornings and on weekdays after the students finish their public or independent school day, often between 4 and 6 in the afternoon. The total number of hours of instruction per week ranges between 2 and 8 (Commission on Jewish Education in North America, 1991; Ackerman, 1969; Lipset, 1994; Kosmin, *et al.*, 1991). There are roughly 1900 supplementary schools (around 25% meet only on Sundays) and 500 day schools in the United States, serving around 400,000 students. About 70% of the children who are currently getting a Jewish education receive that education in the supplementary school system.²

In recent years the American Jewish community has begun to place a renewed emphasis on Jewish education. In the aftermath of a national survey of Jewish life in North America (Kosmin, *et al.* 1991) and spurred by concerns about its future viability stemming from assimilation and the high rate of intermarriage (as reported by that survey), the community’s leadership has focused on the potential of education for communal survival, religious knowledge and ethnic identification. Ironically, at the same time that education was being looked to for a solution to its problems, the community was also *blaming* Jewish education for the crisis in which it found itself. If only Jewish education had been better, more stimulating and more

² There are no precise current figures available for all aspects of Jewish education. The numbers cited here are based on the 1981-83 school years as reported in Dubb and DellaPergola (1986) and adjusted taking into account Kosmin, *et al.* (1991).

powerful – some were saying – we would not see so many Jews today who fail to identify with their people or do not find meaning in their religious traditions (Woocher, 1996; Ruskay, 1995/6).

In 1988 a national commission of religious leaders, charitable foundations, educators, and philanthropists was convened by a respected community leader and issued a report calling for a revitalization of Jewish education, particularly through a focus on building the profession of Jewish education and mobilizing lay support for the entire endeavor. An intermediary organization, the Council for Initiatives in Jewish Education (CIJE), was created to help spearhead this reform effort in 1990 (Commission on Jewish Education in North America, 1991; Holtz, 1993; Holtz, 1992).

Improving the Profession: From the Research Study toward Developing TEI

One of early initiatives of CIJE in its effort to focus on the personnel crisis in Jewish education was to launch a research study of the teachers in three typical Jewish communities. The study documented what was already well known or long suspected in the field-- the teachers in Jewish schools, though highly motivated and serious about their work, were woefully underprepared for their jobs. In the supplementary schools in particular the teachers lacked background in Jewish subject areas and training in Jewish education. 80% of the teachers were found to be poorly prepared in both pedagogy and Judaica subject matter (Council for Initiatives in Jewish Education, 1994; Gamoran, Goldring, Robinson, Tammivaara, & Goodman, 1996). Simultaneously, CIJE conducted a parallel study of educational leaders in the same three communities (principals of day school and supplementary schools, directors of Jewish early

childhood programs) and discovered that by the standards of preparation of leaders in contemporary general education, leaders in Jewish schools are also inadequately prepared (Goldring, Gamoran, & Robinson, 1996).

Was professional development helping to address these deficiencies in teachers' preparation? Unfortunately, according to the CIJE study, professional development opportunities available in these communities were minimal (on average teachers attended only 4.4 workshops over the course of two years!) and what was offered did not meet the teachers' real needs. Usually these professional development sessions were one-shot workshops, undifferentiated according to teachers' backgrounds, settings, or experiences. Day school teachers would often sit with supplementary school teachers; veteran teachers and novices were grouped together and the content of sessions rarely was intellectually stimulating or engaging (and how could they be given the variegated population participating?) The CIJE report called for communities to create comprehensive plans for intensive and effective professional development for their teachers.

When the report was issued, the staff and consultants of CIJE were faced with a challenge, the depth of which was unanticipated when the research project studying the teachers was begun. Simply put, if professional development for teachers³ was critical, who in the communities would be able to provide a new kind of teacher education? Who would teach the teachers? And not only *teach* the teachers, but envision different modes of teacher education from what is currently available. These "teacher educators" were needed to help ensure a higher quality of

³ The issue of professional development for principals is also crucial, given the findings of the study, but for the present the focus of TEI is on teachers. Other initiatives for principals have been piloted by CIJE; still others are under consideration (Goldring, Gamoran, & Robinson, 1996).

education in the classroom by working with teachers to improve actual practice in schools. Thus the job of the teacher educator should be viewed *not* as essentially administrative or organizational, but as primarily *educational*.

