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Executive Summary

Background

Leaders of Jewish day schools play an important role in shaping, nourishing, and sustaining Jewish commitment. A long line of research points to the importance of Jewish day schools in shaping Jewish commitment and teaching the skills and knowledge conducive to participation in Jewish life. School leaders directly affect educational programs; teachers’ professional practice; and how administrators, faculty, students, and parents work together as a community. These effects are generated through the leaders’ many job responsibilities. Among them are hiring and supervising teachers, ensuring high standards for teaching and learning, and building a safe and supportive school climate.

Limited research exists on Jewish educational leadership practices and conditions for school leader success. The few studies on educational leadership that have been published in the past 15 years primarily drew on case studies. There is a need for research that includes a large sample of Jewish day school leaders and examines leadership practices and the conditions that influence them. This study is part of a three-year research project that aims to answer the research question: What is effective educational leadership in Jewish day schools, and how can it be nurtured and sustained?

Theory of Change and Objectives

This report summarizes an exploratory study of leadership practices and the conditions that influence leaders’ behaviors in Jewish day schools. A theory of change developed for this study captures three leadership domains that were selected because of their potential applicability to both senior leadership (e.g., heads of schools) and middle management (e.g., division heads). These domains are:

a. VISION: The school leader promotes a vision for Jewish living and learning.

b. STAFF: The school leader enables teachers’ learning and professional growth.

c. COMMUNITY: The school leader interacts with the school community to attend to the interests, priorities, and needs of students, teachers, and parents.

The theory of change (Exhibit 1) suggests that with effective leadership practices in place—and the conditions that enable them—schools can create and sustain high-quality educational programs. These school outcomes that result from effective leadership include a supportive and ethical school climate that embodies Jewish values; a professional learning community; and good relationships with families, the school board, and the larger Jewish community. In such an environment, teachers can use pedagogy that promotes student school engagement, academic proficiency, and values. It follows that if all of these elements are in place, schools and teachers will become more effective and ultimately contribute to improved student outcomes. For example, students will demonstrate stronger Jewish knowledge and skills, greater college and career readiness, and a greater sense of connectedness to the school community.
Although the consistent use of key leadership practices is critical for educational success, the larger context matters as well. Availability and affordability of relevant professional development opportunities, teaching resources, and the support of the parent body and community-based Jewish organizations can affect the work of leaders.

To further our understanding of educational leadership in Jewish day schools, the study summarized in this report had two goals:

1. To develop and validate a measure of leadership behaviors in Jewish day schools; and
2. To study the leadership practices of Jewish day school leaders in relation to contextual factors such as relations with teachers, parents, and the local Jewish community, and leaders' workload and professional development.

Methodology

We designed a study that integrates quantitative and qualitative data drawing on a large-scale survey and in-depth interviews with a smaller sample of school leaders. The respondents were heads of schools and division heads from Centrist Orthodox, Modern Orthodox, Community, Reform, Schechter, Yeshiva, and Immigration/Outreach schools. For the survey, the study team invited school leaders from 338 schools that met the sample inclusion criteria and received completed surveys from leaders in 304 schools (90 percent response rate). For the interviews, the study team invited 87 heads of schools and division heads from 50 schools to participate in phone interviews. The team completed interviews with 72 leaders (83 percent response rate).

Findings

Using the newly developed measure of Jewish educational leadership, this study identified seven conditions that influence the practices of school leaders across all school types. The Vision domain was measured as a composite score of eight items that were highly correlated (Cronbach’s $\alpha = .83$). The eight items measured self-reported frequency of leadership behaviors such as inspiring, motivating, and modeling. Two supporting conditions were identified:

1. **Relations with teachers.** A relationship of trust helped leaders build a committed staff united by common understanding of school values and a shared purpose. Findings showed that new leaders were less satisfied with their relations with teachers and scored lower on the Vision scale. This finding is important in light of the survey data showing that 41 percent of the leaders had been in their current position for three or fewer years.

2. **Professional development.** Participation in professional development on topics related to Judaic studies enabled leaders to promote the school’s vision for Jewish living and learning. However, only about one fifth of the leaders attended such professional development.
### Executive Summary

Exhibit 1. Theory of Change for Leadership Behaviors in Jewish Day Schools

#### VISION: The school leader promotes a vision for Jewish living and learning.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Competencies</th>
<th>Leadership Behaviors</th>
<th>School Outcomes</th>
<th>Teacher Outcomes</th>
<th>Student Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of Jewish texts, values, and traditions</td>
<td>Consistently articulate a vision</td>
<td>Alignment of school programs with vision</td>
<td>Improved instruction</td>
<td>Stronger Jewish knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of trends in Jewish education</td>
<td>Encourage staff to promote the school’s vision</td>
<td>High standards for Jewish learning</td>
<td>Greater infusion of Jewish values and wisdom across the curriculum</td>
<td>Greater commitment to Jewish living and learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication skills</td>
<td>Be a role model</td>
<td>A school culture that embodies Jewish values</td>
<td>More explicit support of policies, practices, and programs to promote Jewish values</td>
<td>More involvement in Jewish communal life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning and visioning skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Greater sense of belonging to the Jewish People</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Stronger relationship with Israel</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### STAFF: The school leader enables teachers’ learning and professional growth.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Competencies</th>
<th>Leadership Behaviors</th>
<th>School Outcomes</th>
<th>Teacher Outcomes</th>
<th>Student Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of best practices</td>
<td>Build teacher collaboration and trust</td>
<td>Clear standards and learning objectives</td>
<td>Stronger content knowledge and pedagogical practice</td>
<td>Improved academic performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication, coaching, and mentoring skills</td>
<td>Empower teachers to identify and implement new approaches to instruction</td>
<td>A professional learning community</td>
<td>More effective use of time</td>
<td>Greater college and career readiness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to collect and use data for decision making</td>
<td>Solicit feedback and suggestions from teachers</td>
<td>High-quality and innovative programs</td>
<td>Greater attention to differing student needs</td>
<td>Improved social and emotional skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning and resource management skills</td>
<td>Provide and enable access to professional development</td>
<td>Structures for matching instruction with students’ needs</td>
<td>Greater job satisfaction</td>
<td>Greater internalization and practice of character values</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### COMMUNITY: The school leader interacts with the school community to attend to the interests, priorities, and needs of students, teachers, and parents.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Competencies</th>
<th>Leadership Behaviors</th>
<th>School Outcomes</th>
<th>Teacher Outcomes</th>
<th>Student Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of stakeholders’ interests and needs</td>
<td>Be accessible to students, teachers, and parents</td>
<td>Good relationships with families, the school board, and the larger Jewish community</td>
<td>Improved teacher-student relationships</td>
<td>Greater sense of belonging and connectedness to school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication skills</td>
<td>Initiate dialogue with students, teachers, and parents</td>
<td>Rising enrollment rates</td>
<td>Improved teacher-parent relationships</td>
<td>Greater perception of the school environment as safe, caring, and supportive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open-mindedness and self-reflection</td>
<td>Encourage and model a culture of open and honest communications</td>
<td>Strong reputation of the school in the community</td>
<td>More collaboration with volunteers, community-based organizations, and experts in Jewish education</td>
<td>Greater motivation to volunteer and contribute to the school community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creativity and problem-solving skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Conditions for Educational Leadership (e.g., Communications With Parents; Professional Development; Support of Community-Based Organizations)**
Instructional leadership practices focused on enabling staff professional learning and growth were positively and significantly correlated with the Vision and Community leadership domains. The Staff leadership domain was measured as a composite score of seven items that were highly correlated (Cronbach’s $\alpha = .76$). The seven items measured self-reported frequency of leadership behaviors such as developing cooperative relationship among staff, implementing teachers’ ideas, and helping teachers reach their professional development goals. Despite its overlap with the other leadership domains, two supporting conditions were uniquely associated with this domain:

3. **Time for instructional leadership.** Leaders needed a minimum number of hours per week for observing and mentoring teachers and curriculum development to support teacher growth. Increased time dedicated to administrative duties and teaching classes reduced time for instructional leadership practices.

4. **Autonomy to make decisions.** School boards and heads of schools who trusted leaders with important instructional decision making enabled leaders to bring in new initiatives and veto new programs or approaches. Leaders who were given autonomy to make decisions empowered their teachers to pursue their own ideas and initiatives.

Leaders’ interaction with the community was perceived as beneficial to the strength of the educational programs of the school as well as its financial sustainability. This leadership domain was measured as a composite score of five items that were adequately correlated (Cronbach’s $\alpha = .64$). The five items measured self-reported frequency of leadership behaviors such as visibility, accessibility, role modeling, and solicitation of feedback and dialogue. Three supporting conditions were identified:

5. **Close communications with parents.** Schools benefited in many ways from open dialogue between leaders with parents and aligning educational programs with the needs of families.

6. **A school leadership team.** By sharing leadership responsibilities with a school leadership team, leaders were better able to dedicate sufficient time to interacting with their constituencies.

7. **Collaboration with other organizations.** Through joint programs and community support, leaders expanded the course offering and introduced new approaches to support academic learning and student engagement in the Jewish community.

**Conclusions**

How leaders support the vision, staff, and community of their schools is important to understanding the nature of educational leadership and the contextual conditions that influence it. Overall, school leaders reported that they establish clear priorities for achieving the mission and vision of the school, help teachers reach their professional development goals, and set an example for the values they seek to promote through their interactions with stakeholders (students, teachers, and parents). The findings of this study are consistent with other research on educational leadership in public and independent schools. In addition, there are some supporting conditions and practices that are unique to the context and mission of Jewish day schools. Because this study used self-report data, the findings should be interpreted with caution. A follow-up study, which collects data from teachers, students, and supervisors, is currently in progress. The findings from this research project can inform conversations on how to best support effective implementation of leadership practices in Jewish day schools.
Introduction

Schools need effective leaders. Research demonstrating the importance of effective educational leadership has grown substantially in the last decade. School leaders account for up to 25 percent of the variance in student academic progress. The influence of school leaders on student growth is indirect—manifesting through classroom teachers and other schoolwide factors. That said, insofar as we can measure such things, leaders (such as heads of schools or division heads) have a stronger effect on a school’s entire student body than teachers do, because teachers affect only their particular students. School leaders directly affect educational programs; teachers’ professional practice; and how administrators, faculty, students, and parents work together as a community. These effects are generated through the leaders’ many job responsibilities. Among them are hiring and supervising teachers, ensuring high standards for teaching and learning, and building a safe and supportive school climate.

