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About this Report

The Collaborative for Applied Studies in Jewish Education (CASJE) is a community of researchers, practitioners, and policymakers dedicated to improving the quality of knowledge that can be used to guide Jewish education and learning. CASJE is committed to developing high quality research that is responsive to critical questions across diverse sectors in Jewish education. CASJE’s programmatic and fiduciary home is located at the George Washington University’s Graduate School of Education and Human Development (GSEHD).

This report is the last in a series of publications that shares findings from the CASJE Career Trajectories of Jewish Educators Study. The larger CASJE study seeks to understand the recruitment, retention and development of Jewish educators in the United States. You can read more about this study at www.casje.org.

The Career Trajectories Study is organized around four central research questions:

1. Preparing for Entry
2. On the Journey
3. Mapping the Marketplace
4. The Census

**Mapping the Market** looks at the labor market for Jewish education in the United States, analyzing both supply-side and demand-side data to understand what employers look for in Jewish educators and how pre-service and professional development programs prepare educators to meet the needs of the learners and communities they serve.
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Executive Summary

Mapping the Market explores the work of Jewish educators in the context of a labor marketplace. It focuses on both the demand side of that marketplace (i.e. the institutions that employ Jewish educators) and the supply side (i.e. the programs and institutions that prepare or support Jewish educators). Demand-side data (including a survey, interviews, and job description analyses) come from 219 employers in eight communities of widely differing size across the United States. Supply-side data come from interviews with and a survey of thirty-seven degree-granting and non-degree granting providers of training and professional development.

Key Findings

Demand Side of the Marketplace

The study finds that the marketplace for Jewish educators is so fragmented and diverse, it is meaningless to conceive of it as a single labor market. The scale of the challenge in finding and hiring educators is connected to the size of the staff roster to be filled, the extent of turnover in organizations, and ultimately the talent pool available to meet the specific responsibilities associated with positions to be filled. Location is just a small part of the hiring challenge.

The staffing challenge is most acute in supplementary schools. The narrative about a personnel crisis in Jewish education may have been fueled by the experiences of employers in this sector, historically and still the largest provider of Jewish education.

Reflecting the fragmentation of the market, employers look for widely different qualities and capacities in the Jewish educators they hire. Depending on the sector, and the extent to which they conceive of their work as education or engagement, employers may prioritize the personal/dispositional characteristics of those they employ (who educators are), the relational (how educators interact with others), or the professional/technical (what those educators know and can do). What employers look for in their hires strongly influences how and where they search for talent, more so than where, geographically, their organization is located.

If the public education marketplace is characterized by localism, then for some venues of Jewish education (supplementary schools, early childhood centers, and JCCs) the catchment area being tapped may be even smaller—domestic rather than local. In these settings, even in the larger communities, there is rarely more than one degree of separation between the employer and the candidate. Reflecting this extreme localism, few organizations share public details about salaries and benefits in their job postings. With word of mouth such a common hiring pipeline, there is a pervasive lack of transparency about what new hires are being offered.

Once educators are hired, the form and content of the professional development they access can be traced to how challenging it was to hire them in the first place. In organizations that select from a surfeit of candidates, professional development serves to sustain the personal and intellectual growth of team members rather than to improve their core competencies. Among organizations that struggle to hire optimal candidates, professional development takes on more of an educative or even remedial function. Generally, there is limited demand for broadly conceived pre-service or in-service development offerings.
Supply Side of the Marketplace
On the supply-side of the marketplace, more students are graduating each year from degree programs in Jewish education than was the case the last time this field was reviewed, in 1989. This growth is due to the emergence of specialty programs in different subfields of Jewish education. Most tertiary-level institutions have seen a contraction in the number of students graduating with a general degree in Jewish education.

Given the high retail price of a high-quality degree in Jewish education, few students enroll without substantial subsidization. Consequently, the ups and downs of this segment of the marketplace are heavily contingent on the extent to which programs can attract philanthropic funding.

Today there is a robust industry of independent providers of professional development in Jewish education competing in a busy marketplace, in contrast to twenty years ago when most professional development was provided by central agencies. With low overheads, these independent providers can develop new products quickly, unconstrained by sunk costs.

The programs that populate the burgeoning marketplace are very much aligned with cultivating what the great bulk of employers seek in their Jewish educators: the personal/dispositional and the relational rather than the professional/technical. These characteristics are anchored in engagement-oriented skills. However, in a small countervailing trend, the forms and content of high-quality adult Jewish learning have become a template for the professional development of educators. This trend reflects a broader phenomenon of organizations evolving from providing direct services to consumers of Jewish education to empowering retailers of Jewish education.

In recent years, federated entities have developed their own internal capacities to serve their staff, employing a corporate university model to offer a suite of structured learning opportunities to professionals in their orbit. This phenomenon reflects the specialization and sectorialization of the professional development marketplace.

Overall, this exploration of the Jewish educator landscape illuminates how diversified Jewish education has become in recent times. In some sectors it is more fitting to describe the work of Jewish education as that of Jewish engagement, an activity centered on fostering a connection to Jewish life and living. In other places, Jewish education continues to be concerned with cultivating cultural literacy and religious or ethnic commitment. These profoundly different goals drive what employers look for in their staff, and these goals, more than where an employer is located in the country or in what size community, determine how challenging it is to find appropriate personnel.

The dynamic state of the supply side of the Jewish educator marketplace is symptomatic of this diversification in the marketplace. In fact, the dynamism of the supply side of the landscape may itself be an indicator of the extent to which supply-side institutions are adapting to changes in the broader field even while adaptation of this kind is painful, especially for those who have been around longest.
Introduction

Why Study the Marketplace for Jewish Educators?

Education is an intensely personal endeavor. Becoming a teacher is, as Jane Danielewicz puts it, “an identity forming process whereby individuals define themselves and are viewed by others as teachers.” At the same time, education is also a form of work. When conducted as paid labor, it is a commodity. As such, like other commodities, “its value is driven less by intrinsic worth than by market demand.”

CASJE’s exploration of the career trajectories of Jewish educators echoes these two concepts. Two research strands, Preparing for Entry and On the Journey, examine what draws individuals to become Jewish educators and the journeys they take once they make this choice. A third strand, Mapping the Market, explores the work of the Jewish educator in the context of a labor marketplace. The focus is not on individual educators and their internal landscape but on the external landscape, the employment marketplace in which educators work. In this strand, we examine both those who employ educators and what they look for in their employees (the demand side of the marketplace) and the institutions that prepare educators and support them in their work (the supply side).

As is the case, in all three strands of CASJE’s study of the career trajectories of Jewish educators, we define ”Jewish educators” as paid professionals who work directly with people of any age who identify as Jews, in settings—whether virtual, brick-and-mortar, or outdoor—that aim to help participants find special meaning in Jewish texts, experiences, and associations (even if some who are engaged in these efforts may themselves use terms like “Jewish engagement” or “Jewish meaning-making” to describe their work).

While there is extensive research about the individuals who work as Jewish educators, and while there have also been periodic explorations of their career trajectories, much less is known about the marketplace in which Jewish educators work. This is a field where the last major studies were conducted two and three decades ago when the institutional landscape was quite different—when, for example, major Jewish communities supported their own Hebrew college or bureau-affiliated accreditation programs to prepare new educators for the field. Many of these institutions and programs have disappeared from the landscape over the course of the last fifteen years. Until the launch of this new study, we haven’t known in any systematic fashion how difficult it is for employers today—across the various sectors of Jewish education—to recruit new hires, what they look for in those hires, where and how they find staff, and what support they expect their new employees to need in order to perform their jobs adequately. We have also lacked current information about how the institutions that train Jewish educators are organized in relation to the personnel needs of the field’s various sectors.

To offer an example of one such gap in our knowledge: various studies have established that the marketplace for public school teachers is highly localized. More than 75% of teachers prepare to enter the field and take up positions within the states where they reside; where, geographically, one attends college is a strong predictor of where one takes up a first job. There’s similar evidence of this localism in the fact that teacher shortages in most subjects vary greatly from state to state if not from district to district. In short, many aspects of the public school, teacher marketplace simply aren’t consistent across the nation.

2 Davenport, 2017.
4 Sutcher et al., 2019.
5 Krieg et al., 2016.
6 Moore-Johnson, 2019
And yet, we don’t know how relevant any of these phenomena are to the field of Jewish education. Does, for example, the preparation and recruitment of Jewish educators for college campuses or summer camps function in the same localized way? It seems unlikely. What about the day school marketplace, which at least pertains to teachers, rather than educators more generally? When there are so few locally constituted programs for pre-service teacher preparation, do teachers find their way to jobs in Jewish schools in an analogous fashion to public school teachers?

Better information about these matters could contribute to data-informed innovations on both the demand and supply sides of the educator marketplace. Such innovations might include, for example, smarter sector-relevant interventions for the recruitment of better prepared Jewish educators; newly designed professional development services aligned with the diverse roles Jewish educators are expected to perform in different venues; or the development of sustainable business models for the preparation and professional development of educators at different stages of their careers.

At present, lacking systematically gathered data, labor-market solutions are developed on the basis of unexamined assumptions about what challenges the field of Jewish education as a whole and what interventions work in other educational sectors beyond Jewish education. Market forces can be irresistible; applied research can contribute to solutions that ameliorate their most brutal consequences and utilize their most promising opportunities.

**What We Studied**

Given how little is known about the Jewish education labor market today, the first task of this study was to provide basic descriptive data. We set out to document what is happening on the ground across various types of communal and institutional contexts, for both the demand and supply sides of the marketplace. Then, having documented these phenomena, we sought to determine how well matched the needs of employers are with the activities and expectations of the institutions that prepare educators for the work of Jewish education in all its various forms.

Specifically, the study was constructed to address the following demand-side questions, relating to the needs and practices of employers:

1. How challenging do employers find it to recruit new Jewish educators?
2. What do employers look for in the Jewish educators they hire?
3. How and where do employers find the Jewish educators they hire?
4. What professional development do employers provide for their staff once they are hired?

On the supply side, relating to the institutions preparing and professionally developing educators, we ask:

5. What are the programs that are training today’s and tomorrow’s Jewish educators?
6. What markets do these programs serve and what imagined Jewish educator roles are they designed to prepare/support?

Finally, exploring the interaction of the demand and supply sides, we ask:

7. How well matched are the needs of employers with the expectations and efforts of professional preparation and training programs?
Sample and Methods

Demand Side

Consistent with the other strands of CASJE’s career trajectory study, we conceive the institutions on the demand side of the marketplace to be organized within the following sectors, each of which is made up of educationally distinct venues.

**Sector 1: Formal Jewish Education**: Day schools, supplemental and afterschool programs, and early childhood centers.

**Sector 2: Informal/Experiential Settings**: Day camps, residential camps, Jewish community centers, youth-serving organizations, and campus organizations.

**Sector 3: Engagement, Social Justice, And Innovation**: National organizations such as Honeymoon Israel, OneTable, Moishe House, Repair the World, Avodah, and Hazon.

**Sector 4: Communal Institutions And Agencies**: Federations, Jewish Community Relations Councils, and Jewish Vocational and Family Services.

**Sector 5: Non-Organizational Networks**: Predominantly made up of self-employed individuals.  

Data for this report pertaining to Sector 1 and Sector 2 institutions were gathered from employers in eight communities selected to represent a range of sizes of Jewish populations and diverse geographic regions of the United States. As with the *On the Journey* study, Jewish educational organizations from across the community were included other than those that exclusively serve Haredi (ultra-Orthodox) families. The participating communities were: Austin, TX; Boston, MA; Chicago, IL; Detroit, MI; Las Vegas, NV; Miami-Dade, FL; Nassau and Westchester Counties, NY; and San Francisco Bay Area, CA. These same eight communities participated in the *On the Journey* study. Effectively, therefore, this work functions as a form of multiple case study analysis.

In these eight communities, data were gathered through a mix of qualitative and quantitative methods. First, through eighteen exploratory employer focus groups and six key informant interviews, we assembled a preliminary picture of the central issues pertaining to the demand side of the educator marketplace. The focus group protocol can be viewed in Appendix C.