As this problem came into focus, it became clear that the Jewish educational system did not have people in leadership roles whose primary responsibility was professional development for teachers. And even those who nominally had such a responsibility--such as those working within the various Boards of Jewish Education (BJEs) located in most communities of significant size--were either overburdened with other tasks or unprepared themselves for this assignment. Though many in these roles had been excellent classroom teachers themselves, few if any had been trained specifically in the area of professional development. They had moved up through the ranks of Jewish education, from teacher to principal or BJE professional. Few were familiar with the recent scholarly literature in the field of professional development. Most were still locked into the one-shot workshop model. And no existing institution in Jewish educational life offered a program for training teacher educators. We needed simultaneously to help define a new leadership role (Teacher Educator) and develop a mode of training people for that role. How to address this problem?

TEI: The Organization of the Program

TEI began by assembling an advisory group of experts from the fields of Jewish education and general education to help conceptualize the program. From that advisory committee and elsewhere, a faculty was recruited to develop a set of educational goals and a structure for the program:

The central goal of TEI is to develop leaders who can mobilize significant change in teaching and learning through improved and creative professional development for teachers in their institutions, in their communities, and on the national level. TEI graduates will be catalysts for change who are substantively grounded in ideas and concrete practices, and who also have a deep understanding of instructional improvement and educational change.

In order to realize the goals delineated above, the planners devised a structure that fit the professional situation of the future participants. In addition, the concept of TEI was based on the view that learning is best facilitated by working in community. Thus because most of the participants would be senior people in their fields, and because we wished to create a “culture of inquiry” among them, we conceptualized the program as an intensive “study group” rather than a traditional course. In the words of Ingvarson (1987; quoted in Sparks & Loucks-Horsley, 1989, p. 50): “The most effective avenue for professional development is cooperative study by teachers themselves into problems and issues arising from their attempts to make their practices consistent with their educational values.”

The Teacher Educator Institute would be an in-service, non-degree program, and the TEI *program itself* was designed to serve as a kind of model of professional development for these future teacher educators in its use of “investigations” (described below) and in espousing the notion that we were all (faculty and participants alike) “inquirers” or perhaps even researchers into the nature of teaching and teacher education (Schaefer, 1967; Little, 1993; McLaughlin & Oberman, 1996; Lieberman & Miller, 1992; Little & McLaughlin, 1993; Cochran-Smith & Lytle, 1993; Zeichner, 1983).

Underlying all of this work is a view of teaching in general that views *inquiry* at the heart of teaching practice (Cohen, McLaughlin, & Talbert, 1993); Schwab, 1978; Shulman & Keislar,

1966; Cohen & Ball, 1990).⁴ Thus the design of TEI as a form of professional development itself is rooted in a conception of teaching “that portrays teachers and students as inquiring together about problems that matter to all.” (Wilson, Miller, & Yerkes, 1993).

In order to create an experience that allows time for the development of and reflection about new ideas and practices, opportunities for experimentation and feedback, the programs were designed to allow TEI participants to meet six times over the course of a two year period with assignments and follow up work in between group meetings. Each seminar was designed to take place at a hotel or conference site for four to five all-day (and evening) sessions.

The first cohort, a group of fifteen educators began in the summer of 1995. By the time we came to recruit the second cohort in the winter of 1996, word of the program had spread and we assembled a group of 45 educators-- more than twice what we had originally expected – which first met in June, 1996. A third cohort will begin in the winter of 1998.

TEI’s participants include Jewish educators who currently work in Boards of Jewish education or as principals in supplementary schools. (In Cohort Two, there are also participants whose responsibilities lie in the area of Jewish early childhood.) Thus their roles already include professional development responsibilities. In the first cohort, 13% of the participants were supplementary school principals and 87% came from Boards of Jewish education. Cohort 2 expanded the profile of participants: 36% were principals, 42% came from BJE’s, 11% were directors of Jewish early childhood educational programs, and 11% were recruited from other

⁴Inquiry as an educational approach was introduced into modern Jewish education in the early 1960s through the influence of Joseph Schwab and Seymour Fox in the pioneering curricular work of the Melton Research Center, particularly for teaching Bible to children (Zielenziger, 1992).

Jewish educational contexts (family educators, adult educators, etc.)