Leaders of Jewish day schools play an important role in shaping, nourishing, and sustaining Jewish commitment. A long line of research points to the importance of Jewish day schools in shaping Jewish commitment and teaching the skills and knowledge conducive to participation in Jewish life. Effective educational leadership is critical to the success of Jewish day schools. Thus, we come to our research on Jewish day schools’ educational leadership, as described in this report, with a profound regard for the importance of day schools and the influence of their leadership. This awareness frames our central research question: What is effective educational leadership in Jewish day schools, and how can it be nurtured and sustained?

Some leadership qualities are important in all schools, while others may be specific to Jewish day school leaders. Much of the leadership research that has influenced the field may be considered as generalizable to Jewish day schools. For example, teacher supervision, the use of data-driven instructional decision making, and building safe and supportive learning environment. However, in addition to these tasks that span all types of schools, educational leaders in Jewish day schools have other responsibilities. They need to:

■ Promote a deep sense of Jewish cultural and religious identity;
■ Build and reinforce a commitment to Jewish community and Jewish peoplehood; and
■ Articulate and execute the school’s mission and vision in tune with the school’s Jewish community.

---
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Limited research exists on Jewish educational leadership practices and conditions for school leader success. The few studies on educational leadership that have been published in the past 15 years primarily drew on case studies, and some of them focused on different settings such as supplementary schools, camps, and trips to Israel. There is a need for research that includes a large sample of Jewish day school leaders and examines both research-based practices identified in public schools and practices that are unique to Jewish day schools.

**Leadership in Jewish Day Schools: Theory of Change**

The prevalent school leadership frameworks in both the national public school context and the Jewish day school context inform this study. The Professional Standards for Educational Leaders, developed by the National Policy Board for Educational Administration and nine major national organizations, are considered the “gold standard” for leadership practices. The 10 standards provide a generally accepted operational model of what school principals should be able to do. Most states have adopted these standards, which influence principal preparation programs, certification, professional development, and performance evaluation systems. Another framework informing this project is the AVI CHAI Foundation’s leadership framework, which identifies nine distinct Jewish day school functions that require effective leadership.

Based on the available research, American Institutes for Research’s (AIR) work with public school leaders, and the leadership frameworks described previously, we developed a theory of change that serves as a roadmap for the current research (Exhibit 1). The theory of change captures three leadership domains that were selected because of their potential applicability to both senior leadership (e.g., heads of schools) and middle management (e.g., division heads) and because each of these domains may affect teacher and student outcomes. These domains are:

a. **VISION:** The school leader promotes a vision for Jewish living and learning.

b. **STAFF:** The school leader enables teachers’ learning and professional growth.

c. **COMMUNITY:** The school leader interacts with the school community to attend to the interests, priorities, and needs of students, teachers, and parents.

The theory of change suggests that with effective leadership practices in place—and the conditions that enable them—schools can create and sustain high-quality educational programs. These school outcomes that result from effective leadership include a supportive and ethical school climate that embodies Jewish values; a professional learning community; and good relationships with families, the school board, and the larger Jewish community. In such an environment, teachers can use pedagogy that promotes student school engagement, academic proficiency, and values.

---
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It follows that if all of these elements are in place, schools and teachers will become more effective and ultimately contribute to improved student outcomes. For example, students will demonstrate stronger Jewish knowledge and skills, greater college and career readiness, and a greater sense of connectedness to the school community.

Although the consistent use of key leadership practices is critical for educational success, the larger context matters as well. Availability and affordability of relevant professional development opportunities, teaching resources (e.g., packaged curricula, educational technology applications and tools), and the support of the parent body and community-based Jewish organizations can make the work of leaders easier and more powerful. At the same time, a community that comprises different religious denominations in Judaism, a geographically dispersed school community (e.g., students residing in multiple cities), and limited financial resources are among the contextual factors that may impede instructional improvement and educational innovation, adversely affecting school, teacher, and student outcomes.

Exhibit 1 shows the relationship between leadership practices and school, teacher, and student outcomes. To implement the leadership practices outlined under the column Leadership Behaviors, Jewish day school leaders need a set of skills as outlined in the column labeled Competencies. In sum, we hypothesize that if leaders have the identified competencies and implement the three domains of leadership practices, they have the potential to positively achieve the outcomes listed for School Outcomes, Teacher Outcomes, and Student Outcomes.

This report aims to lay the groundwork for future studies on Jewish educational leadership. Before we address the relationship between leadership behaviors and teacher and student outcomes, it is important to establish the extent to which the identified leadership behaviors are a key part of what leaders do and the contextual factors that may change the intensity and nature of leaders’ behaviors as well as the relationship between leadership behaviors and teachers and student outcomes.
### Exhibit 1. Theory of Change for Leadership Behaviors in Jewish Day Schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VISION: The school leader promotes a vision for Jewish living and learning.</th>
<th>Leadership Behaviors</th>
<th>School Outcomes</th>
<th>Teacher Outcomes</th>
<th>Student Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of Jewish texts, values, and traditions</td>
<td>Consistently articulate a vision</td>
<td>Alignment of school programs with vision</td>
<td>Improved instruction</td>
<td>Stronger Jewish knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of trends in Jewish education</td>
<td>Encourage staff to promote the school’s vision</td>
<td>High standards for Jewish learning</td>
<td>Greater infusion of Jewish values and wisdom across the curriculum</td>
<td>Greater commitment to Jewish living and learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication skills</td>
<td>Be a role model</td>
<td>A school culture that embodies Jewish values</td>
<td>More explicit support of policies, practices, and programs to promote Jewish values</td>
<td>More involvement in Jewish communal life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning and visioning skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Greater sense of belonging to the Jewish People</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STAFF: The school leader enables teachers’ learning and professional growth.</th>
<th>Leadership Behaviors</th>
<th>School Outcomes</th>
<th>Teacher Outcomes</th>
<th>Student Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of best practices</td>
<td>Build teacher collaboration and trust</td>
<td>Clear standards and learning objectives</td>
<td>Stronger content knowledge and pedagogical practice</td>
<td>Improved academic performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication, coaching, and mentoring skills</td>
<td>Empower teachers to identify and implement new approaches to instruction</td>
<td>A professional learning community</td>
<td>More effective use of time</td>
<td>Greater college and career readiness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to collect and use data for decision making</td>
<td>Solicit feedback and suggestions from teachers</td>
<td>High-quality and innovative programs</td>
<td>Greater attention to differing student needs</td>
<td>Improved social and emotional skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning and resource management skills</td>
<td>Provide and enable access to professional development</td>
<td>Structures for matching instruction with students’ needs</td>
<td>Greater job satisfaction</td>
<td>Greater internalization and practice of character values</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMMUNITY: The school leader interacts with the school community to attend to the interests, priorities, and needs of students, teachers, and parents.</th>
<th>Leadership Behaviors</th>
<th>School Outcomes</th>
<th>Teacher Outcomes</th>
<th>Student Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of stakeholders’ interests and needs</td>
<td>Be accessible to students, teachers, and parents</td>
<td>Good relationships with families, the school board, and the larger Jewish community</td>
<td>Improved teacher-student relationships</td>
<td>Greater sense of belonging and connectedness to school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication skills</td>
<td>Initiate dialogue with students, teachers, and parents</td>
<td>Rising enrollment rates</td>
<td>Improved teacher-parent relationships</td>
<td>Greater perception of the school environment as safe, caring, and supportive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open-mindedness and self-reflection</td>
<td>Encourage and model a culture of open and honest communications</td>
<td>Strong reputation of the school in the community</td>
<td>More collaboration with volunteers, community-based organizations, and experts in Jewish education</td>
<td>Greater motivation to volunteer and contribute to the school community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creativity and problem-solving skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Conditions for Educational Leadership (e.g., Communications With Parents; Professional Development; Support of Community-Based Organizations)**
The Focus of This Report: Conditions for Educational Leadership

Even the best leader preparation program will not suffice absent certain working conditions. The burgeoning work on educational leadership development has included AVI CHAI Foundation stipends for the enrollment of Jewish day school leaders in the Principals’ Center at Harvard University’s Summer Institute; the Institute for Day School Management for Jewish Day School Leaders, a joint program of the Columbia University Graduate School of Business and UJA-Federation of New York; the Day School Leadership Training Institute of the Jewish Theological Seminary; project SuLaM of the RAVSAK network; Lookstein Center’s Educational Leadership Advancement Initiative; and Torah Umesorah’s Principal Fellowships (Chevras Yesud Ma’alah), to name a few. Investing in leadership training programs is one of the most effective ways to sustain high-quality formal Jewish education in North America.\(^{19}\) To effectively prepare leaders and support them throughout their career in Jewish day schools, research on effective leadership in the context of leaders working conditions in Jewish day schools is needed. Leadership is an interdependent system, influenced by staff, families, other leadership, school structure and resources, and the larger community.\(^{20}\) Leadership behavior may change as a function of the availability of other administrators\(^{21}\) and school financial resources.\(^{22}\)

**Conditions unique to Jewish day schools may influence leaders’ success.** Because of their independent status, Jewish day schools do not have access to the extensive network of resources available to public schools. In addition, Jewish day school leaders do not share major decisions about academic standards, curriculum, and instruction with state and local education agencies. Although this autonomy offers leaders the freedom to align resources with schools’ needs, it also can be an overwhelming responsibility. The decisions of Jewish day school leaders should consider the attitudes and needs of multiple stakeholders. The Jewish community has a culture of high parental involvement and community leadership investment and engagement in school governance. The involvement of parents in the decision making of Jewish day schools far exceeds that of parents in public schools and other independent schools.\(^{23}\) The demands of tuition-paying parents require school leaders to master a complex range of leadership skills to form collaborative relationships with parents. In many instances, the community may be ideologically varied, creating an additional source of tension for the school leader to navigate.\(^{24}\) At its best, the collaborative relationship that leaders build with parents may result not only in parental support and investment in the school but also in the contribution of the school to parent education and Jewish learning.\(^{25}\) In addition, some material situations that affect the work of school leaders with their staff on curriculum and instruction may be unique to Jewish day schools. One of these situations may be the availability of properly trained educators, particularly in Jewish studies.\(^{26}\) Also, the absence of strong, well-designed, coherent curricular frameworks in

\[^{19}\] Elkin (2010); Jewish Education Service of North America (2009); Kaplan (2008); Spillane, Halverson, & Diamond (2004).

\[^{20}\] Augustine et al. (2009); Bridwell-Mitchell & Lant (2013); Southern Regional Education Board (2009, 2010)

\[^{21}\] Sederberg (1983)

\[^{22}\] Leithwood & Riehl (2003)

\[^{23}\] Ross (2012)

\[^{24}\] Solomon (2013)

\[^{25}\] Perl (2012)

\[^{26}\] Ben-Avie & Kress (2006); Jewish Education Service of North America (2008); Krakowski (2011); Sales (2007)
Jewish studies remains a significant issue. As a result, school leaders often must start at square one—developing standards and curricula for Jewish studies and training teachers to use these materials. Then leaders must ensure that the curricula are implemented well, provide the appropriate supports, and assess the results.