Data from these interviews were then mined in order to develop an employer survey subsequently sent to a “convenience sample” of 865 individuals identified as being responsible for hiring educators in Sector 1 and Sector 2 institutions across the eight communities. There were 219 responses to the survey, a response rate of 25%. The survey was designed to explore the demand-side questions listed above and, where relevant, included items from existing, validated, and/or commonly used measures that explore the constructs of interest in this strand of the study. The survey can be viewed in Appendix D. See Appendix A for descriptive information about the makeup of the sample, including organizational type, denominational

---

7 This study does not include this sector because it does not involve both an employer and employee in a conventional sense.

8 While the sample includes a wide variety of communities, it does not include the smallest Jewish communities in the United States, what can be called “one shul towns.” We recognize that in such places, there might be just one or two Jewish educators in the community, probably working as volunteers. In these places, the educator marketplace likely functions differently from even the smallest communities in our sample. It would be worthwhile to conduct a follow-up study in communities of this size.

9 As with the *On the Journey* study, rather than employ a national approach, for reasons of efficiency, we gathered data from a purposive sample of communities with the specific intent of exploring the extent to which community size was a factor in the educator labor market and in the career trajectories of educators. We learned that in both instances, educational venue and sector are far more influential variables than community size or location.

10 Stake, 2013.
affiliation, size in terms of total number of employees, number of Jewish educators employed, and numbers of participants served by the organization.

As part of an additional layer of qualitative data gathering, all of the employers to whom surveys were sent were asked to share Jewish educator job announcements they had posted during the past twelve months. These announcements were submitted to textual analysis with the goal of exploring how the work of a Jewish educator is conceived, the kinds of prior experiences seen as relevant to such work, and the terms and conditions being offered in different sectors. We received ninety such postings from fifty-nine institutions.

There are only a few dozen institutions in Sector 3 and Sector 4 that employ Jewish educators in the eight participating communities. Some of these institutions are nationally rather than locally based, meaning that the same personnel might service more than one of the eight communities in our sample. Because of the much smaller numeric size of these sectors, and because of their more national reach, employers in these sectors were not surveyed. Instead, we conducted twenty interviews with the individuals ultimately responsible for hiring Jewish educators in these organizations. The interview protocol can be viewed in Appendix E.

Supply Side

Finally, three methods were employed to explore the research questions concerned with the supply side of the Jewish educator labor market: (1) A content analysis of providers’ websites as pertaining to their professional development and educator preparation offerings; (2) Interviews with program directors at all of these institutions designed to explore what imagined roles such programs prepare participants for, what markets they serve, and the nature of their relationships with employers; and (3) An online inventory completed by program directors at all of these institutions regarding the goals, signature pedagogies, content foci, audiences served, and cost of their programs, as well as the numbers of educators they serve each year.

These quantitative and qualitative data were gathered from thirty-seven supply-side institutions identified by Sector 1, 2, 3, and 4 employers and by other informants as the primary providers of educator preparation and professional development services to the field of Jewish education. The providers identified do not include all those who make up the supply side of the Jewish educator marketplace. They also do not include programs geared to the preparation of organizational leaders, nor do they include organizations whose primary function is curriculum production, development, or delivery. But they do constitute, in the eyes of employers, the most significant Jewish contributors to the educator marketplace. The interview protocol and program inventory can be viewed in Appendix F and G. An analytical map of the provider landscape derived from these data can viewed in Appendix H and online at casje.org/map.
Demand-Side Findings

How Challenging Do Employers Find It to Recruit New Jewish Educators?

KEY FINDINGS: The marketplace for Jewish educators is so fragmented and diverse, it is meaningless to conceive of a single labor market for Jewish educators. The scale of the challenge in finding and hiring educators is connected to the size of the staff roster to be filled, the extent of turnover in organizations, and ultimately the talent pool available to meet the specific responsibilities associated with positions to be filled. Location is just one small part of the hiring challenge.

It can be impossible. It could be the day before Hebrew school is going to start and you still don’t have the teacher for a class. Or it could be that you have to be so inventive to make sure that every class is covered in some way, that you’re always trying to juggle and think about and figure out in a consistent way—even when it’s not the hiring time. It’s very, very stressful.

—Director, Supplementary School

We’ve never had that problem of not having someone appropriate. In the last few months, we’ve had people send us names…. We don’t have an issue of, we don’t know where to go…. It’s an organic process, people bring others in. We might say we’re looking for this or that, a skill set, an event, whatever. We have such an eclectic group, excited to bring their network in.

—Executive, National Innovation Organization

The discourse on Jewish education has long been shaped by a narrative of scarcity, of a looming “personnel crisis,” and of “a severe shortage of talented, trained and committed personnel for the field of Jewish education.”11 In reality, the situation today is much more uneven, depending on the sector in question and specifically the interplay between three factors: the number and proportion of Jewish educators on an organization’s roster, the frequency of staff turnover, and the availability of replacements. Some venues experience a perfect storm where all of these issues are challenging, while others seem to inhabit much calmer waters where no one factor is really a source of turbulence.

Roster Size

The staffing structures of Jewish organizations differ markedly across different sectors of Jewish education. Some national or community-level organizations—such as Federations or Jewish engagement organizations—include just a handful of Jewish educators on their staff, who in turn constitute a small proportion of their total payroll. At the opposite extreme, there are providers of Jewish education—youth-serving organizations and early childhood centers, for example—where more than half of the staff are regarded as Jewish educators. The size of these specific organizations may vary, but the fact that so many of the staff are Jewish educators can create stress when new hires are needed. Finally, another kind of mix is possible: organizations such as day schools and overnight camps often employ large numbers of Jewish educators in a wide variety of roles, but these individuals make up a minority of overall staff rosters that also include general

educators and technical specialists. In objective terms, these organizations may have to secure the services of many Jewish educators at any one time, but the task of filling these positions may pale compared with larger staffing challenges. (Exhibit 1 shows some of these variations among survey respondents from Sector 1 and Sector 2 venues, that is, institutions for formal and informal Jewish education.)

Exhibit 1: Average Staff Size at Survey Respondent Organizations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Average Staff Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Day School</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplemental School</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preschool/ECE</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camp</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Group</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Campus</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JCC</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Turnover

On their own, staff size and the proportion of Jewish educators who make up that staff do not determine how challenging it is to maintain a full complement of Jewish educators. In fact, the challenges associated with hiring new staff are just as likely to be driven by how long current staff stay with a program or institution, though occasionally the need to hire can be fueled by organizational growth rather than turnover. The survey of Sector 1 and Sector 2 employers reveals a great deal of variability in respect to staff turnover. As seen in Exhibit 2, the highest turnover is in the camping sector, where most staff are seasonal employees, and in youth-serving organizations, where staff invariably age out. In these cases, almost all staff leave within three years. Turnover in day schools is much lower and is in line with levels reported among public school teachers.\(^ \text{12} \) In this setting, half of new hires leave within five years, though interestingly (but not shown here), turnover is greater among general studies faculty than among Judaic studies faculty.

Interview data from leaders of Jewish social justice and innovation organizations (Sector 3) reveal that many organizations hire along two tracks: one for intern-like positions or fellowships, involving short tenures of a year or two, and one for “permanent” positions, where individuals typically stay for much longer. As previously noted, Jewish educators make up a relatively small part of their staff; other staff are usually organizers, coordinators, recruiters, technical specialists, and the like. These organizations therefore need to hire very few educators at one time, and in some years, don’t have to make any such hires at all. These programs often have a niche appeal, too, especially among their own alumni, which smooths the task of finding new personnel. Against the backdrop of talk about a general shortage of Jewish educators, some interviewees from this sector attributed their relative successes to the distinctive appeal or strengths of their own organization (as in the first quotation below). In fact, their success in this respect may have more to do with the labor market advantages afforded by the sector in which they operate than the talent-seeking adeptness of their leadership.

\(^ {12} \) Ingersoll et al., 2018.
We don’t have positions open often. We have interns every year in graduate school….When there’s a class of graduating students, there’s always people there. And now we have a community of thousands of alumni. So we don’t have a problem recruiting. But we’re a bit of a different organization, we’re idiosyncratic.

—CEO, National Provider

When we do post, we get a flood of applicants. Sometimes they’re people who are in a classroom and want a next step. We don’t hire that often so it’s not a big focus. Talent growth has generally been organic, based on need.

—Director, National Provider

In organizations with larger numbers of Jewish educators on staff, the stresses involved in maintaining a full complement of team members are acute, especially when the rates of turnover are high. This is most notably the case in supplementary schools where a higher proportion of staff serve as frontline Jewish educators. There can be a lot of positions to keep filled. We surmise that the narrative about the personnel crisis in Jewish education may have been fueled by the experiences of employers in this sector, historically the largest provider of Jewish education and still heavily reliant on volunteer educators. Although some congregational schools seemed to have squared the circle—they’re in the right location, their congregational leaders have a special appeal, or they can draw on large congregant pools for appropriate candidates—others (likely most) are engaged in a perpetual struggle to maintain their rosters.\(^\text{13}\) No wonder some describe themselves as dependent on miracles to maintain a full complement of faculty.

---

\(^{13}\) We suspect that this challenge is even more acute in the smallest communities, such as those not included in this study.
I feel like in every school year I’ve had, there’s always, like, some miracle human that shows up to fill the position that’s empty and it may not always be before the first day of school, but it’s enough to fill out the year. I know that many other educators who do this work also feel the same way, but somehow the position always gets filled and I don’t know if that’s because we all unconsciously bend our standards or whatever. Miraculously, there’s always enough teachers for the students.

—Director, Supplementary School

I hired someone this year three days before the start of the school and had to let her go in December and find somebody else. How long was that position open? I don’t know. It was always open; I just had a warm body in there for a little while.

—Director, Supplementary School

Survey data confirm that employers in this venue are indeed having to replace higher proportions of their staff each year than those in any other venue. As Exhibit 3 shows, just under half of supplementary schools report needing to replace more than 50% of their Jewish educator staff each year. To provide some context, not one day school head who responded to the survey reported having to do so; 86% of day school respondents reported replacing between none and a quarter of their Jewish education staff each year.

Exhibit 3: Proportion of Supplementary School Educators Replaced Every Year (n = 109)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>35%</td>
<td>0%-25% of staff replaced every year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20%</td>
<td>26%-50% of staff replaced every year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12%</td>
<td>51%-75% of staff replaced every year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33%</td>
<td>75%-100% of staff replaced every year</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When Turnover Interacts with the Talent Pool

The case of supplementary Jewish education helps indicate how the mix of factors that contribute to staff recruitment challenges varies by sector and venue. In recent years, hourly pay in supplemental schools has become quite competitive (see On the Journey “Compensation” brief), but for the vast majority who work in this venue the work is part time or something they do as volunteers. If people can find opportunities to work elsewhere for longer hours, and perhaps for pay, they’ll take it. This a large part of what accounts for the high levels of turnover. To take another example: in youth-serving organizations, high levels of turnover derive from the wide disparity between the number of entry-level jobs and the smaller number of high-level jobs. As an interviewee from this sector put it, “there’s a shelf life to a lot of these jobs, right…if we’re retaining people past three years, that’s not the norm.” While frustrating, this phenomenon does not mean that employers find it especially hard to recruit frontline youth professionals. There is always a robust number of interested candidates for such positions.
In day schools, the special challenge when it comes to staffing is less about turnover and more about finding people with specialized skill sets (especially in higher grades). Both interviewees and survey respondents from this venue highlighted the challenges of finding Hebrew teachers as a strong instance of this phenomenon. They may find hiring challenging, but that's less about the quantity of personnel they have to hire and more about the qualities they seek. These circumstances all stand in contrast to what we found among Sector 3 and Sector 4 employers, for example in the social justice, innovation, or emergent adult Jewish engagement fields. Most of these employers are not looking for specialists and are therefore able to draw from a deeper pool. They also keep people longer, because they typically offer full-time work and maintain cultures in which people see opportunities for growth. It is no wonder they find the task of employee recruitment less challenging.