Participants are invited to join TEI as members of educational teams. There are currently ten such communal teams as well as four teams that represent national denominational movements and other national educational projects. The team structure is an integral part of the program's change strategy. It facilitates the creation of local cohorts of educators who have shared an intense learning experience, developed a shared vocabulary and mode of educational discourse, and wrestled with conceptions of good teaching and learning and professional development (Yinger, 1990, pp. 89-90). These participants, we anticipate, will be able to plan and implement similar experiences for others in their own settings.

When participants have completed the TEI course of study, they come away with new ideas and innovative approaches to providing leadership in teacher education. But their return to the field requires support, assistance and mentoring. They need opportunities to try out new ideas and get support in dealing with difficulties that naturally arise as they introduce new programs to the field. To help facilitate participants' growth as leaders and professionals, the next step for TEI is to develop ways to link participants and "graduates" of TEI in a variety of ways: through establishing an e-mail network and electronic computer conferencing, by developing a newsletter for members of the TEI group, and bringing the group together for annual conferences. This kind of networking is crucial to ongoing professional development for the teacher educators (McLaughlin, 1991; McLaughlin, 1993; Pennell & Firestone, 1996; Feiman-Nemser, 1991).

TEI: The Educational Orientation

TEI is based upon a set of educational assumptions and beliefs. First, underlying the work of TEI is a desire for teachers to help children learn “worthwhile” things (Peters, 1966). Teachers need a chance to think about: what are these worthwhile things and how can children be helped to learn them? It is only then that teaching can become, in Eleanor Duckworth’s phrase, “engaging students in giving thought to those matters we think important” (Duckworth, 1987, p. 139). How, the TEI program asks, can professional development opportunities be created that would help foster this stance toward teaching?

Second, TEI is based on the concept that what teachers learn in professional development experiences must be situated within the realities of their own work and practice. As Ann Lieberman expresses it: “Most of the in-service or staff development that teachers are now exposed to is of a more formal nature; unattached to classroom life, it is often a melange of abstract ideas with little attention paid to ongoing support for continuous learning and changed practices” (Lieberman, 1996, p. 187). TEI tries to address that problem by providing participants with a variety of educational experiences aimed at enhancing their growth as teacher educators. These experiences are rooted in the idea that TEI itself is a serious learning experience in which the “subject matter” is the nature and practices of professional development for teachers and the examination of teaching and learning itself (Feiman-Nemser & Remillard, 1996).

The TEI program, then, is organized around three central areas of study:

- 1) Jewish subject matter content. We wanted to give participants a chance to learn together (at an adult level) different subject areas typical of the supplementary school and to explore the ways that these personal learning experiences could help inform the participants’ understanding

of good classroom teaching and professional development. We study content that is worthwhile and provocative in which participants are actual learners and need to address learning issues and religious, attitudinal issues that are inherent in the content. For example the group might study a biblical narrative-- such as the Tower of Babel story (Genesis 11:1-9)-- that is typically taught to children in supplementary school settings. Our approach would be to engage in a close reading of the narrative paying careful attention to the literary structures of the story, the interpretative history of the text, and the religious challenges posed by such tale (e.g. “What was so wrong about building a tower with its top in the sky?”) (Holtz, 1984).

2) Teaching and learning. We use the Jewish content studied as a sources for reflection on the content itself, but also on what it means to teach and learn that content (Feiman-Nemser & Remillard, 1996). Some of the questions we consider are: What does a teacher have to know in order to teach the particular subject matter that we have learned? What did we experience as learners studying that particular subject matter and how might that be relevant (or not relevant) to the experience of children?

To continue the example from above, the Tower of Babel story would raise specific challenges: What were the difficulties that we encountered in that text? For example, we would puzzle over the question of what it means to “make a name for ourselves” (Gen. 11:4)? Or why does God object to there being “one people with one language for all” (Gen. 11:5)? These reflections on our own learning would lead us to a consideration of how this text might best be taught to children? What “representations” (Shulman, 1986) would best engage students in a deep encounter with the narrative? How might a teacher further his or her knowledge about the story at hand?

This in turn opens up larger questions for discussion: What do we mean by good teaching and learning? In what way is teaching subject specific in what ways is it generic? What aspects of current research in general education can be applied to Jewish settings and subject matters? What lacuna currently exist as we think about teaching Jewish subject areas and how might they be filled? The relevant research on pedagogical content knowledge (Shulman,1986; Kennedy, 1991; Grossman, 1990) and the newer literature that tries to apply that body of knowledge to Jewish education has been particularly helpful in framing our thinking (Dorph, 1993; Chervin, 1994).