**Objectives of the Study and Structure of the Report**

This report summarizes the first phase of a three-year research project studying the enabling conditions and outcomes of Jewish educational leadership. This research, conducted by AIR, aims to spark conversations on how school associations, school boards, and heads of schools can facilitate ongoing learning and improve the practice of senior and middle school leaders over time. This first report draws from a national survey of Jewish day schools and in-depth interviews with school leaders.

We designed this study with these goals in mind:

1. To develop and validate a measure of leadership behaviors in Jewish day schools; and
2. To study the leadership practices of Jewish day school leaders in relation to contextual factors such as relations with teachers, parents, and the local Jewish community, and leaders’ workload and professional development.

This report focuses on the prevalence of the leadership behaviors detailed in the theory of change, the relationships between the behaviors and school outcomes, and the conditions that affect leadership behaviors. The following sections detail the methodology, findings, and conclusions of this study. The findings are organized by the three leadership domains depicted in the theory of change and discussed earlier.
Methodology

A Mixed-Methods Study Design

We designed a study that integrates quantitative and qualitative data. The quantitative data came from closed-ended survey responses of school leaders, while the qualitative data came from open-ended survey questions and phone interviews with school leaders. The respondents were identified through phone calls to schools to verify contact information and job positions. In smaller schools, participants typically were the heads of schools. In larger schools, these leaders led a division or a program within their schools.

School Inclusion Criteria

Our study included all elementary, middle, and high Jewish day schools in the United States. The population for the study was defined as follows:

- The schools had to serve students above the second-grade level (i.e., not early childhood schools);
- The schools enrolled at least 10 students per grade level;
- The schools had both Judaic studies and general studies programs;
- The schools served predominantly general education students (i.e., not solely dedicated to special education);
- The language of instruction was English;
- The schools’ mission expressed a clear commitment to secular studies and college readiness;
- The schools were private (i.e., independent schools); and
- The schools represented the following types of Jewish day schools: Community, Immigrant/Outreach, Orthodox, Modern Orthodox, Reform, Schechter, and Yeshiva.

Survey Description and Response Rate

The survey was developed for this study. The survey items were piloted in interviews with five heads of schools. The survey was administered online, with an option to take the survey by phone or to complete a paper-and-pencil version of the survey. The survey comprised close-ended and open-ended questions. Closed-ended questions asked respondents to rate how frequently they perform different types of activities (e.g., “I solicit feedback from parents”). Additional closed-ended questions asked respondents to rate their satisfaction with different aspects of their job, identify types of professional development that they attended in the last five years, and enter the number of hours they spend on each aspect of their job during a school week. One other set of closed-ended questions that were addressed to heads of schools only asked about the school system as a whole (e.g., types of factors that currently hinder the school’s instructional capacity).

Exploratory, open-ended survey questions gathered data for topics that did not lend themselves to multiple-choice questions (e.g., “What student outcomes do you use to assess progress toward accomplishing the school’s mission?”). Some of the exploratory questions were addressed to heads of school only (e.g., “If you were serving on the search committee for a division head, what educational leadership qualities would you look for in an ideal job candidate?”) whereas other questions were addressed to division heads only (e.g., “Please name one recent professional development program or practice that you found extremely helpful in preparing you to promote students’ Jewish growth.”). The full survey instrument is provided in Appendix A.
We obtained a response rate of 84 percent; 437 of the 523 surveyed school leaders (heads of schools and division heads) completed the survey. As Exhibit 2 shows, response rates were high in all school categories. For example, we invited 159 school leaders from community schools, and 130 took the survey (82 percent response rate).

Exhibit 2. Leaders Invited and Leaders Responded by School Category

For the analyses included in this report, we merged survey results from division heads and their supervisors (heads of schools). The survey results include responses from 304 of the 338 schools that met the sample inclusion criteria (90 percent response rate). As Exhibit 3 shows, response rates were high in all school categories. For example, we invited leaders from 102 community schools, and leaders from 89 community schools took the survey (87 percent response rate).

Exhibit 3. Schools Invited and Schools Responded by School Identification
The responding schools were split evenly between urban and suburban settings (with just 1 percent in rural areas); one quarter (27 percent) were located in New York and New Jersey. The schools ranged in size from less than 150 students to more than 450 students. A detailed discussion of the characteristics of the respondents is provided in Appendix B.

**Interviews Description and Response Rate**

The study team invited 87 heads of schools and division heads from 50 schools to participate in phone interviews. The team completed interviews with 72 leaders (83 percent response rate). Each interview lasted 20 to 40 minutes. The interviews were semistructured and focused on the characteristics of the community served by the school, the job responsibilities of the school leaders, and recent curriculum and instruction initiatives that have shown promising results. In addition, school leaders were asked about how they support teachers’ instructional practices and what types of professional development help them better support their staff.

**Analytic Approach**

The study team analyzed the raw responses of school leaders to survey items. We did not use weighted adjustments to account for geography, respondent demographics, denomination, grade-level configuration, school size, or other factors because nonresponse analysis showed that the raw data were free of the bias that may result from missing data. Appendix B summarizes key characteristics of the schools and school leaders who completed our survey.

Factor analysis showed a clear three-factor solution, which corresponded with the three leadership domains described in the Introduction to this report. Average behavior ratings of the survey respondents at the item and leadership domain levels are presented in Appendix C. As shown in Exhibit 4, the three leadership domains were positively correlated (Exhibit 4). Although the magnitude of each association is low, all three were statistically significant, and thus suggest some interdependency among the domains.

**Exhibit 4. Three Domains of Leadership Behaviors**

To identify the conditions that are statistically associated with the frequency of leadership behaviors, the study team conducted multivariate statistical analyses of variance followed by univariate analyses of variance. Appendix D summarizes the results of the statistically significant univariate analyses of variance by leadership domain. The qualitative interview data were used to interpret the quantitative survey findings.

---

27 In Exhibit 4, r is the correlation or association among participants’ ratings under the two practices. The values of r range between +1 and −1, where 1 is total positive correlation, 0 is no correlation, and −1 is total negative correlation. * indicates that the r value is statistically significant at p < .05.
Findings

VISION

Promote a Vision for Jewish Living and Learning

The purpose of this section is to describe the conditions associated with leaders’ promotion of the school’s vision for Jewish living and learning. This leadership domain was measured as a composite score of eight items that were highly correlated (Cronbach’s α = .83). The eight items measured self-reported frequency of leadership behaviors such as inspiring, motivating, and modeling. This section describes two supporting conditions that emerged from the quantitative and qualitative data: leaders’ relationships with faculty and professional development.

Leadership Behaviors

■ Consistently articulate a vision  
■ Encourage staff to promote the school’s vision  
■ Be a role model

School Outcomes

■ Alignment of school programs with vision  
■ High standards for Jewish learning  
■ A school culture that embodies Jewish values

Supporting Conditions

1. Strong Relationship With the Faculty
2. Professional Development

1. Strong Relationship With Faculty

Leaders’ promotion of the school’s vision was associated with their relations with teachers. We found statistically significant differences between high and moderate levels of leaders’ job satisfaction with relations with teachers when examining self-reported frequency of behavior (leaders’ composite score on the 8-item Vision scale). Leaders who were highly satisfied with their relations with teachers had higher scores on the Vision scale than leaders who were moderately satisfied. None of the survey respondents reported a low level of satisfaction with relations with teachers. We offer an interpretation of this finding based on qualitative data. Without strong relations with teachers, leaders may encounter resistance to new programs and practices and mixed communications with students and parents about the purpose of programs and the values of the school. Translating the school vision into practice may result in added job responsibilities and burden on teachers. Heads of schools often attributed teacher effort to their willingness to work harder for leaders they respect and trust. To encourage staff to promote the school vision, leaders provided guidance on what teachers should do inside and outside the classroom. They
also established experiential Jewish education programs and policies that aimed to convey the importance of the school values. The following quote from an interview with a head of school exemplifies such activities initiated by a division head:

“In terms of the Jewish engagement, that is something that he really tries to push, with both himself and his teachers quite significantly, in increasing the Shabatonim, increasing the opportunities for teachers to do things outside of school, including Oneg Shabbat outside of school. He is very much into teachers building relationships with students, and he tries to reinforce it as much as possible, both directly through the faculty and through special programs such as extra learning programs that are intended to bring about Jewish engagement. He has instituted what he calls ‘Kiddush Ha-Shem Honor Roll,’ which is supposed to be distinguished from an academic honor roll. It recognizes students who embody Kiddush Ha-Shem in a bunch of different areas, including Jewish engagement, how they conduct themselves, and how they participate in classes. Also, he hires and gives feedback to teachers based on how well he thinks teachers help kids engage with their Judaism.”