Rounding out this area of our inquiry is the case of early childhood education. The venue presents a paradox. Focus groups with early childhood directors paint a bleak picture of the low levels of benefits in this venue.

I mean, I've been teaching 44 years. I have no benefits of any kind whatsoever. There’s no 401(k), there’s no pension. I mean, when I finish teaching eventually, I will have a basement full of supplies and things—and memories and that’s it.

—Director, Early Childhood Center

Our whole staff is like that, you know. They have a second income. We have one divorced woman who relies on this salary, and we have another woman who is about 50, who has two children and lives with her parents so she could make it on the preschool salary.

—Director, Early Childhood Center

These are acutely challenging conditions, and yet, as seen in Exhibit 2 above, average lengths of tenure in this venue are relatively high. Although few teaching assistants stay for long, more than half of early childhood teachers remain with their employers for more than five years; some stay for decades. Employers also imply that it is not so difficult to find new recruits. In fact, some employers even confess to talking candidates out of doing this work because of how financially challenging it will be. Confirming findings from the On the Journey study, staff are willing to tolerate these conditions either because they’re not the primary breadwinners in their families; because of the convenient alignment between this work and their family lives, especially when so much of the work is part time; or, more elusively, because they formed bonds with these workplaces when their own children were younger, and they simply stay. Whatever the reasons, staffing up is less of a challenge than could have been expected given the pay and benefits offered.

**An Integrated Picture**

The interplay between the factors discussed in this section can be summarized as in Exhibit 4.

On the basis of this summary, it seems that the most decisive factor in determining the scale of the recruitment challenge is not roster size or turnover but the size of the talent pool. When the talent pool is deep, recruitment is less challenging even when staff turnover is high or numerous positions need to be filled at any one time. And the depth of the talent pool is strongly connected both to specificity of the positions to be filled and the availability of program alumni as potential recruits. In turn, these variables are influenced by one more circumstance: where in the country an employer is located. As became clear from focus groups with Sector 1 leaders especially, the size of
a community makes a great deal of difference to employers’ expectations of the talent they might find, in particular if the position is one for which potential staff are unlikely to relocate. A focus group participant put it like this:

“I’ve lived in many different places: New York, Los Angeles, and now I am in Texas. Previously, teaching experience was always necessary for me [when making a selection]. Now, in this town, I’m not going to get a teacher. That’s not a possibility.”

—Director, Supplemental School

But, for all of the discomfort conveyed by these words, it is misleading to associate educator recruitment challenges too closely with the idiosyncrasies of geographic location. The data reported in this section indicate the extent to which the challenge of recruitment is interwoven with systemic and structural features in the marketplace of Jewish education as well as the goals of Jewish education in those sectors. Location is just one part of the story.

What Do Employers Look for in the Jewish Educators They Hire?

**KEY FINDINGS:** Employers are not in the market for the same “commodities.” Depending on the sector, and the extent to which they conceive of their work as education or engagement, they’re likely to prioritize the personal/dispositional characteristics of those they employ (who educators are), the relational (how educators interact with others), or the professional/technical (what those educators know and can do).

*We had 70 applications for a Jewish educator spot. It’s super hard to whittle it down to someone with all the qualifications we were looking for. Tough to have educators that are relatable, and the right kind of energy.… There’s a big difference between a Jewish educator and someone who loves Jewish learning.… It’s hard to find someone with relevant experience. We want someone who can work with pluralistic young adults. Not a lot of settings to do that.*
There aren’t a lot of applicants with experiences like that because those experiences don’t really exist. When someone is coming from a synagogue, I have a bias—they’re probably one dimensional.

—Director, Social Justice Organization

I would differentiate between Jewish studies if we’re talking about teaching Bible or Rabinics or Talmud or Tanakh versus Hebrew. It also varies by location. I would say Hebrew, finding a Hebrew teacher, a formally trained foreign language instructor, is very difficult. There may be some places where you have little choice but to hire a Hebrew speaker and try to help them with pedagogy. To find a Jewish studies instructor to teach disciplined Bible or Mishnah, I would say probably could be a month or two, but much easier than finding a Hebrew teacher.

—Head of School, Day School

Evidently, the specific responsibilities associated with positions to be filled are a critical variable in how challenging it is to find new staff. When positions call for particular know-how—such as special education or the advanced study of Jewish texts—it can take many months to find the right candidate, whatever the sector or location. And yet, beyond such circumstances, it is possible to discern a more fundamental issue that shapes how challenging it is to find staff: what, ultimately, are employers looking for in the Jewish educators they hire? What knowledge and skills should those educators possess? What values are they expected to hold? What kinds of people should they be? And what roles are they expected to perform? These questions not only have a bearing on the demand side of the marketplace—how challenging it is to find staff—they also have significant consequences for the supply side in terms of what educator preparation and development programs might, or should, contribute to the ecosystem of Jewish education.

Job Postings Convey Variegated Priorities

Employers convey some of their assumptions about these matters in their job announcements. We gathered a sufficiently robust sample of such postings from employers in the three Sector 1 venues—day schools, supplementary schools, and early childhood centers—to enable their textual analysis. Comparisons of the most frequently employed words and concepts in these postings convey something of the differences in the aspirations and expectations across different subfields of Jewish education. This analysis helps surface the extent to which those who lead institutions prioritize the personal/dispositional characteristics of those they employ (who educators are), the relational (how educators interact with others, whether colleagues or clients), or the professional/technical (what those educators know and can do).

As seen in Exhibit 5, day school employers prioritize formal expressions of professional/technical characteristics (inferred by the words “degree,” “university,” “bachelor,” and “certificate”) as well as technical content (“Hebrew”). In supplementary schools, too, content is important (“Hebrew”, “Judaism”) but the personal/dispositional looms large (implied by words like “creative,” “dynamic,” and “engaging”). In early childhood centers, both the professional and personal are important (“knowledge” and “degree” alongside “creative” and “enthusiastic”), but the relational (“communication”) is emphasized too, something that’s less evident in the other two venues.
Although leaders in these three venues seek individuals with somewhat different profiles, when they describe the foci of educators’ work, there is more uniformity at least across two venues. Day schools and supplementary schools both prioritize relational aspects of educators’ work (“community” and “collaboration”/ “collaborative”). Early childhood centers, however, emphasize the technical features of taking care of young children, including ensuring that their charges get naps and snacks.

**Setting-Specific Differences**

A comparable though much richer picture of similarities and differences emerges from survey data, across a wider variety of venues. The picture created by these data is of setting-specific differences alongside shared fundamentals, an impression especially reinforced by interview and focus group data.

What employers look for in the Jewish educators they hire was explored from several directions in the survey (the full set of responses can be seen in Appendix B). Exhibit 7 shows, for example, the characteristics identified by employers as among the three most important they look for in a candidate. In this instance, no single characteristic is prioritized by respondents from all of the venues, and sometimes the differences between venues are stark. “The ability to be a positive role model” is highly desired by overnight camp leaders (selected by 78% of them) and somewhat desired by youth group employers (67%), but it is much less of a priority for day school, supplementary school, and college campus respondents. By contrast, only day school and early childhood respondents selected technical/professional characteristics in moderate numbers:
“mastery of the subject matter” (45% of day school respondents) and “teaching credentials” (by 37% of ECE respondents). Otherwise, both these characteristics are low priorities for respondents from other venues. There is an unmistakable impression that employers are not in the market for entirely the same commodities.

Exhibit 7: Characteristics Desired in Candidates (Top Three Selections, n = 217)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Day School</th>
<th>Supp. School</th>
<th>ECE</th>
<th>Camp</th>
<th>Youth Group</th>
<th>Campus</th>
<th>JCC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The ability to relate well with learners</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passion/enthusiasm for teaching</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The ability to create a fun and stimulating environment</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The extent to which the candidate’s philosophy of learning aligns with the organization’s</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior experience</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The ability to be a positive role model for learners</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mastery of the subject matter</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching credentials</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The ability to relate well with colleagues</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The ability to relate well with parents</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The quality of the college/ university the candidate attended</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These differences, and also some shared fundamentals, come to life in interviews and focus groups. In the following quote, a youth-serving organization employer underlines the importance of recruiting staff who will be appropriate role models for participants. Listing his hiring priorities, he ultimately argues for a relational model of Jewish education, one grounded in the personal dispositions of the educator:

One is experience, and relative experience. Two is a proven track record…Three, is that they’re relatable and social. Because, especially for some positions, especially working with youth, if they’re not relatable, and if they’re not role model like, it’s not going to work. Also, if they don’t really love it. So yeah, so that’s where our hiring is based. I look less for degrees; I look more at the person.

—Director, Youth-Serving Organization

A day school head makes clear that some of these same characteristics are also desirable in her sector, but she has other priorities too, again very much in line with the survey data. In this case, the interviewee touches on personal, relational, and professional characteristics.
I have three criteria that I look for whenever I hire somebody. I want someone who is a content expert. It’s important that they know the material. I want somebody who has the ability, who’s a pedagogue, who has the ability to transmit that information. … I want somebody who has the pedagogic expertise. Thirdly, I want somebody who is a role model … it’s not sufficient that they are knowledgeable in their field and have the ability to transmit that information to students, they also need to be a symbol of what it is to be a good person, what it is to be a good Jew. That’s in particular when we’re talking about Jewish studies, but not only. I want my general studies teachers, whether they’re Jewish or not Jewish, also to be good role models.

—Head of School, Day School

Shared Fundamentals
A different survey question further highlights this sense of shared fundamentals mixed with venue-specific priorities. Here, respondents were asked to indicate how important it is for candidates to have certain skills and know-how (see Exhibit 8). Again, day school and early childhood respondents place a greater emphasis than others do on technical know-how (“subject matter” for day schools and “child development” for early childhood), while youth group, overnight camp, and campus employees stress the personal and relational (“high emotional intelligence,” “working well with others,” and “the ability to be creative and flexible”). Almost all venues value “the ability to be creative and flexible,” but for supplementary school and JCC respondents this was of particular importance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exhibit 8: Desired Skills and Know-How in Prospective Hires (% Very Important, n = 217)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Day School</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The ability to be creative and flexible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working well with others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High emotional intelligence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong communication skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comfort with religious pluralism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of child development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mastery of subject matter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mastery of instructional methods/strategies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good organizational skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong leadership skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technological proficiency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being able to detect mental health issues</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In a focus group, campus employers made clear that while they value candidates who possess strong levels of Jewish literacy, they ultimately prioritize relational skills and personal dispositions.

*I’m looking for an educator that is comfortable with traditional texts and has the ability to show the relevancy of those texts to students’ lives. We ask educators to teach text to students and staff during an interview. We are also looking for educators that are interesting beyond their skill of teaching text. They must have an ability to connect with students beyond the text. Students on our campuses do not by and large prioritize Jewish learning or community; much of our work on our campuses is getting them “to want” those experiences. So, when we look for educators, we try to find people who are dynamic, engaging, and personable. People who are willing to experiment and try different modalities, and are comfortable failing with an audience.*

—Director, Campus Organization

Focus group data also clarify why supplementary school directors prefer staff who have “the ability to be creative and flexible.” Anticipating that it will be difficult to find candidates with sufficient grasp of the content, employers prefer that those who do take up a position relate well to children, model Jewish values, and are ready to take guidance from and be instructed in the content by their supervisor. This was the only sector where employers consistently made explicit that they would, and in fact expected to, remediate staff members’ lack of content knowledge, as long as those staff were responsive to direction.

*I look for that desire to work with kids first and foremost and the desire, you know, to help along the next Jewish generation. I look for that more than their knowledge of Jewish content because the content we can teach to them.*

—Director, Supplemental School

Relevant Prior Experience

**KEY FINDINGS:** What employers seek in their new hires heavily influences the kinds of Jewish educational and life experiences they expect candidates to have. Where the priority is Jewish engagement, then preparation and disciplinary training are less important. Where Jewish education and the cultivation of cultural literacy are more important, prior training matters much more.