3) Professional development. We also turn to issues of professional development by asking how can we foster the kinds of teaching and learning of rich and challenging subject matter that we have been exploring. In addition, we expose participants to the latest literature in the field of professional development from general education and consider ways that this literature may apply to their own contexts within Jewish education. How can the current literature about and practice of professional development be adapted to the situation of contemporary supplementary school education? This is a particularly complex issue because the vast majority of teachers in supplementary schools are part-time and paid on an hourly rate. The issues of scheduling-- simply finding time to work on professional development-- are radically different from that found in a public school, independent school, or for that matter, a Jewish day school. Hence attention to the organization and systems both within supplementary schools and within the structures of Jewish education in communities needed to be part of our agenda as well. Yet at the same time the importance of professional development in Jewish education may be even more critical than it is in general education. The lack of both subject matter background and

formal training of teachers in Jewish education means that professional development must play a central role in improving instruction in the field (Council for Initiatives in Jewish Education, 1994; Dorph, 1995).

The TEI program offers a wide range of specific educational activities to the participants. These are meant to model activities that the participants themselves can use in creating professional development experiences of teachers in the field. Let us look briefly at three of these activities.

First, we are creating a set of real-life video tapes of Jewish teaching from supplementary school classrooms. The tapes are related to the specific Judaica subject matter content that is being studied at that particular TEI seminar and are presented *not* as examples of “model lessons” but rather as opportunities to create conversations around the question: what makes for good teaching and learning of *this particular* Jewish subject matter. Indeed the video tape becomes a kind of “text” for exploration. (Lampert & Ball, in press; Ball, 1996, p. 507; McDonald, 1992, pp.9-19; Yinger, 1990).

Excerpts from tapes of lessons are viewed by the participants and discussed-- both in small groups and in the larger meeting of the whole group. Individuals or small groups develop “investigations” into particular aspects of the tapes that they find of interest and generative of future learning. They explore the various supporting materials that have been created to encourage these conversations: transcripts of the lessons, tapes and transcripts of interviews with the teacher and students who have appeared on the tape, examples of teacher’s lesson plans and students’ class work. Ultimately our goal is that tapes will be taken *out* of TEI-- the participants in the program will use these tapes as part of a TEI-created “toolbox” in their own work creating and implementing professional development sessions for teachers in the field.

A second activity is curricular investigation. Since we wish to foster good teaching in our settings, it was important to find ways for leaders of professional development to help teachers use prepared curriculum materials in a deeper and more reflective fashion. Learning how to investigate curricular materials is seen as a way to support teachers in their work. Participants engaged in exercises that encouraged them to compare various materials meant for the same age students, investigate a variety of subject matters as presented in curriculum and construct a set of questions that would help teachers think more seriously about the use of those materials in their classroom (Ball, 1996, p. 506; Ball & Cohen, 1996; Zumwalt, 1989).

A third strategy for learning begins out in the field. Participants are asked to conduct investigations of an actual teacher's practice in their own community. Each TEI participant observes and then interviews a teacher using a protocol developed by the TEI faculty. This gives the participants opportunities to revisit the ways in which teachers think about teaching. We see the one-on-one focused conversation with a teacher as yet another form of professional development that the future TEI graduate will be able to introduce into the field. The participants write up their observation and interview and then bring their work back to the seminar by presenting their findings and reflections at the subsequent meeting of the TEI seminar.

Finally, as mentioned above, the TEI seminar itself-- by using a variety of pedagogic activities and forms of learning-- seeks to be a model of professional development (for the participants) that can be applied and adapted in the participants' own work in the field.

TEI and Educational Leadership

We have described TEI as a program in leadership development for Jewish education. We see this happening in two different ways. First, we would argue that the person responsible for professional development in schools, in communities, or nationally, is or should be considered an educational leader, as much as a school principal or superintendent is. In Jewish education professional development typically is led by individuals in a number of different positions: the school principal, a lead teacher, a BJE professional, a representative from a national denominational movement or a commercial publisher of curriculum materials. In our view there is also room for the creation of a new position in schools-- *the professional development resource person* (PDR), a position parallel to the curriculum resource person sometimes employed by schools.