For leaders, an indicator for teachers’ buy-in was the way teachers talked with stakeholders about Jewish engagement programs. Leaders recognized that staff buy-in is much more than adherence to program implementation guidelines—it is a sense of common purpose and shared values. Teachers were expected to model values in their interactions with students, parents, and faculty members and to demonstrate that they understand the reason for the various programs and appreciate their importance. For example, in schools that schedule their academic activities, such as testing dates, around Jewish and Israeli holidays, teachers were expected to show that they respected these considerations. As noted by a school leader:

“We have a set of standards for professional practice, which include the expectation that each teacher will uphold and embrace the school’s values. That doesn’t mean that if you are a non-Jewish teacher you should become observant of Jewish practice. Even if you are a Jewish teacher, it doesn’t mean you should [become observant]. It does mean that, if we’re going to have a day of celebration, you don’t say to your students, ‘We’re going to miss another class because you have another special program.’ But, instead, you should say, ‘I’m so looking forward to learning more about Israel next Thursday. I know the tekes [‘ceremony’ in Hebrew] is going to be meaningful, and I can’t wait to experience it.’”

Teachers played an important role in contributing to the identification and articulation of the core values of the school. Interviews with leaders revealed a strong belief in the importance of input of all stakeholders when defining the key values that the school aims to foster. In some schools, the process involved review of the research and conversations among faculty members on topics of Jewish learning and values. In some cases, teachers explored the idea of creating lesson plans that demonstrate the relevance of core values to students’ lives. Others explored how to align pedagogical practices of teaching values with students’ developmental milestones. Leaders advocated for a process that—although driven by the administration and the school leadership—is planned and executed by faculty members. A sense of ownership by staff has led to the integration of Jewish values in teacher team meetings,
curricular decision making, communications, and students’ behavior grades in report cards. The following quote provides an example of how a school leader involved stakeholders in this process:

“We have been doing a lot of work with our students, teachers, and the greater community to articulate three core values for our school. So, we used both English and Hebrew. For example, we use ‘Wisdom’ (‘Hochma’ in Hebrew), ‘Community’ (‘Klal Yisrael’ in Hebrew), and ‘Heartedness’ (‘Lev Tov’ in Hebrew). I worked with a consultant and the faculty to articulate what we mean by each of those values. The language to explain each one of those values really came from the faculty.”

Another aspect of promoting a vision for Jewish living and learning was working with staff to create standards for the Judaic studies curriculum. Through frequent interactions, administrators and staff reached a shared understanding of and commitment to what each student should know at each grade level. School leaders either assumed the role of creating standards or designated another administrator with the relevant expertise to design standards. A school leader described the collaborative process she has established in her school:

“The way I do things, when I’m coming into a meeting, [is that] I kind of know what I want to achieve in the end. It’s not totally open, but the teachers have 100 percent participation and involvement. I come all ready with the curriculum map, and teachers have to read through and agree or disagree and discuss the document. So, teachers are part of making the document together. So, yesterday we reviewed our curriculum map for Israel studies and the next step will be Jewish holidays.”

Leaders reported three main obstacles to maintaining a rigorous Judaic studies curriculum. The obstacles noted by leaders were as follows: (a) lack of academic standards in Judaic studies, especially at the high school level; (b) educators’ belief that if they wanted the students to love Judaic studies, they could not assign a lot of homework and tests; and (c) concerns about students’ fatigue because of the rigorous general studies curriculum and other extracurricular activities. Because of these obstacles, maintaining a strong program required close work with teachers, as noted by a school leader:

“As an administration, we have pushed back pretty hard on that and said, ‘If we want people to view Judaic studies as serious, we should be more systematic about the progression of skills.’ So, my role has been to try help the department chair and to get people on board as we articulate standards and align [standards] with key assessments. We have been pushing our teachers on that. When the teachers are writing objectives, I try working with them ahead of time and [debriefing] afterward.”
School leaders who had been in their present position for longer more often worked with teachers to promote the school’s vision for Jewish living and learning (Exhibit 5). Statistical analysis suggested that relations with teachers is one of the factors explaining the association between time in current position and leadership behaviors. School leaders who had been in their present position for longer were more satisfied with their relations with teachers. Building a relationship of trust with teachers is a process that takes time, sometimes several years. The relationship that leaders build with teachers over time enables them to know the personalities of teachers and to use this knowledge to motivate and inspire teachers, and to exert authority, when needed. As noted by a school leader:

“One of the things I have generally found successful as far as my approach to working with teachers is building relationships and trust first. I took the time in my first two years in my position when I made very few demands and very few direct instructions to my teachers. I spent a lot of the time hearing their challenges and listening to the struggle they were having. I provided support in whatever way I could, whether coming into their classrooms to provide them [with] support [or something else]. It could be something as simple as coming into their classroom for 10 minutes so they could have a bathroom break. I think when you spend the time building those relationships and developing that trust, then when you have enough ‘deposited in the bank,’ you can then make withdrawals and you can make requests. I have teachers that I did not expect to be able to make much progress [with] at all, and they now pretty much do anything I ask them to do because I have developed that trust and that relationship. When teachers feel spoken down [to] or demands are made of them, it can come across in a way that creates tension and pushback to the initiative and the change.”

Exhibit 5. The Relationship Between Promoting the School’s Vision and Years in Current Position

Note. This exhibit shows the average composite score on the Vision scale for six groups of school leaders, by number of years in current leadership position.
2. Professional Development

Professional development was an important condition that made it possible for leaders to promote the school vision. Leaders who participated in professional development (e.g., workshops at school or outside the school) related to Judaic studies had significantly higher composite scores on the vision scale than those who did not receive professional development. Of nine topics examined, differences were found for eight topics of professional development (Appendix D): (1) setting goals for students’ Jewish growth; (2) assessing students’ Jewish growth; (3) enhancing the tefilah (prayer) experience; (4) developing a Tanakh curriculum, (5) developing an Israel education curriculum; (6) developing a Hebrew language curriculum; (7) integrating character education into the curriculum; and (8) designing experiential Jewish education. We did not find differences in promoting the school vision as a function of participating in professional development about creating schoolwide cross-curricular Jewish learning programs.

Notably, just one fifth of our sample reported participating in professional development on these topics during the last five years. Several leaders noted that the Jewish education field in the United States is missing good, formal professional development opportunities that are relevant to Jewish learning and engagement. Many of the school leaders we interviewed reported being avid readers who constantly sought to learn about new research findings about effective educational practices. They typically learned from the professional literature and conferences in the United States and in Israel. Some leaders believed that an advanced degree in Jewish education could help them link together educational theory and the goals of the Judaic studies curriculum. The following quote from a head of school describing the Judaic studies principal exemplifies this point:

“He’s totally revamped the Judaic studies curriculum in the last two years. He organized teachers into committees to work on the curriculum. There is a dramatic difference in the school in terms of teachers understanding exactly what it is that is expected of them in terms of a real solid written curriculum. However, I think that having a theory base is very important to administrative practice. I don’t know that he has really studied curriculum theorists and has that strong theory base. I think he that he is a very reflective individual and I think that if he were to be involved in professional development, perhaps a doctoral program in Jewish education would make him a better and stronger administrator.”

The relationship between professional development and the extent to which leaders’ promote the school vision may be bidirectional. According to qualitative data, professional development enabled leaders to learn about new practices and curricula and expand their ability to critically reflect on current practices at their schools. In addition, professional development outside the school provided opportunities for meeting leaders from other schools and learning from what they do to implement their school’s vision. Some leaders described the training as the result of ordering a new curriculum from a developer or contracting with a professional development provider as part of an initiative that the school leadership (e.g., the head of school and division heads) has been pursuing for some time.
Summary and Discussion: Conditions That Support Promotion of the School’s Vision

Promoting the school’s vision for Jewish living and learning was an important part of the leadership responsibilities of all educational leaders, regardless of their job title or school type. This finding aligns with the results of a recent head-of-school survey conducted by RAVSAK.28 According to this survey, a school culture that is mission-driven and aligned with the school’s commitment to Jewish values were top priorities for leaders.

Leaders’ ability to gain the buy-in of teachers was an important part of promoting the school’s vision. However, new leaders were less satisfied than other leaders with their relations with teachers and did less to promote the school vision for Jewish living and learning. This finding is consistent with prior research showing that newly appointed leaders need time to build the relationships with faculty members that provide a foundation for better accomplishing the vision and mission of the school.29 Research shows that it takes approximately five years to fully implement schoolwide policies and practices that will positively impact the school’s culture and performance.30 This finding is important in light of the survey data showing that 41 percent of the leaders had been in their current position for three or fewer years. Prior research on Jewish day school leaders reported a similar percentage of new leaders.31 Promoting longer retention of school leaders can have a substantial, positive impact on leaders’ behavior.

Leaders who participated in one of eight types of professional development topics related to Judaic studies were more likely to promote the school vision for Jewish living and learning. Although both new and veteran school leaders were interested in professional development, they expressed a preference for training that did not involve travel or missing workdays and noted the shortage in quality professional development specific to Judaic studies. Similar to research findings in public schools,32 leaders believe that professional development is important to their ability to oversee curriculum and instruction. Also, they needed professional development that enabled immediate and direct application of theory into practice and that could work around their busy schedules. The most preferred model was having a coach or a mentor. Notably, satisfaction with their own professional growth was associated with leadership behaviors across all years of job experience. Leaders expressed a need for both targeted professional development that supported new instructional initiatives and general learning opportunities that enabled them to stay current on the most recent educational research on effective practices. Researchers33 suggest that professional development for school leaders should include immediate application to practice to analyze how the leader works with staff members, makes decisions, and aligns time management with priorities.

29 Betelle, Kalogrides, & Loeb (2011); Branch et al. (2012); Clark, Martorell, & Rockoff (2009); Seashore-Louis et al. (2010)
30 Seashore-Louis et al. (2010)
31 Ben-Avie & Kress (2008); Schick (2007)
32 Martin & Searby (2016)
33 Helsing, Howell, Kegan, & Lahey (2008)
Enable Teachers’ Learning and Professional Growth

The purpose of this section is to describe the conditions associated with leaders’ support of teachers’ professional growth. This leadership domain was measured as a composite score of seven items that were highly correlated (Cronbach’s $\alpha = .76$). The seven items measured self-reported frequency of leadership behaviors such as developing cooperative relationship among staff, implementing teachers’ ideas, and helping teachers reach their professional development goals. This section describes two supporting conditions that emerged from the quantitative and qualitative data: time for instructional leadership and leaders’ autonomy to make decisions about educational programs in the school.