A dwindling number of employers want, let alone require, new hires to have received formal preparation; some (in Sector 3) prefer that new appointees don’t come with such preparation, and others are ready—or at least accept the need—to train people on the job.

The qualities employers seek in their new hires strongly informs their preferences for the kinds of Jewish educational and life experiences candidates should have. Not surprisingly, perhaps, employers in some sectors (most notably, day school and camp) prefer candidates to have been shaped by institutions like those to which they’re applying, if not by their very own organization. Survey data show that the camp sector is especially clannish in this respect, with approximately three-quarters of respondents expressing a preference for alumni of their specific organization. The calculations behind this way of thinking were clarified by a camp director during a focus group.
We are looking for educators who understand what it means to work in a pluralistic setting and can bring their authentic selves to the position YET are comfortable in a shomer Shabbat and shomer kashrut environment AND who understand that we are not an Orthodox camp.

—Director, Overnight Camp

When camps have such particular and distinctive ideological orientations, the surest way to ensure that new hires understand what is expected of them is to recruit from among alumni.

The question of what prior life and educational experiences candidates should possess revealed sharply diverging perspectives among Sector 3 and Sector 4 organizations. This issue pointed to a particular difference between those whose missions foreground cultural continuity and Jewish learning (historic components of Jewish education) and those who conceive of their organizations as disruptors committed to the task of Jewish engagement. On the one side are employers who look for candidates with advanced degrees or rabbinic ordination. These qualifications indicate, as one interviewee explained, “a mastery that is helpful for learning,” or curriculum-building know-how. As another interviewee put it, “we really want people who know Jewish texts, content in a deep way. Rabbis are a good shorthand for that. They’re not the only ones who can do it well, but it is a way to know that they’ve spent enough time studying what we need them to know.”

Others are satisfied with a “base level of Jewish knowledge” or are “less compelled by degrees.” On the one hand, this standard is seen as a way to subvert privilege. As the director of a social justice organization explained: “I don’t think we’ve ever posted a job that requires a Masters…We have a lot of insight into the inequities around those systems…and for me seeing the phenomenal people in my life who never went to grad school, for whom it might not have fit in with their path, it doesn’t make them less qualified.” A senior educator in a very different setting offered a similar argument drawing on her own life experience:

I’m not a rabbi, and the reason in part is because women weren’t becoming rabbis when I went to school…I don’t have a PhD, but I’ve taken more classes than a lot of people with PhDs. I would not require a degree/credential. I also know that works against women and against people who have come at this from a different path.

—Senior Educator, Communal Agency

There are others who eschew highly certified candidates because they’re suspicious that people who have been too heavily socialized by legacy institutions won’t be fully inclusive or committed to doing things differently. As one interviewee put it, “they bring too much of the script of what the arc of the experience is supposed to be.” Instead, these employers prefer to train new recruits themselves and, if necessary, have them go to graduate school after a few years on the job to gain accreditation and confidence. The director of one institution explained it like this: “I find, unfortunately, that people with degrees in education are most complicated. They’re often taught structures that are not learner-centered. I only halfway mean this, but the irony is that those who come in [with that background] have to unlearn some stuff; it doesn’t translate. It’s not about curriculum, it’s about experiences.”

And yet still others are more eclectic or at least less dogmatic: “What I care more about is that people have core educational experience—I don’t care where it came from so long as they can speak the language of Jewish, both with their lips but also in their bones.” If candidates can show they can do the work required of them in a sensitive and thoughtful manner, tested in the course of a rigorous recruitment process, it doesn’t matter where they come from.
If we conceive of the Jewish educator as a commodity in the labor market, then we can conduct the following accounting in relation to the venues of Sector 3 and Sector 4: (i) content knowledge, most readily signified by rabbinic ordination, is valued but not always a requirement; (ii) other kinds of specialist knowledge are a prerequisite for filling specific roles especially when serving certain age groups; (iii) pedagogical knowledge is valued everywhere, although it often seems reduced to knowing “how to hold a room, getting an idea across, and communicating.” Further, there are also any number of desired personal dispositions that employers seek, especially those that help in the forming of meaningful personal relationships. Finally, it is rare for employers to express a specific desire that candidates arrive with pedagogic content knowledge or know-how in facilitating the learning of specifically Jewish content. There does not seem to be demand for this particular kind of knowledge in these sectors.

The Sector 1 and Sector 2 survey directly probed the issue of accreditation and prior education and the extent to which employers required prospective educators to come with certification or a relevant degree. The responses were consistent with the data points previously analyzed: day school, early childhood, and professional campus educators must usually meet such requirements; camp, youth-serving, and supplementary school educators typically do not (see Exhibit 9).

As was the case with Sector 3 and 4 venues, these differing expectations tend to reflect whether a venue prioritizes Jewish engagement or Jewish education. Where the priority is Jewish engagement (and in this respect supplementary schools appear to focus on such functions), preparation and disciplinary training are less important. Where Jewish education and the cultivation of cultural literacy are more important, then prior training matters much more (and in this respect, the campus Senior Jewish Educator is clearly expected to perform such roles). Institutional goals markedly shape employer expectations of what they want their staff to do and, in turn, what experiences they should have had in the past.
How and Where Do Employers Find the Jewish Educators They Hire?

KEY FINDINGS: What employers look for in their hires strongly influences how and where they search for talent. What they’re looking for and the venue in which they’re situated make much more of a difference to how they find people than where, geographically, their organization is located.

If the public education marketplace is characterized by localism, then for some venues of Jewish education the catchment area being tapped may be even smaller—domestic, one might say, rather than local. In these settings, there is rarely more than one degree of separation between the employer and the candidate, even in the larger communities.

To go to those venues and those events has been not helpful. The best connections have been word of mouth. We’ll put out ads and we’ll get a million resumes in. People who know us, who know the school and what the school culture is like and what our standard of teacher is like, they’ll say, you know, you should really meet this person.

—Head of School, Day School

What employers look for in their hires strongly influences how they go about searching for such people and where they look. In fact, what they’re looking for and for what particular venue they’re recruiting makes much more of a difference to how they find people than where, geographically, their organization is located. This is made very clear by survey data and is consistent with the findings reported in the previous section. Community size makes almost no difference to the extent to which Sector 1 and Sector 2 organizations employ “word of mouth,” “tapping their own networks,” or “putting ads on Jewish hiring websites,” as well as ten different additional strategies. There is a statistically significant difference in relation to just one strategy—“posting ads on general hiring websites”—in the frequency with which it used by employers in smaller communities compared with those in medium-sized or large ones, perhaps because the recruiting challenge is that much more difficult in these places.

Venue, however, is a decisive factor in distinguishing between the strategies employers utilize to find talent. As seen in Exhibit 10, there is tremendous variation in the extent to which employers activate their own informal resources (something that is most evident among supplementary schools, early childhood centers, and overnight camps) or engage mechanisms that provide access to candidates located further afield.

If the public education marketplace is characterized by localism, then for some venues of Jewish education (supplementary schools, early childhood centers, and JCCs) the catchment area being tapped may be even smaller—domestic, one might say, rather than local. In these settings, there is rarely more than one degree of separation between the employer and the candidate, even in the larger communities. With supplementary schools typically offering only part-time work, they do not expect new hires to come from very far away. And in a sector with high levels of turnover, the search for new talent is ceaseless.
The following anecdote from the director of a supplemental school is typical:

I hired a teacher a few years ago that I was sitting next to at a baby naming and she was young and not real happy in her full-time job and loved Judaism and I said, why don’t you teach for me? She said, what do you mean? Then I ended up hiring her and she was an amazing teacher and actually now works full time at the temple. It’s just that I don’t always ask the question. Anyone who has a full-time job, I ask a question, if they’ve ever thought about it, if they’re interested. So I’m constantly on the lookout.

—Director, Supplemental School

For day schools, word of mouth continues to be important, but a small minority have found the benefits of building relationships with pre-service preparation programs. The Pardes Institute of Jewish Studies in Jerusalem was mentioned by several focus group participants, as were the denominational seminaries (Hebrew Union College-Jewish Institute of Religion, Jewish Theological Seminary, and Yeshiva University). These relationships provide access to a deeper pool of talent, and they help ensure that those joining a school are in sync with the practices employed by other members of the faculty. A couple of focus group participants also noted the contribution of a new player in the marketplace, Talenteducators. This nonprofit organization, supported by the Government of Israel, is helping to connect schools across North America with candidates and assist with subventing professional development, if needed.
As seen in Exhibit 11, most of the Sector 2 venues—overnight camps, youth groups, and college campus organizations—are set up to recruit nationally. They have no reason to limit themselves to locally based candidates. They function as distinct marketplaces from the venues in Sector 1.

### Exhibit 11: Geographic Scope of Recruitment by Venue (n = 217)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Venue</th>
<th>Percentage of Recruitment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Day School</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplemental School</td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECE</td>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camp</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Group</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JCC</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sector 3 and Sector 4 organizations also play on a national stage and draw from wide pools, even when they’re looking to make a local hire. Those organizations that hire some staff for shorter-term fellowship or internship tracks generate pools of candidates they can fish for permanent positions when those become available. Organizations that serve emergent-adult populations have extensive alumni listservs that provide access to large numbers of mission-aligned candidates, too. These two factors account for why, as we noted above, most organizations in these sectors do not find it especially difficult to make hires. Tapping alumni networks constitutes an elaborate form of recruiting by “word of mouth”—although communication in this respect tends to be asynchronous and virtual.

In recent years, a few Jewish organizations have become important connectors or sources of talent for Sector 3 and Sector 4 organizations. Interviewees report that Leading Edge’s career board (CareerHub) has been useful, as has JPRO’s networking resources for Jewish professionals. And about a quarter of the interviewees mentioned drawing candidates from alumni of Hillel’s Springboard Fellowship. In addition, a couple of interviewees from social justice organizations mentioned Idealist as a point of access to suitable candidates. Organizations with strong brands and distinctive missions tend to be magnets for talent; as national organizations, this is an advantage that most Sector 1 and Sector 2 organizations don’t have. If they also place a premium on graduate level education, they’ll certainly turn to graduate programs in Jewish education, Jewish professional leadership, or Jewish studies as well as rabbinic preparation (semikha) programs. Overall, if the marketplace for Sector 1 organizations tends to be hyperlocal, then for Sector 3 and 4, and to a large extent for Sector 2 as well, the playing field is national. This pattern has been further reinforced by the increasing number of national organizations ready to hire remote staff, especially since the onset of the COVID-19 pandemic.

### Salaries and Benefits as a Hiring Tool

**KEY FINDINGS:** Few organizations share public details about salaries and benefits in their job postings. With word of mouth such a commonplace element in the hiring of new staff, there is a pervasive lack of transparency about what is being offered.
One might have thought that competitive salaries and benefits would be a crucial tool in the race to recruit staff. Our analysis of job announcements reveals, however, that remarkably few organizations share public details about such things. Exhibit 12 shows that while some aspects of the jobs offered are commonly described, such as the content and scope of the work, most organizations do not specify either wage levels or benefits packages.

Exhibit 12: Proportion of Job Postings Providing Specific Information about the Position (n = 90)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Day School</th>
<th>Supp. School</th>
<th>ECE</th>
<th>Camp</th>
<th>Youth Group</th>
<th>Campus</th>
<th>JCC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Content of work</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scope of work</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior Experiences</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salary</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefits</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentoring/PD</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In some instances, the lack of specifics may be because what’s offered is not very attractive and might drive away prospective candidates. As a supplemental school director confessed in a focus group, the work is not exactly something that many would be happy advertising:

_Lack of compensation, not knowing for sure if I am going to be there the next day. Where is it going to take me? How far can I go? It’s not attractive. It’s not sexy. If I’m going to go out to the bar with my friends, what am I going to say? I’m a religious schoolteacher? Are you kidding me? That’s what you’re doing today? We don’t have enough money to offer. So you offer very little money with a lot of expectations, and people don’t want to go into it. There are less and less people to choose from._

—Director, Supplemental School

The patchiness of these job announcements may also reflect the informal, hyperlocal means by which so many educators are recruited. With word of mouth such a commonplace element in the hiring of new staff, there seems to be a pervasive lack of transparency about what’s being offered. It seems that a great many appointments involve some form of personalized deal making. These deals may be an effective way to get people through the door, but as we learned during interviews with current and former educators as part of the _On the Journey_ strand of our work, over time the lack of transparency can breed inequity, not to mention resentment and disaffection. Employees are inclined to assume their colleagues must be receiving a better deal than them.
What Professional Development Do Employers Provide for their Staff Once They’re Hired?