Such a person may be a lead teacher or, depending on the size and structure of the school, he or she may have few or no current teaching responsibilities. Freed from many of the obligations of classroom teaching, the PDR would also have none of the managerial or fiscal responsibilities that so often inhibit the school principal from finding time to organize or lead professional development. By being a member of the school's staff, the PDR would have the first hand knowledge of the school's culture that the BJE or nationally-based teacher educator may lack.

In addition, the view of professional development articulated in TEI-- based around the concept of inquiry and study group-- helps make such a locally based notion of PDR possible as well. If professional development is no longer seen as the outside expert "doing a workshop," but rather as a shared inquiry among the faculty, there is more of a possibility to base the work in the school itself, organized and developed by the school's own PDR.

Nonetheless, we recognize that not all schools will be able to support such a position, both financially and in terms of available personnel. Given the difficulties of finding qualified professionals in Jewish education, locating PDRs for school may present an insurmountable challenge. We also recognize that there *are* advantages in having outside expertise to conduct professional development-- but it is crucial in our view that new modes of preparing these outside experts (along with potential PDRs) be developed. We believe that TEI offers one such example of professional preparation. Failing to create such preparation programs, we will continue to have more of what we have in most cases today: professional development that does not influence classroom practice, that is deemed to be a failure, because the only approach used is the one-shot workshop or a close facsimile to it.

The issue of leadership affects professional development in a second way as well. No matter who specifically designs and leads the work with teachers, school leaders-- specifically principals-- must desire, understand, support, advocate for these new forms of professional development. In Jewish education this means that principals need to be able to articulate a position backing professional development to their lay leadership (school board members) and in the case of supplementary schools to the rabbinic leadership of their congregations. The school leader needs to be a champion for professional development within his or her institution. And they need to back up their advocacy through the hard currency of restructuring schools in order to allow time for teachers' professional development and securing funding to help launch both in-service programs and opportunities for teacher development through curriculum projects, experiments in videotaping and researching an individual teacher's own practice and chances for outside study and travel.

Even more than that the school principal needs to reimagine the school climate and culture in ways that are compatible with the ideas about teaching and professional development that TEI has been advocating. If we expect teachers to take an investigative stance about their own practice-- both in how they teach children and how they think about and reflect upon their teaching-- principals need to value that way of thinking as well. Principals need to be open to creating a school climate of investigation and inquiry, and they themselves need to rethink their own style of leadership in order to allow this to happen. Indeed, there needs to be an investigative stance vis-à-vis the institution as a whole.

The Teacher Educator Institute described in this paper, provides an example of a training program that clearly places teacher professional development at the center of the instructional leadership role in a context of inquiry and collective culture. Educational leaders in general, and principals in particular, should be committed to a vision of schools that are vibrant communities of learning. In such schools, educational leaders are engaged in creating a collective culture that includes widespread involvement from teachers. Such perspectives require leaders that exemplify the culture of their schools. Inquiry forms an integral part of daily routines as teachers and leaders work to create a shared culture, but also demonstrate these values in action.

Acknowledgments

The authors wish to acknowledge the generous support of the Nathan Cummings Foundation which has supported The Teacher Educator Institute since its inception. The planning group and faculty of TEI included: Gail Zaiman Dorph, Deborah L. Ball, Sharon Feiman-Nemser, Alan Hoffmann and Barry W. Holtz.