### Leadership Behaviors

- Build teacher collaboration and trust
- Empower teachers to identify and implement new approaches to instruction
- Solicit feedback and suggestions from teachers
- Provide and enable access to professional development

### School Outcomes

- Clear standards and learning objectives
- A professional learning community
- High-quality and innovative programs
- Structures for matching instruction with students’ needs

### Supporting Conditions

1. Time Management
2. Autonomy to Make Decisions

1. **Time for Instructional Leadership**

School leaders who enabled teachers had fewer administrative and teaching responsibilities. We define instructional leadership as the work of leaders with faculty members to ensure that every student receives high-quality education. Teacher professional growth was highly emphasized in interviews. Leaders believed that continuous learning promoted satisfaction with one’s career, sparked conversations about educational practice, and encouraged teachers to revitalize their lesson plans every year. As noted by one school leader:

> “I think that successful teachers are the ones who don’t want to do the exact same unit and the exact same lesson over and over again. They are interested in trying to find ways to always do new and exciting things.”

Survey data suggested a trade-off between management (e.g., budgeting, marketing) and course teaching duties on one hand and instructional leadership (e.g., observing teachers, curriculum planning) on the other. Although it was not clear how many hours per week leaders typically worked (many reported working 14-hour days), the more administrative and teaching duties leaders fulfilled, the less they worked on instructional leadership tasks, such as observing teachers. The number of hours dedicated to administrative duties ranged from 1 to 45 hours, with
average of 16 hours per week. The number of hours leaders taught classes (as the classroom teachers or substitute teachers) ranged from 1 to 14 hours per week, with average of 5 hours per week. Data showed that there may be an optimal amount of time that leaders can spend on specific tasks. Spending less than three hours per week on each of the following tasks hampered leaders’ ability to support their staff: curriculum planning, meeting with teachers and parents about learning and instruction concerns, curriculum development, and observing teachers in the classroom. At the same time, spending more than eight hours per week on these tasks did not have statistically significant increase in supporting teachers’ professional growth.

Survey data showed that school leaders who were very satisfied with the administrative support they received were more likely to frequently work with teachers on their learning and professional growth. Supporting evidence from interview data indicated that some leaders filled more than one job position in their school. In addition, some leaders had many duties that were not related to instructional leadership, such as institutional advancement, marketing, admissions, and discipline. Being supported by administrative assistants as well as other leaders influenced their ability to fully attend to all their duties. The following quote illustrates the daily time-management dilemmas that leaders faced:

“My plate as a head of school last year was always filled with multiple responsibilities. There were times when it was hard to keep up with all the things I was supposed to be doing at the same time. For example, reviewing student reports at the same time that I’m interviewing people for the next school year, at the same time that I’m supposed to be running the day-to-day operations of the school, which include speaking with parents and supervising teachers.”

Competing priorities forced leaders to find creative ways to manage their time and carve out time for working with teachers. Variations in the extent to which competing priorities impeded support for teachers’ growth were related to the extent to which leaders had working strategies for effective time management. Strategies mentioned by leaders included:

- Delegating leadership duties to a leadership team composed of teacher leaders;
- Hiring an additional administrator or promoting a staff member to assistant principal;
- Contracting with outside organizations (e.g., The Jewish New Teacher Project; Yeshiva University School Partnership New Teacher Induction Program) or paying department chairs to mentor new and struggling teachers;
- Empowering teacher teams to schedule and lead meetings, make decisions, and implement new initiatives; and
- Aligning the amount of time spent on each activity with school priorities and giving up some programs or initiatives in favor of other programs that are more important to the school mission or to stakeholders.

Reported shortage in or inadequacy of educational technology and facilities was associated with lower support of teachers’ growth. We found statistically significant differences between schools with and without reported shortages in facilities and educational technology. In interviews, school leaders noted that management of day-to-day school operations and logistics competed
with instructional leadership for time. Troubleshooting conditions that affected instruction and learning reduced leaders' availability for classroom walk-throughs and mentoring teachers. In contrast, when the school facilities and educational technology met the needs of the school, leaders reported increased capacity for innovative programs such as project-based learning and experiments in science, technology, and engineering. Not only could leaders focus more on instructional leadership, but also their support was needed for implementing the innovative programs.

**Larger schools were more effective at promoting teachers’ growth.** Leaders of larger Jewish day schools (i.e., 500 students or more) reported working more frequently than leaders in smaller schools (i.e., 250 students or fewer across all divisions and grade levels) on finding ways to help teachers reach professional development goals and implementing teachers' ideas for new instructional practices and programs. School leaders noted that when other administrators in the building took on leadership responsibilities (e.g., marketing and recruitment, budget management), they themselves were able to work more closely with teachers on instructional matters, school climate, and special programs to promote students' health, well-being, and enrichment. Leaders in larger schools were significantly more satisfied with their administrative support. They also were more satisfied with their own professional development, which enabled them to effectively advise and guide teachers, as described in more detail in later sections of this report.

2. **Autonomy to Make Decisions**

Leaders’ who had sufficient autonomy to make decisions about curriculum and instruction reported a higher frequency of empowering teachers and supporting teachers’ professional growth. We found a statistically significant difference between leaders with high and moderate satisfaction with their autonomy to make decisions. We also found a statistically significant difference between leaders with high and moderate satisfaction with their relations with the school board (Appendix D). In both cases, higher job satisfaction predicted higher composite scores on the Staff scale. However, this association may be bidirectional. Leaders who reported being trusted by their heads of schools and school board may have proven themselves as highly effective instructional leaders. Conversely, leaders with greater autonomy to bring in new programs were better positioned to support teacher growth through new policies, collaborative structures, or professional learning programs. Interview data suggested that leaders who are given autonomy to make decisions empower their teachers to pursue their own ideas and initiatives. As noted by a division head:

‘I am given a lot of leeway. I am allowed to bring in my programs. I am allowed to spread my wings. I am allowed to spread the wings of my teachers. The head of school is very supportive. There have been times that he and I have disagreed. Sometimes, he will convince me that the way he thinks is best, and sometimes I will tell him ‘I think we should do it this way,’ and he will respect that. I do the same with my deans and the school leadership team.’
Leaders’ reports of autonomy to make decision were not related to leader and school characteristics. Analysis of survey data indicated that the relationships between middle management, senior management, and school boards are a unique quality unrelated to demographic characteristics, professional experience, school type, or school financial resources.

Summary and Discussion:
Enabling Teachers’ Learning and Professional Growth

Time for instructional leadership was an important working condition that affected leadership behavior. This study adds to the growing evidence base linking time management with effective leadership. Constraints on leaders’ time, such as the amount of time the leader spends on teaching in the classroom, can hinder instructional leadership as well as the time a leader has available to meet with students and families. Leaders who oversee the daily operations of the school may have less time to dedicate to instructional leadership due to inadequate facilities and shortages in technology. Past research has shown that inadequate school facilities (e.g., light, ventilation, space) can interfere with instruction and make it less effective. In addition, school leaders in very small schools have to juggle many job responsibilities, limiting their ability to serve as instructional leaders. Heads of very small schools typically oversaw all the school’s operations (e.g., institutional advancement, marketing, admissions, finance, as well as the education program) and therefore had less time to promote teachers’ growth than did leaders in larger schools and larger administration team. The findings are consistent with concerns voiced by leaders in the Jewish community about the challenges faced by small schools.

Autonomy to make decisions that affect school spending on personnel and educational programming was positively associated with leaders’ support of teacher learning. This finding aligns with existing research on public and private schools indicating that the autonomy of the school principal is related to a culture of collaboration and trust among all stakeholders as well as greater initiative taken by teachers to try new pedagogical approaches and build a learning environment conducive to student learning. Experts have suggested that public school leaders can be more effective when they are trusted by the district office with discretion to implement policies and initiatives in ways that meet student needs and to find alternatives to policies and initiatives that are not working.
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COMMUNITY

Interact With the School Community to Attend to Interests, Priorities, and Needs of Students, Teachers, and Parents

The purpose of this section is to describe the conditions associated with leaders’ interaction with the school community. This leadership domain was measured as a composite score of five items that were adequately correlated (Cronbach’s $\alpha = .64$). The five items measured self-reported frequency of leadership behaviors such as visibility, accessibility, role modeling, and solicitation of feedback and dialogue. This section describes three supporting conditions that emerged from the quantitative and qualitative data: close communications with parents, a school leadership team, and collaborative relationships with other organizations.

Supporting Conditions
1. Close Communications With Parents
2. A School Leadership Team
3. Collaborative Relationships With Other Organizations

Leadership Behaviors
- Be accessible to students, teachers, and parents
- Proactively initiate dialogue with students, teachers, and parents
- Encourage and model a culture of open and honest communications

School Outcomes
- Good relationships with families, the school board, and the larger Jewish community
- Rising enrollment rates
- Strong reputation of the school in the community

1. Close Communications With Parents

Leaders’ satisfaction with relations with parents was associated with their interactions of leaders with the school community. We found statistically significant differences between moderate and high levels of satisfaction with relations with parents (Appendix D). Interview data suggested a bidirectional effect. Leaders who were less proactive in their communications with parents regarding school policy and goals of new programs were more likely than other leaders to receive feedback from parents about their concerns and parent-teacher differences. In addition, leaders who were less satisfied with their relations with parents were less likely than other leaders to invite parents to volunteer at school and contribute to new programs. Leaders acknowledged in interviews that meeting the needs of constituencies depended on (1) openness to feedback, (2) assessing the extent to which all members of the school community were treated fairly and with respect, and (3) effectively communicating to parents about areas for improvement and the steps taken by the school to address these issues. All these efforts needed to be proactive, with deliberate allocation of sufficient time to reach out to families and maintain close communications with parents. Heads of schools mentioned the importance of identifying what programs are most important to parents and what the school can offer that is competitive with excellent public schools, other Jewish day schools, and nonreligious independent schools. Also, both heads of schools and division heads continually solicited feedback on and revised their strategies for communicating...
about how decisions about the curriculum and special programs are made (e.g., how the selection of new programs was informed by the core values of the school).