**KEY FINDINGS:** Once educators are hired, the form and content of the professional development they access can be traced to how challenging it was to hire those staff in the first place. In those organizations that take their pick from a surfeit of candidates, professional development is much more about sustaining the overall personal and intellectual growth of team members than the improvement of their core practices. Among organizations that struggle to hire optimal candidates, professional development takes on more of an educative or even remedial function.

_I think that letting the person in the position express what their needs are and encouraging them to find places where they can grow their own knowledge, that’s what’s been helpful to me. I wouldn’t want to decide what’s meaningful to the next person._

—Senior Educator, Communal Agency

When employers struggle to find an optimal hire, professional development provides a means by which to help improve employees’ capacity to more effectively fulfill their responsibilities. About 90% of survey respondents state that they offer “on the job” professional development to both full-time and part-time staff. They indicate that full-time educators have access to more days a year: 43% report that they make available more than five days a year to their full-time staff, while 26% make available a similar quantity of time to their part-time staff.

Professional development can be offered in house, drawing on the internal resources of an organization, or it can be provided by outside suppliers. The relationship between these providers of professional development and frontline organizations is a critical dimension of the Jewish educator marketplace. In a field where individual employees cannot be expected (and many would say, should not be expected) to “know it all” when they take up work, providers of professional development, by cultivating the capacities of professional staff, play a vital role in enabling educational organizations to be as effective as possible in realizing the missions to which they’re committed.

Quantitative data from Sector 1 and Sector 2 venues indicate that most organizations are somewhat more likely to make use of resources that come from within (such as “coaching and/or observation from a mentor or supervisor”) than they are to tap outside providers (“attending a professional conference”), but early childhood centers and campus organizations are exceptions to this rule (see Exhibit 14). (In some educational jurisdictions, early childhood educators are required to complete a minimum number of hours of externally provided professional development each year.) Overall, most organizations seem ready to tap a variety of resources, including some, such as “content-oriented workshops or lectures” and “induction support for new educators,” that likely draw on a mix of internal and external resources.

---

14 By comparison, 77% of the educator respondents to the On the Journey survey, including full-time and part-time educators, report having access to opportunities for professional development. The gap between employer and employee reports likely reflects different understandings of what “on the job” professional development involves.

15 It’s not clear to what extent the choice of professional development medium is driven by price sensitivity. In larger organizations, economies of scale are available to those who bring a provider of PD to their institution rather than subvent staff members who individually access external resources. It may make more financial sense for smaller organizations to run a more-personalized model.
Interviews with Sector 3 and Sector 4 leaders reveal that it is more common among these organizations to provide opportunities for individual staff members to pursue their own interests as part of their professional growth. This greater flexibility might be an artifact of there being fewer educators on their teams, allowing a more bespoke—“personalized”—professional development ethos to flourish, but the flexibility may also reflect less hierarchical cultures in these organizations. One interviewee captured these themes well:

“We have an open PD policy: if people see a conference or something to take advantage of, there is a process for them to ask for that support. It is more organic and probably less structured than maybe it ought to be or could be. We say to people “ask for what you need” and if it’s not in budget we’ll figure out a way to make it work.”

—Director, Jewish Engagement Organization

In some cases, professional learning takes on an organic or continuous feel. It’s more fluid than what might conventionally be considered professional development. This seems to be especially the case in those organizations whose own core mission is centered on learning and research. These organizations practice internally what they aspire to do externally.

“We do internal stuff all the time, but I don’t think of it as PD exactly, it’s just part of our work culture. We do a lot of sharing of things we’re working on, both in staff meetings, but also informally.”

—Director, Adult Learning Organization

---

### Exhibit 14: Forms of PD Offered by Sector 1 and Sector 2 Venues, Full-Time Staff Only (n = 146)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Day School</th>
<th>Supp. School</th>
<th>ECE</th>
<th>Camp</th>
<th>Youth Group</th>
<th>Campus</th>
<th>JCC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coaching and/or observation from a mentor or supervisor</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attending a professional conference</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content-oriented workshop or lectures</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborative learning projects with colleagues</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading and discussing professional literature</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Induction support for new educators</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coaching and/or observation from a peer</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individualized PD plans for each educator</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coaching and/or observation from an outside consultant</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial support for pursuing graduate studies</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**LEGEND**

▲ Exclusively Internal  ■ Exclusively External  ● Blend
Those with deeper benches are more likely to draw on their own teams to provide professional development internally. In some cases, those who are reticent to hire individuals who had received “too much” prior training are also less inclined to outsource professional development. They are doubtful that outsiders would really grasp who they are. They would prefer their own team members to help raise one another. As one interviewee explained, their expertise in this work is part of why other organizations turn to them for professional support.

What Professional Development Support Do Organizations Seek?

What professional development content organizations seek can be traced back to how challenging they find it to recruit staff. As we have already noted, many if not most Sector 3 and Sector 4 organizations operate in a buyer’s market: they can either take their pick from a surfeit of candidates (some of whom already learned the work with them as program participants and as fellows or interns) or they can take their time to find the ideal candidate, not having to “put a body in the classroom on Monday.” These organizations don’t tend to seek professional development that can improve their core practices; they seem to assume that their staff are already quite competent. Instead, professional development is much more about sustaining the overall personal and intellectual growth of their team members or it is intended to upgrade their sensitivities and skills in relation to specific topics or issues. For example, these organizations are focused on upping their game with respect to diversity, equity, and inclusion, and in their use of technology. In short, professional development provides a means by which to be responsive to the changing needs of the fields in which they operate.

There’s a different dynamic among Sector 1 and Sector 2 organizations, especially among those organizations that struggle to hire optimal candidates. For these employers, professional development takes on more of an educative or even remedial function. As one early childhood director summed it up, “there is always a need to ‘go back to the basics.’” Of course, those basics mean something different in different venues.

In supplemental schools, where many of those who serve as teachers or as facilitators of learning do not have an educational background, professional development is heavily concentrated on core practices; outside resources of professional development are not required for those purposes. The goal is to build teachers’ “tool kits” (a commonly used metaphor) and to provide them with access to resources and approaches they can take straight to the classroom—“tachlis,” as one focus group participant put it. A different focus group participant summed up her wish list nicely:

*Classroom management, behavioral management kind of stuff. Zones of regulation, positive reinforcement, other toolbox things. I often do tech professional development, how to use tech tools in their teaching. A lot of social–emotional stuff and havruta learning and text study in a classroom, listening skills, team building.*

—Director, Supplemental School

Day school interviewees referenced the need to help newer staff, especially, with their classroom management skills, but their professional development priorities tended to be more advanced: integrating technology in the classroom, meeting diverse student learning needs, or nurturing the habits of reflective practice. These are needs that usually require assistance from outside providers, often from beyond the Jewish community.
The professional development needs of early childhood directors fall somewhere in the middle, driven often by the need to keep up to date with state licensing or accreditation requirements. ECE directors want to ensure their staff are fully versed in “developmentally appropriate practices,” something, one interviewee explained, “we all need training on periodically.” But they also want to push their teams to take on more advanced practices, to be familiar, for example, with the Reggio Emilia approach. Finally, they know that many of their hires need help with enriching their Jewish curriculum or sharpening their Jewish lens. They tend to carry out these activities in-house or draw on the services of parents of other individuals internal to the institution to keep costs down.

No focus group participants from Sector 2 organizations articulated the same extensive wish list, but some specific needs did surface. Those working with youth, at overnight camp or year-round, mentioned the importance of getting training around mental health issues. Campus interviewees tended to articulate a more personalized orientation, much like their peers in Sector 3 organizations, but did call out the need for training in communication or experiential education, vital components of their work.

**Taking Stock**

Reflecting on the professional development needs expressed by leaders of these organizations against the backdrop of their practices when it comes to hiring new staff, there is an unmistakable sense of a market in flux. A dwindling number of employers seem to want, let alone require, new hires to receive formal preparation, especially those that see their primary task as Jewish engagement rather than Jewish education. Some would prefer that new appointees don’t come with such preparation, and others are ready—or at least accept the need— to train people on the job. When it comes to providing their hires with professional development once they have started work, there has been a related bifurcation between, on the one hand, investing in the improvement of core practices and bringing about such improvement through on-the-job training in house and, on the other hand, exposing staff to specific timely topics, supported by niche, single-issue providers from outside their own organization. There does not seem to be very much demand for broadly conceived pre-service or professional development offerings.

This is a challenging reality for providers of such services, especially those in tertiary-level educational institutions traditionally associated with educator preparation. In the next section, we turn our attention to how these providers view the Jewish educator marketplace.
Supply-Side Findings

Two-to-three decades ago, before the turn of the last century, the preparation of individuals for work in Jewish education was in large part conducted by communal or denominational institutions for higher education, many of which had been established during the first half of the 20th century. Professional development was offered as an adjunct service by these institutions or was one of the main activities of locally established Bureaus of Jewish Education. The preparation institutions formed a network, the Associations of Institutions for Higher Learning in Jewish Education (AIHLJE), that sought to learn from one another’s experiences, if not coordinate their efforts. As part of a larger effort to professionalize the field, an independent body, The National Board of License for Teachers and Principals of Jewish Schools in North America, working together with the AIHLJE group, attempted to establish standards that would enable employees to demonstrate their preparedness for the work of Jewish education and enable employers to be sure that potential hires met minimal professional standards. These efforts, whether in relation to preparation or licensing, largely served the institutions of Sector 1: supplemental schools, day schools, and to some extent early childhood centers. They did not tend to serve Sector 2 institutions: youth-serving organizations, camps, and JCCs. Few Sector 3 institutions existed at that time; they have been founded in the last twenty years reflecting a flowering of innovation and entrepreneurialism intended to spark Jewish education and engagement.

Today, the National Board of License still exists but is effectively moribund; it was not mentioned by one interviewee as part of this study. The tertiary-level institutions for educator preparation continue to operate while generally serving much smaller cohorts. Most of the Bureaus have gone, although some have transformed into national providers of professional development. Three of the eight communities that participated in this study—Miami-Dade, San Francisco Bay Area, and Nassau-Westchester—are served by agencies for Jewish education that were once local Bureaus of Jewish Education and today continue to offer a wide range of professional services to their local educators as well as to educators from elsewhere in North America. On the ground, despite the shrinkage they have experienced over recent years, these agencies are among the most active providers of professional development in the country—in the form of consultancies, workshop series, and special events for educators.

It is beyond the scope of this study to reconstruct or deconstruct the evolution of these institutions. However, an additional component associated with this study provides a picture of the supply-side marketplace today in the form of an analytical map of thirty-seven institutions that offer educator preparation and professional development services (see Appendix H). This audit is not exhaustive. It does not include, for example, programs, such as the Day School Leader Training Institute (DSLTI), that are geared to the preparation of organizational leaders. The audit also does not include organizations whose primary function is curriculum production, development, or delivery. It documents the activities of providers identified either by employers in the eight communities that participated in this study or by additional key informants as constituting the primary providers of preparation and development services today.

Over the following pages, we provide a general account of the situation on the supply side of the Jewish educator landscape as constituted by the institutions that prepare and support the professional development of frontline Jewish educators. We describe prominent features of this landscape specifically as they relate to the interface between what the providers of these services

16 Davidson, 1990
17 DSLTI and others that serve similar functions were mapped in a different study conducted by Rosov Consulting for Prizmah: Center for Jewish Day Schools (see Rosov Consulting, 2017).
offer and what services those in the field—individual educators and educational institutions—consume. To bring to life the features we describe, we include short accounts of organizations whose evolution and current status are especially illustrative of larger trends.