REFERENCES

- Ackerman, W. (1969). *Jewish education-- for what*. New York: American Jewish Committee.
- Ball, D. L. (1996). Teacher learning and the mathematics reforms: What we think we know and what we need to learn. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 77:7, pp. 500-508.
- Ball, D. L. & Cohen, D. K. (1996). Reform by the book: What is – or might be – the role of curriculum materials in teacher learning and instructional reform. *Educational Researcher*, 25:9, pp. 6-8, 14.
- Cochran-Smith, M., & Lytle, S. L. (1993). *Inside/outside: Teacher research and knowledge* New York: Teachers College Press.
- Chervin, S. M. (1994). *The transformation of personal orientation to pedagogical orientation of Torah teachers in Jewish schools*, unpublished dissertation, Stanford University, Palo Alto, CA.
- Cohen, D. K., & Ball, D. L. (1990). Policy and practice: An overview. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis* 12, pp. 327-345.
- Cohen, D. K., McLaughlin, M. W., & Talbert, J. E. (Eds.) (1993). *Teaching for understanding*. New York: Jossey-Bass.
- Commission on Jewish Education in North America (1991). *A Time to Act*. Lanaham, MD: University Press of America.
- Council for Initiatives in Jewish Education [CIJE] (1994). *Policy brief on the background and training of teachers in Jewish schools*. New York: Council for Initiatives in Jewish Education.
- Darling-Hammond, L., & McLaughlin, M. W. (1996). Policies that support teacher development in an era of reform. In McLaughlin, M.W., & Oberman, I. (Eds.), *Teacher Learning: New Policies, New Practices* (pp. 202-218). New York: Teachers College Press.
- Dorph, G. Z. (1993). *Conceptions and preconceptions: a study of prospective Jewish educators' knowledge and beliefs about Torah*. Unpublished dissertation, The Jewish Theological Seminary of America, New York.
- Dorph, G. Z. (1995). Transforming Jewish teaching: A necessary condition for transforming Jewish schools. *Agenda: Jewish Education*, #6, pp. 21-24.
- Dubb, A. A., & DellaPergola, S. (1986). *The first census of Jewish schools in the diaspora*. Jerusalem: Hebrew University, Institute of Contemporary Jewry.
- Duckworth, E. (1987). *"The having of wonderful ideas" and other essays on teaching and learning*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Feiman-Nemser, S. (1991). Helping novices learn to teach: Lessons from an exemplary support teacher. Paper presented at the International Study Association on Teacher Thinking, Surrey, England.
- Feiman-Nemser, S. & Remillard, J. (1996). In F. B. Murray (Ed.), *The Teacher Educator's Handbook* (pp. 63-91). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Fox, S., & Novak, W. (1997). *Vision at the heart: Lessons from Camp Ramah on the power of ideas in shaping educational institutions*. New York: Council for Initiatives in Jewish Education.
- Gamoran, A., Goldring, E. B., Robinson, B., Tammivaara, J., & Goodman, R. (1996). *Teachers in Jewish schools: A study of three communities*. Unpublished manuscript. New York: Council for Initiatives in Jewish Education.

- Goldring, E. B., Gamoran, A., & Robinson, B. (1996). Educational leaders in Jewish schools. *Private School Monitor* 18:1, 6-13.
- Goldenberg, C., & Gallimore, R. (1991). Changing teaching takes more than a one-shot workshop. *Educational Leadership*, 49:3, pp. 69-72.
- Goldring, E. & Rallis, S. (1993). *Principals of Dynamic Schools*. Newbury Park: Corwin Press.
- Grossman, P. L. (1990). *The making of a teacher: Teacher knowledge and teacher education*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Hallinger, P. (1985). Assessing the instructional management behavior of principals. *Elementary School Journal*, 86, 217-247.
- Hallinger & Murphy, J. (1987). Instructional leadership in the school context. In W. Greenfield (Ed.), *Instructional leadership: Concepts issues and controversies* (pp. 179-203) Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Heilman, S. C. (1992). *Defenders of the faith*. New York: Schocken Books.
- Holtz, B. W. (Ed.) (1984). *Back to the sources: Reading the classic Jewish texts*. New York: Simon and Schuster.
- Holtz, B. W. (1992). Making change happen: Prospects for innovation in Jewish education. *The Melton Journal*, 25.
- Holtz, B. W. (1993). *Why be Jewish*. New York: American Jewish Committee.
- Kennedy, M. M. (1991). *Teaching academic subjects to diverse learners*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Kosmin, B., et al., (1991). *Highlights of the 1990 national Jewish population survey*. New York: The Council of Jewish Federations.
- Lampert, M. & Ball, D. L. (In press). *Learning Teaching: New Pedagogies, New Technologies*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Lieberman, A. (1996). Practices that Support Teacher Development. In McLaughlin, M.W. , & Oberman, I. (Eds.), *Teacher Learning: New Policies, New Practices* (pp. 185-201). New York: Teachers College Press.
- Lieberman, A., & Miller, L. (1992). *Teachers, their world and their work: Implications for school improvement* New York: Teachers College Press.
- Lipset, S. M. (1994). *The power of Jewish education*. Los Angeles & Brookline, MA: The Wilstein Institute.
- Little, J. W. (1986) Seductive images and organizational realities in professional development. In Lieberman, A. (Ed.) *Rethinking School Improvement*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Little, J. W., & McLaughlin, M.W. (1993). *Teachers' work: Individuals, colleagues, contexts*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Little, J. W. (1993). Teachers' Professional Development in a Climate of Educational Reform. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 15:3, 129-151.
- Lord, B. (1994). Teachers' professional development: Critical collegueship and the role of professional communities. *The future of educational perspectives on national standards in America*. New York: College Entrance Examination Board.
- Loucks, S & Zacchei, D. (1983). Applying our findings to today's innovations. *Educational Leadership*. 41:3, pp. 28-31.