Leaders cited multiple reasons for the importance of close communications with parents. Parent satisfaction contributed to strong reputation of the school, which in turn increased enrollment. Parents also had an important role in fundraising. But, most importantly, school leaders believed that a sense of community is essential for accomplishing the school mission and the growth of students. A strong community that is founded on Jewish values had to be inclusive, responsive, and caring. Accordingly, analysis of survey data showed a statistically significant positive association between leaders’ emphasis of a caring school community as one of the key aspects of the school mission and the frequency of their interaction with the school community (Appendix D). Importantly, leaders noted that close communications are necessary but not sufficient factors for building good relations with parents. Leaders had to make important decisions, which affected the school budget, to accommodate parents’ requests. The following quote demonstrates how schools created schedules and programs responsive to the interests of families:

“...We put in a lot [of] hours. We have a very long school day—longer than most schools. There is school on Sunday. There are optional night classes on Tuesday and Thursday nights. The parents want a lot of Jewish studies and a lot of general studies. They want the kids to work hard, and I think this is why we are attracting a lot of kids.”

Although most communications initiated by parents involved their children’s grades and school experience, leaders said that parents also made comments and requests concerning schoolwide policies. School leaders noted that establishing a system of communications with parents that enabled timely responses to parents’ questions and feedback was an important part of their leadership role. As described by a school leader:

“...We have this challenge that parents have been through the system [of Jewish day schools] and have experienced the system. They have their preconceived notions of the educational system, and that becomes a big challenge to [take] initiative and change. I think one [thing] a school can—in a healthy way—do is what I would call ‘parent education’ or ‘parent involvement.’ I think the more open and transparent we are with the parents in terms of the research, the logic, and the methodology behind initiative, and the more we include parents in being available to responding to questions, the less pushback that we get. So I think it kind off comes from a combination of parents—especially in the Jewish community—being very opinionated, along with the need for schools to be more transparent and more engaging with their parent body.”

Another reason for the importance of communications with parents is the ideological diversity that exists in many communities. Leaders of schools representing the entire spectrum of denominations mentioned the effect of ideological differences among parents on community-building strategies. Interview data suggested that Jewish school leaders needed to continually revisit and defend schoolwide policies to reconcile multiple perspectives among members of the community served by the school. Relevant policies ranged from the requirement to wear kippot during the school day to the rigor of the Judaic studies curriculum. As one school leader described:

“...Because we are diverse, parents’ opinions can impact our [Judaic studies] program. Parents can come and expect students to do one page of Gemara every week; other parents do not understand why students should learn Gemara at all. We are always revisiting and never do the same thing twice. We never say we got it. We cannot set priorities based on parents’ feedback but cannot ignore parents’ needs when we set priorities [either].”
However, although wanting to be inclusive, school leaders felt it was important to set standards and to create a unified community with shared values. In addition, schools explored strategies for student engagement (e.g., making the prayer experience more meaningful). Making every child and family feel that they are a valued member of a vibrant and supportive community was critical to keeping families in the school, leaders said. For example, elementary school leaders noted the importance of building a community with families of preschool and kindergarten students to encourage and enable families, especially the nonreligious, unaffiliated parents, to keep their children in the school despite the alternative of high-quality public schools. A school head commented:

“People choose to be here because we are a nurturing, friendly place. I don’t think that many families say, ‘We choose to pay the $30,000 rather than going to the public school because this school’s instruction is $30,000 better.’ I think that’s a really hard case to make, especially because their teachers get paid a lot more than ours. But I think for them to say that our school does an amazing job—in the context of also providing an outstanding learning environment—creating this very nurturing, warm, and welcoming community that we love being part of and that our kids need.”

Communications with parents were key to prioritizing, introducing, and forming collaborative relationships around innovative instructional practices. Many school leaders were wary of launching too many new programs given the associated costs of materials and training, teacher fatigue, and limited time within the regular school day and school year. Conversely, leaders noted the importance of keeping abreast of the latest research evidence on effective instructional practices and continually exploring how innovative pedagogical practices can support the school’s academic goals and students’ interests. When leaders endeavored to upgrade school programs, they assessed for alignment with the school mission and vision to safeguard the school from using a piecemeal, fragmented approach. Then, they articulated to stakeholders the considerations that informed the decision whether or not to implement initiatives explored by the school. A common statement made by leaders in interviews was the need to filter the many opportunities and programs that parents want the school to explore.

2. A School Leadership Team

School leaders relied on the support of the school’s other administrators and educational leaders, including department chairs, deans, assistant principals, and others to develop an effective system of communications with parents and cultivate a caring school community. In interviews, heads of schools and division heads noted that interacting with the school community required more time than they could give. To the extent that they could effectively work with a school leadership team to share a variety of leadership tasks, they felt that the school community was better informed and served. Some leaders had a single leadership team while others worked with different teams, committees, and task forces for different purposes (e.g., academic learning, social and emotional learning). The following quote from an interview with a school head provide such example:

“I give credit to her [division head] listening to teachers who requested a Health and Wellness Task Force. It was the teachers’ idea, and she worked with a proposal that teachers put together.”
Teachers really felt that there were kids who were heading into crisis and that the school could have anticipated that. So, based on the recommendations of the Task Force, the school now can preempt serious problems that kids are facing. Every year, there was always someone ending up getting expelled, having a break down, or going to a hospital. This year, we were able to prevent more and help students deal with [the] death of a parent, illness of a sibling, or other major traumatic events in their lives.

She is always monitoring what teachers are proposing. She pulls together task forces and then puts them to rest when they run their course.

In this example, the school leader encouraged teachers to develop a plan that included key details such as who needed to be involved, what were the projected costs, and how could the school assess the success of the new initiative. The Health and Wellness Task Force provided important leadership support. It gauged the needs of the school community, proposed a solution and action plan, and helped the school leader monitor the implementation of the new school policies.

Being a newly appointed leader with more limited leadership responsibilities was associated with lower frequency of interaction with the school community, according to survey data. School leaders who were responsible for part of the curriculum (e.g., Judaic studies principals who supervise Judaic studies teachers) reported significantly lower frequency of interaction with the school community than school leaders who oversaw all curriculum and instruction matters. The gap was widest between leaders who were three years or less in their current position and the other leaders. Interview data suggested that new leaders who oversaw part of the curriculum were focused more on the goals of curriculum development and ensuring high instructional quality in the classroom and were uncertain about the extent to which they should be interacting with the school community.

3. Collaborative Relationships With Other Organizations

School leaders regarded developing relationships with Jewish community leaders and other Jewish organizations as activities that could greatly benefit the school. The involvement of leaders in the community had many forms, ranging from forming social and professional networks with other Jewish education professionals to actively contributing to other organizations, for example, teaching in local supplementary schools. In addition, some leaders explicitly encouraged students to participate in activities organized by other organizations. The following quote describes how a head of school changed the school attendance policy to encourage student participation in weekend youth group activities:

“In interviews with incoming students, I typically mention that we encourage our students to be involved in NCSY or Bnei Akiva [Jewish youth groups]. Nowadays, we have added CTeen, which is Chabad teen network that is becoming a popular group within our school as well. In terms of school policy, if students are going on a Shabatonim [weekend program] from Bnei Akiva or NCSY, the Friday that they miss does not count as being absent from school. This is a policy to encourage students to go on Shabatonim.”
Although senior leaders (e.g., heads of schools) consistently reported that forming partnerships with community-based organizations was part of their job responsibilities, division heads had mixed opinions about whether they should be involved in building school-community partnerships. Division heads who initiated partnerships with community members sought to strengthen the curriculum (e.g., by inviting guest speakers, planning field trips, or planning project-based learning) as well as expand the extracurricular enrichment programs offered by the school. Examples to such partnerships include:

- A collaboration with community centers, camps, and other Jewish agencies to provide an enrichment program for senior students that included designing projects that reflect students’ career or academic interests beyond high school.

- Teachers and leaders working with a local Jewish art museum to explore the use of Jewish art in the Judaic studies curriculum as well as the English language arts curriculum.

- Partnering with Jewish social service agencies to conduct community service projects.

**Summary and Discussion: Interacting With the School Community**

**Schools have much to gain from investing in family-school partnerships and community relations.** The findings reported in this section are consistent with research findings and expert recommendations to leverage partnerships with families and community-based organizations both for financial sustainability and for better instruction, which matches the needs of all students. Such collaboration can support the long-term sustainability of schools as well as the scope and quality of their enrichment programs. At the same time, leaders in our study reported that strong Jewish day schools attracted Jewish families to their neighborhood and supported youth movements by encouraging students to attend weekend and afterschool programs. As other researchers have noted, Jewish day schools and Jewish communities can mutually benefit from a successful school-community partnership.

**School leadership teams provided valuable support to school leaders.** School leadership teams provided expertise that complemented the knowledge and skills of leaders; offered diverse perspectives on issues; and supported the planning, implementation, and evaluation of the outcomes of school initiatives. In public schools, there are emerging, research-based models that point to the value of school leadership teams that have the capacity for data-driven decision-making processes. Another benefit to school leadership teams is the continuity of knowledge given the high turnover rates of school leaders, which can interrupt new reforms and the sustainability of school improvement initiatives. Through a culture of collective responsibility, high-quality education can be sustained through the effort of multiple leaders in the school. This approach has implications for future research and practice relevant to school leaders’ performance evaluation and professional development. Rather than establishing goals for individual leaders, there are benefits to identifying best practices for shared leadership and high-performing leadership teams.

---
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Conclusions

This report is part of a research effort to conceptualize, measure, and test the effects of educational leadership in Jewish day schools. In this report, we introduce a new assessment instrument of leadership practices in Jewish day schools. This measure is aligned with leadership behavior paradigms that conceptualize effective leadership through a set of practices such as promoting a vision, empowering staff, and creating a sense of community with shared values. The theory of change informing this measure as well as the data analysis posits that there are key leadership domains that are an important part of the work of leaders across job titles and school types. First, the school leader must communicate and promote a clear vision. She or he also must establish clear priorities for achieving the mission and vision of the school, which must be understood by the students, their parents, teachers, and administrative staff. Second, school leaders must dedicate sufficient time and resources to help teachers reach their professional development goals, observe and mentor teachers, and feel comfortable with empowering staff members to share leadership responsibilities. Third, school leaders should be highly visible to the school community and set the right example through their interactions with stakeholders (students, teachers, and parents). Leaders need to consistently demonstrate the values they seek to promote: passion for Jewish living and learning; work ethic; caring, compassion, and integrity; and open-mindedness.