The Uncertain State of Degree-Granting Institutions

**KEY FINDINGS:** More students are graduating each year from degree programs in Jewish education than was the case in 1989, the last time this field was reviewed. About seventy students a year graduate from degree-granting pre-service programs alongside a further 155 in-service students who are already employed.

The growth in the number of graduates is due to the emergence of specialty programs in different subfields of Jewish education. Most tertiary-level institutions have seen a contraction in the number of students graduating with a general degree in Jewish education. Some have stopped offering such “generalist” programs all together.

Currently, twelve institutions offer an entry-level academic degree of some kind in Jewish education or Hebrew education, almost all in the form of a graduate degree. It is hard to enumerate how many students graduate from these programs each year because the institutions do not count students in consistent ways. We estimate, conservatively, that about seventy students a year graduate from degree-granting pre-service programs alongside a further 155 in-service students who are already employed. The total number of graduating students each year seems to be higher than when Aryeh Davidson reviewed the field in 1989; he estimated a total of 315 currently enrolled students, excluding those at the doctoral level or in non-degree-granting programs, suggesting about 150 annual graduates. The growth in the number of graduates over the last thirty years seems to be due to the emergence of specialty programs, for example in Israel education at George Washington University or in Hebrew at Middlebury College, both of which typically serve people already working in the field. These two programs had not yet been launched when Davidson conducted his review of the field.

Interviews with educational and administrative leaders in this sector make clear that most of these institutions have seen a contraction in the number of students graduating with a general degree in Jewish education. Some have stopped offering such “generalist” programs all together. Interviewees propose three explanations for these developments.

First, as indicated above, there is less demand from applicants for general degrees in Jewish education. People are drawn to specialisms or are inspired to follow particular passions, such as experiential education, specific forms of communal service, or environmental education. Jewish education as a distinct, but general, field has less appeal. One dean described the consequences at her own institution, a college that for decades operated a Masters in Jewish Education program:

> In the past and on our books we’ve had a MA in Jewish Education, but we haven’t enrolled students in that for some time. We did a program review two years ago, looking at Jewish educational programs but realized that a general MA in Jewish education was not appealing to Jewish educators. Many wanted an MA in education more generally or a specialty in reading or special education, and we don’t offer that.

—Dean, Jewish Community College
A second factor, which is not new but continues to be an acute challenge, is that prospective educators do not need certification to find work or keep their jobs in most settings. As we saw above, few employers insist that new hires come with an educational qualification, let alone one in Jewish education; and only a minority of employers encourage, let alone financially support, their staff to get a degree once they’re already working. A different dean, this time at a university, articulates her challenge as follows:

*The hurdle is convincing people it’s worth their time and thousands of dollars to actually prepare for the job they are looking to have. I can’t say “without this you can’t teach.” In Jewish education, you don’t have to be at all prepared in any professional way. You can get a job without being prepared.*

—Dean, University

One of her colleagues at a different university reported a similar challenge. She argued that this challenge comes with profound consequences for the field, in terms of employee turnover. Her claim is strongly supported by findings from the *Preparing for Entry* strand of our work about the positive contribution of “Enabling Opportunities” (pre-service programs and internships) to the career commitment and professional resilience of educators.

*Not getting a degree at all is our biggest competition. … There is a world out there of people who are working and don’t want to invest in a degree. You can get the job without a degree and then get burnt out and then leave. We are wasting talent because we have people who could have become skilled and not burnt out.*

—Dean, University

A third factor, also far from new, has further contributed to this situation: even if educators are interested in pursuing advanced learning at a tertiary-level institution—whether before or once they start work—it rarely pays in financial terms to do so unless an individual aspires to reach the most senior ranks in the field. The business model at the tertiary level is very hard to sustain without substantial support provided by external funding sources. A senior college faculty member spelled out the issue:

*This is all tied to money. If a teacher is earning $55K–$65K a year, they cannot afford themselves to pay for an MA that is going to cost $25K per year. It’s not a business plan that works. If we want people to develop their skills and capacities, and to be lifelong learners, like we do in medicine, we need to invest in this. … There is a mismatch between what places are offering and what people need. Putting the financial burden on the teachers makes it impossible.*

—Senior Administrator, Jewish Community College

For those who run degree-granting programs, the situation is intensely frustrating; not only does it threaten the survival of their programs, it contributes—in their view—to the degradation of the field. Some, in fact, suggest that employers are partly culpable for this situation. They’ve contributed to a race to the bottom where formal preparation is not a prerequisite. One interviewee contrasted Jewish education with nursing. Nurses don’t make great money, but no hospital would give them work if they weren’t trained. Prospective nurses have no choice but to invest in their own preparation. Prospective Jewish educators are not obligated in the same way.
An ironic feature of this situation is that while most employers no longer insist that candidates possess pre-service certification, candidates who do possess such certification have no difficulty finding work. They’re so quickly snapped up by employers that the preparation programs no longer need to offer job placement services.

Against this backdrop, it’s instructive to look at the cases of a couple of programs each of which seems to have found a way to remain relevant to potential students and be financially sustainable, even while neither has been immune to the various challenges described above.

The Pardes Educators Program, a pre-service program for prospective day school educators, has been running for more than twenty years. While Pardes is based in Jerusalem, its pre-service program operates in partnership with Boston’s Hebrew College. Today, the program is about a third of the size it once was when it was the only educator certification program Pardes offered and when it benefited from sustained funding from a major foundation. For the last seven years, prospective educators have also been able to apply to a parallel certificate program at Pardes in Experiential Jewish Education. Most recently, educators who have already started work have been able to take part in a fourteen-month, blended, in-service certificate program. By diversifying its offerings, then, Pardes now serves more educators in pedagogically intense, early-career educator preparation programs. In a changing market, these offerings continue to be highly competitive, in part because of Pardes’s unique value proposition: it is not just preparing students to enter the field; it also promises an experience of personal Jewish growth in Jerusalem. As interviews with alumni of the program reveal, the personal dimension to this experience is as compelling as the professional opportunity offered.

Presenting a different picture, Towson University in Baltimore enrolls fifteen to twenty students each year in its MA in Leadership in Jewish Education & Communal Service. Towson absorbed the local Hebrew college about ten years ago at a point when it was no longer financially sustainable. Despite its title, the program functions primarily as a pre-service program designed to prepare Jewish educators and Jewish communal professionals for entry to the field, in supplemental schools, religious schools, camp settings, JCCs, and Jewish communal agencies. The program’s modular arrangement allows students to complete courses at different speeds, something that’s especially attractive to those who are already working. More than 70% of the students are locals, drawn from a large catchment area. The business model seems to work as well, embedded in a large state university where full tuition costs about $14,000 a year. Thanks to the support of the local Federation and other funders (about more of which below), students do not pay more than half of full tuition, especially if they then take up work in the community.

The Philanthropic Rollercoaster

**KEY FINDINGS:** When the retail price of a high-quality degree in Jewish education can exceed $50,000, few students enroll without substantial subsidization. The ups and downs of this sector of the educator marketplace are heavily contingent on the extent to which programs can attract philanthropic funding.

Over the past decade, a couple of funding initiatives have made a substantial difference to the ability of institutions to recruit students and improve their work, but these efforts have not fundamentally changed the structural challenges built into the prevailing business model.
When the retail price of a high-quality degree in Jewish education can exceed $50,000, few students enroll without substantial subsidization; there is just too much of a mismatch between the fees in private institutions for higher education and the earning power of educators in the field. The ups and downs of this corner of the educator marketplace are therefore heavily contingent on the extent to which programs can attract philanthropic funding. Over the past decade, a couple of funding initiatives have made a substantial difference to the ability of institutions to recruit students and improve their work, but these efforts have not fundamentally changed the structural challenges built into the design of these programs.

Just over ten years ago, three seminaries (Hebrew Union College–Jewish Institute of Religion, Jewish Theological Seminary, and Yeshiva University), expanded their offerings thanks to a substantial grant from the Jim Joseph Foundation designed to “to attract and train the next generation of Jewish educators and educational leaders.” The initiative was designed, as the Foundation’s communications expressed it, “to graduate and credential a significantly greater number of highly qualified educators to work with Jewish youth and young adults.” When the grant ended in 2014, most of those offerings were scaled back and some were closed. In 2013, the Legacy Heritage Fund launched the Legacy Heritage Midcareer Fellowship. This initiative enabled “established professionals in Jewish education or Jewish communal service to enhance their management and pedagogic skills, as well as deepen their Jewish knowledge” by means of a master’s degree at one of five institutions for higher learning: American Jewish University, Baltimore Hebrew Institute of Towson University, Gratz College, Hebrew College, and Spertus Institute for Jewish Learning and Leadership. After eight years, the initiative continues to run and has even expanded to nine institutions, with tens of professionals a year benefiting from its support. In many ways, the program has been a “life-saver” for the institutions involved, and for that reason many in the beneficiary institutions express anxiety about what will happen once it is concluded.

Some of the institutional leaders in this sector expressed frustration that the funders’ priorities and interests are not fully aligned with what they, the educators, perceive to be the needs of the field, nor do these priorities translate into long-term commitments. This is much like the complaint, reported earlier, that employers don’t help matters by lowering their hiring requirements. Of course, these arguments are a matter of perspective. In an interview, one administrator articulated many of these sentiments:

> Our field is in a very different place than it was 10 years ago. The perception is that people need niche training. That combined with in-house training. If you look at Hillel, Moishe House, they are doing a lot of in-house training…. We are in this time where, as training institutions, we have to figure out this balance between what people want and what we think people need. If I had a choice, I would continue to offer my MAT with its focus on different pedagogies and brain development, but I don’t think I have an audience for that. It’s what I think people need, but I don’t think the audience exists. … It’s all pushed by the funders. Funders don’t want to pay tuition. They want quick results and on-the-job training. Degrees are too expensive.

—Dean, University

The changing offerings in Jewish education at George Washington University provide a useful case of the extent to which institutions expand and contract their programs as external, philanthropic funding allows. During the last two decades of the 20th century, the university ran a master’s program in Jewish education in partnership with the local Bureau of Jewish Education; this was complemented by a range of professional development offerings. This program ended with the

18 Jim Joseph Foundation, n.d.
demise of the Bureau. In 2013, thanks to funding from the Jim Joseph Foundation, the university launched a new master’s degree in Experiential Education and Cultural Arts. It tapped a niche that other institutions were not offering. The funding for this program ended after seven years, and new students are no longer being recruited; but the gap left has been filled by a different program, launched in 2020, a master’s degree in Israel education, formed in partnership with the iCenter and funded by the Marcus Foundation. The foreground focus of these various programs shifted over time, but they share a strong appreciation for similar educational principles and, crucially, from the university’s perspective, make it possible to retain a relatively stable faculty team. The work goes on, but it certainly requires tacking with the philanthropic winds.

The Proliferation of Professional Development

**KEY FINDINGS:** Today there is a robust industry of independent providers of professional development in Jewish education competing in a busy marketplace, in contrast to twenty years ago where most, if not all, professional development offered to Jewish educators was provided by central agencies (i.e., Bureaus of Jewish Education). Today, these providers offer distinctive, even niche products which generate passionate followers. With low overheads, they can quickly develop new products, unconstrained by sunk costs.

With the degree-granting institutions inhabiting an intensely competitive marketplace where most of the individuals they serve cannot afford their offerings at full cost and where consumer tastes have soured on generalized offerings in favor of more specialized products, it is no wonder that some in this sector feel themselves at the mercy of funder whims. Other, independent, providers of professional development have found the climate more hospitable. They offer distinctive, even niche products which generate passionate followers: products such as spiritual growth, the liberation of suppressed identities, artistic creativity, and alternative modalities for learning. With team members who are often part-time contractors, and headquarters that are virtual or no grander than a kitchen table, their low overheads mean they can develop new products quickly, unconstrained by sunk costs. In these respects, the evolution of professional development in Jewish education mirrors broader changes in the post-industrial, gig economy. If twenty years ago most of the professional development offered to Jewish educators was provided by central agencies, today there is a robust industry of independent providers competing for business. There’s also a number of federated organizations, such as Hillel International, Foundation for Jewish Camp, and Moishe House, that increasingly take care of their own needs, having developed extensive structures to advance the professional learning of their team members or their immediate partners.