- McDiarmid, G. (1994). *Realizing new learning for all students: A framework for the professional development of Kentucky teachers* East Lansing, MI: Michigan State University, National Center for Research on Teaching Learning.
- McDonald, J. P., (1992) *Teaching: Making sense of an uncertain craft*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- McLaughlin, M. W. (1991). Enabling Professional Development: What Have We Learned. In Lieberman, A., & Miller, L. (Eds.) *Staff Development of Education in the 90's* (pp. 149-166). New York: Teachers College Press.
- McLaughlin, M. W. (1993). What Matters Most in Teachers' Workplace Context. In Little, J. W., & McLaughlin, M. W. (Eds.) *Teachers' Work* (pp. 79-103). New York: Teachers College Press.
- McLaughlin, M. W. & Marsh, D. (1978). Staff development and school change. *Teachers College Record*. 80:1, pp. 69-94.
- McLaughlin, M. W., & Oberman, I. (Eds.). (1996). *Teacher Learning: New Policies, New Practices* New York: Teachers College Press.
- McLaughlin, M. W., & Talbert, J. (1993). Introduction: New Visions of Teaching. In Cohen, D. K., McLaughlin, M. W., & Talbert, J. E. (Eds.) *Teaching for understanding*. (pp. 1-10). New York: Jossey-Bass.
- National Foundation for the Improvement of Education [NFIE] (1996). *Teachers take charge of their learning: Transforming professional development for student success*. Washington, D.C.:NFIE.
- Pennell, J. R. & Firestone, W. A. (1996). Changing classroom practices through teacher networks: Matching program features with teacher characteristics and circumstances. *Teachers College Record*. 98:1, pp. 46- 76.
- Peters, R. S. (1966). *Ethics and education*. London: Allen and Unwin.
- Ruskay, J. (1995/6). From Challenge to Opportunity. *Journal of Jewish Communal Service*, 72:1-2, 22-33.
- Schaefer, R. (1967). *The school as a center of inquiry*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Schwab, J. (1958/1978) Enquiry and the Reading Process. In Westbury, I., & Wilkof, N. J. (Eds.). *Science, Curriculum and Liberal Education* (pp. 84-129). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Shulman, L. S. (1986). Those who Understand: Knowledge Growth in Teaching. *Educational Researcher* 15:2, 4-13.
- Shulman, L. S., & Keislar, E. R. (1966). *Learning by discovery*. Chicago: Rand McNally.
- Sparks, D. & Loucks-Horsley, S. (1989). Five models of staff development for teachers. *Journal of Staff Development*. 10:4, pp. 40-57.
- Wilson, S. M., Miller, C. , & Yerkes, C. (1993). Deeply rooted change: A tale of learning to teach adventurously. In Cohen, D. K., McLaughlin, M. W., & Talbert, J. E. *Teaching for understanding* (pp. 84-129). New York: Jossey-Bass.
- Woocher, J. (1996). Towards a unified field theory of Jewish continuity. In Aron, I., Lee, S. S., & Rossel, S. (Eds.) *A congregation of learners: Transforming the synagogue into a learning community* (pp. 14-55). New York: UAHC Press.

- Yinger, R. J., The conversaton of practice. In Clift, R. T., Houston, W. R., Pugach, M. C. (Eds.). *Encouraging Reflective Practice in Education* (pp. 73-94). New York: Teachers College Press, 1990.
- Zeichner, K. (1983). Alternative paradigms of teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education* 34:3, pp. 3-9.
- Zielenziger, R. (1992). *Genesis: A new teacher's guide*. New York: Melton Research Center.
- Zumwalt, K. (1989). Beginning professional teachers: The need for a curricular vision of teaching. In M.C. Reynolds (Ed.) *Knowledge Base for the Beginning Teacher* (pp. 173-184). Oxford, England: Pergamon Press.