The results of this study identify supporting conditions for school leadership. The emerging findings highlight the links between leadership and working conditions. It is important to examine what school structures and processes can enable leaders to perform the activities they believe are needed for achieving the mission and vision of the school. The findings draw attention to several factors that are significantly associated with leadership behaviors, including relations of leaders with teachers, parents, and the local Jewish community, leaders' professional development, leaders' autonomy to make decisions, and leaders' workload. Similar to other research studies, some of the findings suggested bidirectional effects or feedback loops between leadership behaviors and the working conditions that facilitate or hinder leaders' ability to perform certain tasks. School leaders may, for example, initiate changes in school structures for teacher collaboration and community relations. Changes in these conditions may subsequently affect leadership behavior, as they support the leaders' work.44

Consistent with the research on to public schools,45 working conditions in small schools are different from those at large schools. In schools that employ small numbers of staff, leaders need to carry out a larger variety of job responsibilities and have fewer opportunities to delegate their work than leaders in larger schools. Small schools may be at a higher risk for not being sustainable, especially if they are located in isolated Jewish communities. In such communities, efforts for enrollment management may be more extensive and it may be difficult to find qualified teachers to hire. In addition, as our findings suggest, there may be less available budget for non-personnel costs, such as educational technology and other equipment. Understanding the working conditions of school leaders is important for interpreting research findings on effective leadership practices, as well as improving the conditions for Jewish day school leadership.

44 Heck & Hallinger (2010)
45 Fuller, Hollingworth, & Young (2015)
The solutions to impeding conditions also are consistent with the educational leadership literature. For example, the growing demands on school leaders, reflecting higher standards for learning and increased flexibility in serving and accommodating diverse populations, have challenged school leaders in public schools to identify educational priorities aligned with the school mission and vision and train faculty members to share leadership responsibilities. As found in this study, past research has shown that school leaders operate through collaborative relationships with staff members, parents, community members, and community-based organizations and gather many types of information—stakeholder feedback, student data, observed classroom instruction, and new evidence on effective practices—that are critical for effective decision making.\textsuperscript{46}

Nevertheless, some leadership practices are unique to Jewish day schools. Although the general practice of being guided by the school core values has been documented by research for a variety of faith-based schools,\textsuperscript{47} the particular issues, perspectives, and strategies should be defined and described in the context of Jewish education. It is important to understand, for example, how leaders of Modern Orthodox schools work with their constituencies to understand and fulfill the ideals of Modern Orthodoxy,\textsuperscript{48} how leaders' apply their understanding of what makes a school Reform,\textsuperscript{49} or how Community school leaders define what constitutes a successful Jewish day school graduate.\textsuperscript{50} This finding raises a question about the applicability of national standards for school principals' evaluation, professional development, and hiring for division heads as well as heads of Jewish day schools. While the work of Jewish day school leaders benefits from the general education research on effective educational practices, programs in Jewish education can help leaders adapt practices to the unique contexts of their schools. However, more in-depth research on the mechanisms of leadership influence within the context of Jewish day schools is needed to identify what is unique about Jewish day school leadership.

However, when it comes to guiding pedagogy and instruction, the different streams of Judaism are not very different. The leadership behaviors examined in this study were rated as frequently done by Jewish day school leaders across school types, denominational identification, and demographic characteristics of the leaders and the populations they served. In addition, the conditions that support leadership behaviors were the same across schools. These findings support the recent merger of five of North America's leading Jewish day school organizations and networks (http://newjdsorg.org/). Common lessons about facilitating successful leadership in Jewish schools can be applied across the spectrum of Jewish day schools.

Understanding Jewish views of leadership can guide research on leadership practices. For example, according to Lewis’s analysis of Judaism’s perspective on leadership, Jewish texts strongly support power sharing. The message is applicable to modern times as well:

---
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The tendency for leaders to want to do things themselves, rather than depend on the skills and judgments of others, is as natural as it is dangerous. Leaders often feel that they must do it all—fix all the problems and answer all the questions. Not only is such an approach a prescription for disaster, as no single individual can do everything, it is a sure way to foster dependence among followers, not build leadership in others.\textsuperscript{51}

As this quote implies, value exists in studying not only the strength of the individual leader but also the effectiveness of the school leadership structure as a whole as well as other supporting conditions, such as how the school leader guides and leverages the collective work of the school leadership team for school improvement.

\textbf{It is too early to establish the impact of the specific leadership practices on teacher and student outcomes.} Self-report data are not sufficient for drawing conclusions on effective practices. Although this study provided important information about the work of Jewish day school leaders, additional data are needed on school, teacher, and student outcomes such as teacher practice, job satisfaction, and retention as well as student academic learning and perceptions of the school climate. Future research should examine the validity of the Jewish Educational Leadership measure. These studies could focus on ascertaining the relationship between leaders’ scores on the Jewish Educational Leadership measure and teachers’ ratings of the behaviors of their school principals. In addition, given the findings reported previously on the conditions that help or hinder leadership practices, it is important to consider the working conditions of school principals to better understand how leadership is associated with school outcomes.

\textsuperscript{51} Lewis (2006, pp. 58–59)
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The Study Survey

1. Please provide your name, the name of your school, and the school location.
   - First name ____________________________________________________________
   - Last name ____________________________________________________________
   - School name __________________________________________________________
   - City, State ____________________________________________________________

2. What is the mission of your school? ______________________________________
   ________________________________________________________________

3. What student outcomes do you use to assess progress toward accomplishing the school’s mission?
   ________________________________________________________________

4. How would you characterize your school?
   - Centrist Orthodox
   - Modern Orthodox
   - Community
   - Solomon Schechter
   - Reform
   - Chabad
   - Chassidic
   - Yeshiva
   - Other (please specify) _____________________________________________

5. What is the total student enrollment in your school (across divisions) in the 2014–15 school year?
   - 0–100
   - 101–200
   - 201–300
   - 301–400
   - 401–500
   - More than 500

6. What national school associations is your school currently affiliated with? (Check all items that apply)
   - National Association of Independent Schools (NAIS)
   - PARDeS
   - RAVSAK
   - Schechter Day School Network
   - Torah U’Mesorah
   - Other (please specify) _____________________________________________
7. If you are a member of a network or a community of practice for day school administrators, please specify its name below.

_____________________________________________________________________________________________

8. If you were serving on the search committee for a division head in a Jewish day school (e.g., head of a lower division, head of Judaic studies division), what educational leadership qualities would you look for in an ideal job candidate?

_____________________________________________________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________________________________________________

9. How frequently do you engage in each of the following behaviors?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Behavior</th>
<th>Very Frequently</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Once in a While</th>
<th>Rarely or Seldom</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I try to understand what “being Jewish” means to my students.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I articulate how my actions are guided by my Jewish knowledge and values.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I encourage teachers to support the school by appealing to their values.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I ask for feedback on how my actions affect teachers’ job satisfaction.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I demonstrate a personal passion for Judaic knowledge.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I give teachers full latitude to choose a path for accomplishing educational goals.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I appeal to my faculty to share the school’s vision of Jewish life.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I solicit feedback from parents.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I help teachers reach their professional development goals.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I make myself visible in classrooms and hallways all day long.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I talk to teachers about the importance of infusing Jewish values into the classroom culture.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I exhibit a passion for contributing to the Jewish community above and beyond my job responsibilities.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I make myself available throughout the day to meet with students, teachers, and parents.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I greet students and their parents as they arrive at school.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I implement my teachers’ ideas and suggestions.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I help teachers understand how their teaching supports the schools’ vision.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I develop cooperative relationships among my staff.  
I model character values in my personal interactions with students and adults.  
I talk with students throughout the day in the hallways, classrooms, and cafeteria.  
I initiate dialogues with stakeholders (e.g., teachers, parents, community members) to reflect on school practices from a variety of perspectives.

10. In your opinion, what leadership practices are both effective and consistent with the mission of your school? 
_____________________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________________

11. In your opinion, is this school’s capacity to provide instruction hindered by any of the following? 
☐ A lack of qualified teachers  
☐ A lack of instructional support personnel (e.g., assistant teachers)  
☐ Shortage or inadequacy of instructional materials (e.g., textbooks)  
☐ Shortage or inadequacy of technology capacity (e.g., computers, internet connection, Smart Boards)  
☐ Shortage or inadequacy of facilities  
☐ Other (please specify)  ________________________________________________________________________

12. Please rate your satisfaction with the following aspects of your job.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Professional growth opportunities for you.</th>
<th>Very Satisfied</th>
<th>Moderately Satisfied</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Moderately Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Very Dissatisfied</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Your autonomy to make decisions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adequacy of administrative support provided for you.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relations with the school board.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relations with the parents of your school.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relations with the teachers of your school.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13. For each of the topics listed below, please tell us about your professional development (PD) during the last five years (i.e., since 2010)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Setting goals for students’ Jewish growth.</th>
<th>Received PD</th>
<th>The PD Was Helpful</th>
<th>This Topic is High Priority for My Future PD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assessing students’ Jewish growth.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhancing the tefilah (prayer) experience.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing a Tanakh curriculum.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing an Israel education curriculum.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Developing a Hebrew language curriculum.

Integrating character education into the curriculum.

Designing experiential Jewish education.

Creating school-wide cross-curricular Jewish learning programs.

Other topic (please specify if received PD, PD was helpful, or topic is high priority)

14. Please name one recent professional development (program or practice) that you found highly helpful in preparing you to promote students’ Jewish growth.

_____________________________________________________________________________________________

15. 17. About how long have you been in your current position?