While these developments are consistent with broader trends in the economy, there are also more parochial processes playing out that have contributed both to the proliferation of professional development alternatives and the fragmentation of the marketplace, if not its fracturing.

Education Supplanted by Engagement

**KEY FINDINGS:** The programs that populate the burgeoning marketplace are very much aligned with cultivating what the great bulk of employers seek in their Jewish educators: the personal/dispositional and the relational rather than the professional/technical. These characteristics are anchored in engagement-oriented skills and in enabling the educator to become a certain kind of person.
The degree-granting institutions are in the education business; education provides both their content and context, and their audience is primarily made up of Jewish educators. As we have seen from the analysis in the first half of this report, today the majority of the organizations on the demand side of the marketplace are in the Jewish engagement business. To essentialize, most are primarily invested in the cultivation of Jewish identity by means of educative Jewish experiences; fewer prioritize the cultivation of Jewish cultural literacy. When they seek professional support and professional development, it is with an interest in being more effective at the task of Jewish engagement. And this is a need that a great diversity of providers has been able to service in recent years. Evidently, the wisdom and expertise needed to help improve these activities do not only come from within the disciplines of education.

When questioned about the audiences with which they work, and if or how they conceive of those audiences as Jewish educators, many supply-side interviewees pushed back, arguing that “educator” was too limiting a construct. As the following examples illustrate, their organizations operate with an expansive conception of what a Jewish educator is, and in turn this conception underlies a wide array of professional development needs:

*We see the role of educator very, very broadly. We would say everyone is a Jewish educator or can be a Jewish educator.... I believe anyone in a position to impact someone’s perspectives in general is a Jewish educator, within Jewish constructs.*
—Director, Independent Provider

*We call them facilitators, not educators. Trying to break down traditional hierarchies—art not just for artists, Jewish text not just for scholars. The question of what makes this Jewish is a relevant question. For me what makes it Jewish and Jewish education is that we’re taking profound technology—thousands of years old havruta learning—and saying this technology in addition to the content it shares—involves sitting with a partner, being responsible for someone else’s learning, putting aside predispositions and automatic responses, building empathy, expanding world view, trying on new ideas in a one-on-one space. That is what this Jewish technology can do.*
—Director, Independent Provider

An interviewee at one independent provider made explicit how the organization’s portfolio of professional development offerings is driven by the expansive concept of “Jewish education” employed by its clients and partners:

*The commonality [in all our programs] is that they’re all working in identity education, values education. That’s the lens for Jewish education we take. To make an overly simplified distinction, if formal education is about subject and knowledge acquisition, this is about values, identity development, and character development. That’s the field we play in. That’s where you’ll have teen programs, youth movements, summer camps, JCCs, pulpits. That sits in there. If participants have a hand in the field of experiential Jewish education, then our approach should be applicable to them.*
—Senior Staff Member, Independent Provider

The genesis and emergence of M²: The Institute for Experiential Jewish Education as a significant player on the professional development scene is indicative of the ways in which the professional development landscape has evolved in recent years. The organization originated as the Institute for Informal Education, located at Yeshiva University, made possible by the Jim Joseph Foundation’s
grant to the education programs of three major religious seminaries, mentioned earlier. The Institute separated from the university as that grant was coming to an end to become a rebranded, independent provider. M2 has since expanded its range of offerings, reaching individuals, communities, and organizations across all sectors of the Jewish education field. In functional terms, it is competing with the university sector from which it emerged, though of course, it does not offer degrees; its graduates have to make do with certificates. Keeping its costs low, M2 makes it a point of principle to charge almost all program participants or their employer a fee of some kind; but, even then, the fees paid, for example by participants in its signature Senior Educators program, are significantly lower than those for a tertiary institute graduate certificate, let alone a graduate degree.

Like M2, the programs that populate the burgeoning marketplace for Jewish educator-qua-engager development are very much aligned with cultivating what the great bulk of employers seek in their Jewish educators, what we previously classified as the personal/dispositional and the relational rather than the professional/technical. These characteristics are anchored in engagement-oriented skills and in enabling the educator to be a certain kind of person. These, for example, are precisely the qualities a couple of additional interviewees saw themselves seeking to cultivate.

*High level of emotional intelligence and social-emotional competency—teachers who have high special emotional competencies are better equipped to create emotionally safe environments where students can open up.*

—Director, Independent Provider

*We tend to operate with the perspective that, in supplemental schools, the teacher’s role is more as learning facilitators. They are bringing some content to their students and trying to get them excited about the content and to learn as much as they can but there is no grander vision on their part other than engagement with Judaic content. So, on our part, we come with an attitude of saying to the teachers “you have the power to reach all of your students—now let’s figure out strategies you can use to do that.”*

—Director, Independent Provider

**Adult Learning Evolves into Professional Development**

**KEY FINDINGS:** In a small countervailing trend, the forms and content of high-quality adult learning have become a template for the professional development of educators. In these cases, the educational teams behind distinctive approaches to learning Jewish texts and Jewish ideas have developed vehicles for bringing their methodologies and philosophies to wider audiences by means of training up cohorts of educators. This trend is part of a broader phenomenon of organizations evolving from providing direct service to consumers of Jewish education to empowering retailers of Jewish education.

If the developments we’ve discussed suggest the triumph of the affective over the cognitive in Jewish education, there has also been a small countervailing trend on the professional development landscape in which the forms and content of high-quality adult learning have become a template for the professional development of educators. In these cases, the educational teams behind distinctive approaches to learning Jewish texts and Jewish ideas have developed vehicles for bringing their methodologies and philosophies to wider audiences by means of training cohorts of educators.
Strikingly, these organizations are moved by a profoundly different concept from those quoted above of who Jewish educators are, what they’re capable of doing, and, most significantly, how they might be developed. As one independent provider expresses it:

_To be an educator is to help people engage with big meaningful Jewish ideas. We don’t see everyone as Jewish educators. We recognize that many people don’t see themselves that way and aren’t trained to be thinking about these ideas and we want Jewish educators to do that._

—Director of Education, Independent Provider

For example, the Shalom Hartman Institute of North America’s orientation to Jewish education is one in which engagement and the relational are in service of the intellectual, of making sense of the world through the prism of profound Jewish cultural resources. The Institute aspires to enable those who do engagement work to employ those resources well: “We are working with engagement professionals, rabbis, educators, etc. We are trying to infuse [their work] with Jewish language and Jewish ideas.” The Institute’s expanding portfolio of programming for frontline educators, and not only for communal leaders or adults who seek opportunities for fresh experiences of Jewish learning, is indicative of a broader trend in which distinctive approaches to adult learning have evolved into platforms for professional development.

Hadar Institute’s Pedagogy of Partnership (PoP) sits even more explicitly at the intersection of the relational and the intellectual. This, in fact, is the specific niche PoP has carved out, to the degree that it is hard to know, when it comes to engagement with the text and engagement with others, which is the means and which the ends. This ambiguity is reflected well in how PoP’s director describes its work as “helping educators more intentionally build relationships between their students so that peers can learn together, and also between students and the content they are learning.” And yet, with the majority of its clients coming from schools— they’re teachers first and foremost, not facilitators or engagers—and with the program sitting under the umbrella of an institution for the adult study of Jewish text, ultimately PoP represents another instance of how powerful adult Jewish learning has become a template for the professional development of Jewish educators. Perhaps this is why, for the time being, PoP’s appeal is limited to those venues for Jewish education where the study of text is a primary concern.

This process by which a program, and specifically an educational methodology, designed initially for adult learners of Jewish text has become a platform for professional development can be observed most vividly in the evolution of SVARA, a site of Jewish learning that characterizes itself as a traditionally radical yeshiva. Given the yeshiva’s conception of “teachers as learners at the front of the room,” the expansion of purpose to the realm of educator professional development was organic. It did not require a shift in educational vision; it involved instead an expansion of the target audience. In 2017, as part of the Jim Joseph Foundation’s Professional Development Initiative, SVARA created a teaching Kollel with the goal that participants “will be equipped to implement ongoing SVARA-method bet midrash learning in their home communities, making empowering and transformative experiences of Talmud study as a traditionally radical spiritual practice accessible to all.” Many of the participants have come out of the yeshiva’s Queer Talmud Camp. It was a natural next step in their own journeys of serious Jewish learning. The shift from adult learning to professional development was seamless.
From Serving Consumers to Empowering Retailers

To use commercial terminology, SVARA’s evolution from providing direct service to consumers of Jewish education to the empowering of retailers of Jewish education has been replicated in recent years beyond those who operate in the field of Jewish text study. This phenomenon has enlivened fields as diverse as arts education, environmental education, and spiritual development. Perhaps there is something inevitable about entrepreneurial educators who have successfully developed a new project or approach seeking to expand their influence without requiring consumers to come to the same single source. In education, there have long been “train the trainer” models that facilitate the expansion of new methodologies. In this instance, it’s more a case of “educating the educator” as a means of extending reach and impact.

This pattern has seen the Jewish Studio Project, for example, take its “combination of art therapy, Jewish learning techniques, and spiritual community building” and extend its reach beyond an eclectic mix of adults who were helped to “wrestle with the questions on which they were stuck,” to the immersive training of “creative facilitators,” who can enable their own communities “to activate their own creativity.” Although the content and scale are quite different, a similar trajectory has played out at Hazon’s Teva Learning Center. For more than twenty-five years, young people have been coming to the Isabella Friedman Center to experience Teva’s brand of Jewish environmental education. Over the last decade, these activities have “morphed,” in the words of its Managing Director of Education, into a fellowship that enables participating educators to bring resources, practices, and a broader theory of experiential education to their own communities. The Institute of Jewish Spirituality has also been through a similar process. Launched more than twenty years ago to enable adults to “slow down, reconnect with themselves and the world, and rediscover their sense of sacred purpose,” today it offers an expanding array of opportunities for educators to learn how “to bring mindfulness to their classrooms.”

These examples shed light on some of the dynamics behind both the diversification and expansion of the educator professional development landscape today. In many ways, the propulsive forces behind these changes are not remedial; they don’t derive from a sense that educators are falling short and need correction. They also don’t seem to be especially focused on improving the educator’s craft, on refining educational practice. Emerging from frameworks for adult education, they’re more concerned with cultivating the character of the educator. They also seem to be propelled by an ethos of enrichment in which the educator’s growth, even personal transformation, is expected to benefit those with whom educators work. There is probably no limit to the possible additional ways in which Jewish educators, as adult learners, might continue to be enriched.

Both an Expanding and a Contracting Universe

KEY FINDINGS: In recent years, federated entities have developed their own internal capacities to serve their own people, employing a corporate university model to offer a suite of structured learning opportunities to professionals in their orbit. This phenomenon is perhaps the fullest expression of the specialization and sectorialization of the professional development marketplace.