- □ 1 year or less
- □ 2–3 years
- □ 4–6 years
- □ 7–10 years
- □ 11–20 years
- □ More than 20 years

16. In a typical week, about how many hours do you dedicate to each of the following activities?

- Administrative tasks (e.g., enrollment management, budgeting) ________ hours
- Observing teachers in the classroom ________ hours
- Curriculum planning and development ________ hours
- Teaching in the classroom ________ hours
- Meeting with parents ________ hours
- Providing or planning staff professional development ________ hours
## Organizational Characteristics of Schools Included in the Survey Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average school size</td>
<td>330 students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average number of administrators per school</td>
<td>6 people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of schools in New York and New Jersey</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of suburban schools</td>
<td>50% (remainder: 49% urban and 1% rural)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average student-to-teacher ratio</td>
<td>8:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of schools that include Grades K–5</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of coeducational schools</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average number of days in a school year</td>
<td>179 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average number of affiliations with school networks</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average number of hours in a school day</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of school heads affiliated with a local community of practice or network</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average annual tuition in 2014–15</td>
<td>$18,850</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Jewish Educational Leadership Measure: Subscale Reliability, Means, and Standard Deviations

Educational Leaders Responses to the Survey Question: “How frequently do you engage in each of the following behaviors?”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor Loadings</th>
<th>Overall</th>
<th>Centrist Orthodox</th>
<th>Modern Orthodox</th>
<th>Schechter</th>
<th>Community</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Promote a Vision for Jewish Living and Learning (Cronbach’s α = .83)</td>
<td>4.10 (0.73)</td>
<td>4.32 (0.62)</td>
<td>4.19 (0.71)</td>
<td>3.96 (0.60)</td>
<td>3.97 (0.69)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I demonstrate a personal passion for Judaic knowledge.</td>
<td>.804</td>
<td>-1.39</td>
<td>.035</td>
<td>4.26 (0.92)</td>
<td>4.60 (0.59)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I articulate how my actions are guided by my Jewish knowledge and values.</td>
<td>.821</td>
<td>-.001</td>
<td>-.022</td>
<td>4.21 (0.90)</td>
<td>4.45 (0.85)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I try to understand what being Jewish means to my students.</td>
<td>.641</td>
<td>.161</td>
<td>.011</td>
<td>4.20 (0.95)</td>
<td>4.43 (0.75)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I appeal to my faculty to share the school’s vision of Jewish life.</td>
<td>.588</td>
<td>.429</td>
<td>-.093</td>
<td>4.11 (1.00)</td>
<td>4.30 (0.99)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I exhibit a passion for contributing to the Jewish community beyond my job responsibilities.</td>
<td>.725</td>
<td>-.062</td>
<td>.332</td>
<td>3.98 (1.08)</td>
<td>4.05 (0.96)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I talk to teachers about the importance of infusing Jewish values into the classroom culture.</td>
<td>.767</td>
<td>.217</td>
<td>-.008</td>
<td>3.82 (1.02)</td>
<td>4.00 (0.87)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 2. Enable Teachers’ Learning and Professional Growth (Cronbach’s α = .76) | 4.14 (0.59) | 4.08 (0.70) | 4.25 (0.61) | 4.25 (0.54) | 4.17 (0.55) |
| I develop cooperative relationships among my staff. | -.003 | .594 | .285 | 4.46 (0.65) | 4.16 (0.82) | 4.51 (0.60) | 4.56 (0.56) | 4.55 (0.61) |
| I help teachers reach their professional development goals. | -.027 | .716 | .178 | 4.23 (0.76) | 4.05 (0.95) | 4.27 (0.74) | 4.44 (0.61) | 4.26 (0.77) |
| I implement my teachers’ ideas and suggestions. | -.010 | .579 | .275 | 4.23 (0.61) | 4.00 (0.70) | 4.37 (0.56) | 4.19 (0.53) | 4.22 (0.59) |
| I encourage teachers to support the school by appealing to their values. | .516 | .544 | -.122 | 4.14 (0.86) | 4.27 (0.72) | 4.24 (0.92) | 4.03 (0.85) | 4.18 (0.73) |
| I make myself visible in classrooms and hallways all day long. | -.056 | .486 | .295 | 4.10 (0.86) | 4.25 (0.90) | 4.07 (0.91) | 4.31 (0.86) | 3.94 (0.83) |
| I help teachers understand how their teaching supports the schools’ vision. | .194 | .656 | .270 | 4.09 (0.79) | 3.76 (0.88) | 4.09 (0.85) | 4.19 (0.71) | 4.12 (0.74) |
| I ask for feedback on how my actions affect teachers’ job satisfaction. | .137 | .649 | .045 | 3.70 (0.99) | 3.40 (1.15) | 3.66 (0.94) | 3.69 (1.04) | 3.93 (0.84) |

| 3. Interact With the School Community (Cronbach’s α = .64) | 4.42 (0.48) | 4.42 (0.50) | 4.42 (0.48) | 4.57 (0.39) | 4.40 (0.49) |
| I model character values in my personal interactions with students and adults. | -.050 | .149 | .582 | 4.79 (0.44) | 4.76 (0.73) | 4.68 (0.51) | 4.94 (0.23) | 4.81 (0.43) |
| I make myself available throughout the day to meet with students, teachers, and parents. | -.090 | .077 | .548 | 4.79 (0.43) | 4.87 (0.34) | 4.75 (0.43) | 4.28 (0.97) | 4.70 (0.55) |
| I talk with students throughout the day in the hallways, classrooms, and cafeteria. | .026 | .077 | .739 | 4.68 (0.52) | 4.68 (0.53) | 4.65 (0.52) | 4.86 (0.35) | 4.61 (0.57) |
| I initiate dialogues with stakeholders (e.g., teachers, parents, community members) to reflect on school practices from a variety of perspectives. | .194 | .275 | .613 | 4.01 (0.85) | 4.03 (0.82) | 3.95 (0.88) | 4.28 (0.74) | 3.96 (0.92) |
| I solicit feedback from parents. | .174 | .445 | .430 | 3.81 (0.91) | 3.60 (0.96) | 3.88 (0.98) | 3.92 (0.94) | 3.94 (0.75) |

---

79 (a) Respondents rated the items on a 5-point scale: 5 = Very Frequently; 1 = Rarely or Seldom. (b) Two items had low loadings (less than 0.30) on all factors and were removed from the analysis. These items are: “I give teachers full latitude to choose a path for accomplishing educational goals” (mean = 4.01, standard deviation = 0.83); and “I greet students and their parents as they arrive to school” (mean = 4.10, standard deviation = 1.15). (c) Descriptive statistics are provided for the four largest groups of schools by denominational classification. Statistics for Reform, Immigrant/Outreach, and Yeshiva are available from the study authors upon request. (d) Sample size in parentheses represents number of schools. (e) Number of schools included in the analysis: Overall: 294; Centrist Orthodox: 50; Modern Orthodox: 74; Schechter: 40; Community: 84. (f) Factor loadings show statistical relations of items to factors (practices). Factor Loadings column headers: 1 denotes Articulate a Vision; 2 denotes Promote Teacher Learning; 3 denotes Interact With the School Community. Numbers in bold font show classification under the respective practice. (g) Cronbach’s α indicates internal consistency or highly correlated survey items. Cronbach’s α higher than .60 indicates a reliable measure of the practice.
The Relationship Between Working Conditions Factors and Leadership Practices

D.1. Univariate Analysis of Variance Results: Promoting the School's Vision for Jewish Living and Learning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variable</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>df Error</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job satisfaction with relations with teachers (moderate, high)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>&lt; .10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job satisfaction with relations with parents (moderate, high)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>&lt; .05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years in current position (&lt;2; 2–3; 4–6; 7–10; 11–20; &gt;20)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td>&lt; .08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional development (last 5 years): Setting goals for students’ Jewish growth (participated; did not participate)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>7.07</td>
<td>&lt; .01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional development (last 5 years): Assessing students’ Jewish growth (participated; did not participate)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>&lt; .05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional development (last 5 years): Developing a Tanakh curriculum (participated; did not participate)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>6.11</td>
<td>&lt; .05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional development (last 5 years): Developing a Hebrew language curriculum (participated; did not participate)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>7.32</td>
<td>&lt; .01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional development (last 5 years): Integrating character education into the curriculum (participated; did not participate)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>5.90</td>
<td>&lt; .05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional development (last 5 years): Enhancing the tefilah (prayer) experience (participated; did not participate)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>3.99</td>
<td>&lt; .05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional development (last 5 years): Developing an Israel education curriculum (participated; did not participate)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>&lt; .07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional development (last 5 years): Designing experiential Jewish education (participated; did not participate)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>5.67</td>
<td>&lt; .05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### D.2. Univariate Analysis of Variance Results: Enabling Teachers’ Professional Development and Growth

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variable</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>df Error</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job satisfaction with relations with parents (moderate, high)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>8.56</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job satisfaction with administrative support (moderate, high)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>11.41</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job satisfaction with own professional growth (moderate, high)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>13.30</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job satisfaction with autonomy to make decisions (moderate, high)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td>&lt;.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job satisfaction with relations with the board (moderate, high)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>9.50</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of hours per week observing teachers (≤2, 3–7, ≥8)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>12.96</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of hours per week working with teachers (≤2, 3–7, ≥8)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>15.93</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of hours per week curriculum planning (≤2, 3–7, ≥8)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of hours per week meeting with parents (≤2, 3–7, ≥8)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>7.84</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational technology (adequate, shortage)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>&lt;.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities (adequate, shortage)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>&lt;.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School size (small: ≤250 students; moderate: 251–500 students; large: &gt;500 students)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>4.48</td>
<td>&lt;.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building a caring school community (part of school mission; not part of school mission)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>&lt;.08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### D.3. Univariate Analysis of Variance Results: Interacting With the School Community to Address Interests and Needs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variable</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>df Error</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job satisfaction with relations with parents (moderate, high)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>20.36</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job satisfaction with administrative support (moderate, high)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>5.10</td>
<td>&lt;.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job satisfaction with own professional growth (moderate, high)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>17.63</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job satisfaction with relations with the board (moderate, high)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>11.08</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of hours per week observing teachers (≤2, 3–7, ≥8)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>5.05</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of hours per week curriculum planning (≤2, 3–7, ≥8)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>6.16</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of hours per week meeting with parents (≤2, 3–7, ≥8)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>12.85</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job responsibilities (overseeing the entire curriculum; overseeing part of the curriculum)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>8.02</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building a caring school community (part of school mission; not part of school mission)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>15.39</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>