One last feature of the landscape worth noting is that while there has been a proliferation of providers of professional development, and even a diversification of their offerings in increasingly
niche forms, a countervailing trend has been playing out at the same time. If, in some quarters, there has been a kind of expansion of the universe of opportunities for professional growth, in other quarters, there has also been what looks like a contraction in opportunities, or at least a centripetal tendency in which federated entities have developed internal capacities to serve their own people. This is a process that’s beginning to occur at Moishe House. It has already taken root at the Foundation for Jewish Camp within a series of fellowship frameworks that help individuals (at different levels of the camp system and with different areas of specialty) continue to grow while enriched by a set of core principles and values. This phenomenon is most far advanced at Hillel International, where what is known as Hillel U employs a corporate university model to offer a suite of structured learning opportunities to the more than 1,000 professionals in Hillel’s orbit. It doesn’t mean that Hillel professionals can’t access learning opportunities within other frameworks. The particular appeal here is that Hillel’s U’s offerings are fully funded and designed to be as job-relevant as possible, something that can always be hit and miss with externally provided professional development. This phenomenon is perhaps the fullest expression of the specialization and sectorialization of the professional development marketplace.
Conclusion

This exploration of the Jewish educator landscape makes vivid how diversified Jewish education has become in recent times. If until the start of the twentieth century, it was possible to conceive of Jewish education as a unitary landmass largely characterized by a set of uniform practices, today, different continents have broken off, each with its own distinct ecosystem. This tectonic process has meant that in some sectors, it is more fitting to describe the work of Jewish education as that of Jewish engagement, an activity centered on cultivating a connection to Jewish life and living. As we have seen, those who inhabit such places posit that almost anyone can be a Jewish educator. The work does not require a special or specialized craft-knowledge; it requires a more generalized set of dispositions and life skills. In other places, those from which new continents separated, Jewish education continues to be concerned with cultivating cultural literacy and religious or ethnic commitment. Those educators are expected to be reasonably well educated themselves and sufficiently adept in the educational practices they’re supposed to employ. This is not work that everyone is expected to do.

Employers’ profoundly different goals drive what they look for in their staff. Even more than where an employer is located in the country or in what size community, these goals determine how challenging it is to find appropriate personnel. It is much harder to find candidates with formal/technical characteristics than with relational or dispositional ones. These priorities influence almost every other aspect of the demand side of the marketplace, including where employers look for staff, how they go about recruiting, and the kinds of professional development they encourage or require staff to experience once hired.

The dynamic state of the supply side of the Jewish educator marketplace is symptomatic of these tectonic shifts. In fact, the dynamism of the supply side of the landscape, and what we called the proliferation of professional development, may itself be a healthy indicator of the extent to which supply-side institutions are adapting to changes in the broader field. Of course, adaptation of this kind is painful, especially for those who have been around longest. Deep-seated norms can be hard to shift. All change is not necessarily good for the field, either. The demise of a pre-service paradigm, for example, means that personnel coming into the field lack the cultural and social capital that enables them to thrive; new hires miss scaffolded opportunities to develop professional resilience that would enable them to survive the inevitable challenges that come with any new form of work. We have heard compelling arguments why there has been an outflow—a waste—of talent from the field in the absence of such protections.

This study provokes a variety of challenging questions.

For the marketplace as a whole:

1. In what ways can protections and interventions be integrated into both the demand and supply sides of the marketplace to avoid the most corrosive effects of an otherwise free market?

For the demand side of the market, across its various sectors:

2. In those sectors not characterized by acute localism, where new hires are not one or two degrees removed from employers, how can employment agencies assist with the tasks of identifying and recruiting talent?
3. If the narrative of a personnel crisis in Jewish education is driven by the experience of a minority of sectors, what would be a more appropriate narrative for the field as a whole, or is such an all-encompassing narrative no longer possible?

4. How helpful would it be to engender more transparency in the job recruitment process around pay and benefits? Is this expectation compatible with the nature of the market?

5. How might the corporate university model for professional development, with its promise of job-integrated, continuous learning, be extended to smaller-scale organizations beyond the federated organizational systems where this model is currently employed?

6. How might the development of and research on Grown-Your-Own collaborative teacher preparation partnerships and pipelines inform an approach for addressing educator shortages in those venues that find it hardest to identify and recruit educators? What additional skills would organizational leaders need if they were to implement a strategy of this kind?

For the supply side of the market:

7. How far can legacy institutions for the preparation and support of Jewish educators be expected to evolve in response to the shifting landscape of Jewish education? What business models might enable the programs offered by these organizations to be sustainable and not so heavily dependent on shorter-term philanthropic support?

8. What special assets do legacy institutions bring to the field of Jewish educator preparation and support that are critical to protect in a dynamic marketplace? How can these be protected in an environment where there is evidence of “a race to the bottom?”

9. Which, as yet untapped, approaches to adult learning can be adapted and extended to serve the professional development needs of Jewish educators?

10. How can philanthropy contribute not only to the maintenance of valuable programs but to structural changes that will enable such programs to survive and thrive beyond the term of their financial support?
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## Appendix A

### Institutional Characteristics of the Analysis Sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Austin</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boston</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detroit</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Las Vegas</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miami-Dade</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nassau County</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco Bay Area</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westchester County</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization Type</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jewish day school</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish supplemental school</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish preschool or early childhood care</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish overnight camp</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish youth group/movement</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College campus Jewish organization</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JCC</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organizational Affiliation</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chabad</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservative</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haredi</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanist</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modern Orthodox</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orthodox</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-Denominational</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reconstructionist</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renewal</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reform</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secular</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pluralistic</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Denominational</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sector</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sector 1</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sector 2</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sector 3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sector 4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization Size</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Small (1–10 employees)</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small (11–20 employees)</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium (21–100 employees)</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large (more than 100 employees)</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Jewish Educators</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1–5 Jewish educators</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6–10 Jewish educators</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11–20 Jewish educators</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21–50 Jewish educators</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51–100 Jewish educators</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 101–150 Jewish educators | 2   | 1% | 1%
| 151–200 Jewish educators | 2   | 1%|

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Participants Being Served by the Organization</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10–20 participants</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21–50 participants</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51–100 participants</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101–150 participants</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>151–200 participants</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201–500 participants</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>501–1,000 participants</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 1,000 participants</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B

How Do Employers Look for their New Hires and What Do They Look For?

The Employer Survey included a series of questions about how employers recruit new hires and what qualities and qualifications they desire them to have. Data tables for these questions are not included in the body of the report and are provided below.

### Recruitment Strategies by Size of Community

*Question: Which of the following strategies do you typically use to find qualified candidates? (Select top 3; n = 217)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Small Community</th>
<th>Medium Community</th>
<th>Large Community</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Using word of mouth</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tapping your own networks</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Posting ads on Jewish hiring websites (e.g., JewishJobs)</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Posting ads on general hiring websites (e.g., Indeed, Glassdoor)</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Posting ads on social media (e.g., Facebook, Instagram)</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Posting open positions on your organization’s website</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tapping the organization’s alumni network</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact training/certificate education programs (e.g., JTS, Pardes)</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Posting ads in local Jewish press</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Posting ads in local newspapers or magazines</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Posting ads on program or fellowship listservs (e.g., WexNet)</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contacting partner organizations</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partnering with local colleges/universities</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Desirable Prior Experiences

**Question:** In assessing a potential candidate for a Jewish educator position, which of the following prior experiences do you find most desirable? (Select top 3; n = 215)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experience</th>
<th>Day School</th>
<th>Supp. School</th>
<th>ECE</th>
<th>Camp</th>
<th>Youth Group</th>
<th>Campus</th>
<th>JCC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Depends on the position</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attended Jewish summer camp</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attended Jewish day school</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participated in a youth group/movement</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alum of organization</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attended a supplemental Jewish school</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Went on an organized group trip to Israel</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We do not give preference to candidates</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>that had any of these experiences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question:** What kind of certification and/or degree do you require for each of these positions? (Select all that apply; n = 217)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Degree in General Education</th>
<th>Degree in Jewish Education</th>
<th>Professional Certificate in an Area of Jewish Education</th>
<th>Degree in an Area of Jewish Studies</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>No Certificate/Degree Required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Day School Jewish Studies Teacher</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day School Hebrew Teacher</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day School General Studies Teacher</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplemental School Teacher</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECE Teacher</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Group Advisor</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counselor</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Jewish Educator</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix C

Demand-Side Exploratory Interview and Focus Group Protocol

Key Informant Interviews

Thank you so much for speaking with us today. We have reached out to you because we are hoping that you, as someone with a unique vantage point on the training and hiring of Jewish educators, will be able to provide some insight into

1. The current opportunities for training and professional development that currently exist for Jewish educators and
2. The issues of supply and demand for the XXX sector/for the field.

This inquiry is part of a study by CASJE (the Consortium for Applied Studies in Jewish Education), a community of researchers, practitioners and philanthropic leaders seeking to build an evidence base in Jewish education to inform improvements in practice and policy. In the Fall of 2019, CASJE launched a major multi-phase research study, conducted by Rosov Consulting (our team), to investigate critical questions regarding the recruitment, retention, and development of Jewish educators in North America; insights from this conversation will inform our initial inquiry into the training and hiring of Jewish educators. Specifically, your input will help us to design a study that asks, broadly speaking, is the marketplace of training opportunities oversaturated? Are there gaps and/or redundancies in program provision? How do employers in the field source talent? What are the supply and demand issues facing the field, in its various sectors?

The conversation should last approximately 45-minutes, and your responses are entirely confidential, meaning we will not attach your responses to your name when we report our findings. Do you have any questions before we begin?

1. From your vantage point as someone familiar with the XXXX sector [or the field or Jewish education more broadly if KI has broader perspective], what are the core training sites and professional development opportunities for the sector/field?
   a. [Probe seek specific names of programs]
   b. What kinds of skills or training do these programs provide?
   c. How do people learn about these opportunities, from where do these programs recruit students?
   d. Are there pre-service training/degree granting programs that lead to careers in X sector or are most educators trained "on the job"?
e. Are these programs local/regionally or nationally based?

f. Are they generally certificated/credentialled?

g. How do employers view these opportunities, are they supplying educators who are prepared to meet the needs of the organizations hiring?

2. What do you know about how employers in the sector go about sourcing talent?

   a. Where do they look?

   b. What challenges do they face when recruiting new talent?

3. How would you describe the state of supply and demand for this sector [is there an oversupply of teachers, undersupply]?

   a. What information is the field lacking regarding supply and demand that might be helpful to the field if included in a study of this nature?

4. Can you think of any colleagues with whom we should speak who could provide greater insight into these questions?
Introduction: Thank you again for making time for this conversation today – we are especially grateful given current realities of the world we’re living in. This focus group is part of a major research study of the experiences and career arc of those who are working or have worked in Jewish educational settings in the U.S. This component of the study explores the “demand side” of the Jewish education marketplace – what employers who hire Jewish educators look for and need in their staff, where they find their staff, and where and how they invest in their professional growth. This round of focus groups will help us in the development of a broader employer survey in eight participating communities across the country.

The project is being overseen by the Consortium for Applied Studies in Jewish Education and is funded by the William Davidson Foundation and the Jim Joseph Foundation.

I’ll be posing questions to the group to spur conversation about your experiences, but I encourage you to respond to and ask additional questions of each other as the conversation unfolds. The conversation should last approximately 75 minutes, and your responses are entirely confidential, meaning we will not attach your responses to your name when we report our findings. While we cannot guarantee that all participants will maintain the same standards of confidentiality that we do, we additionally request that what is said in this space stays in this space to allow for candid and fruitful conversation.

Additionally, do you mind if we record this session to ensure that we are taking accurate notes? Please respond with a verbal “yes.”

Do you have any questions before we begin?

Before we get started, let’s take a moment to get to know each other. Briefly share with us your name, where you work and your role there.

We are first going to ask you questions about your practices and considerations before the era of COVID-19. Later we will discuss the impact of COVID-19 on these practices and considerations.

1. In a typical hiring process, pre-COVID, irrespective of the specific subject matter you are hiring for (a Hebrew teacher or a teacher of Jewish text or a general JS studies teacher) what are the skills you look for in a Jewish educator?
   a. What skills, experiences, and/or aptitudes are most helpful for an educator, whatever their role, to have?
   b. Are there any credentials that have special value?
   c. How do you go about assessing those skills, aptitudes and credentials?
2. Given your comments about what you generally look for in your educators, where do you look to find your educators?

   a. What programs do you tend to hire from (if any)?
   b. How hard/easy is the hiring process in general?
   c. How long is a position usually open before it is filled?
   d. What is your typical hiring season?
   e. How local is the hiring process? Are most of your educators local or do you need to go further afield (nationally or internationally) to fill your positions?
   f. How long do you anticipate a new hire will generally stay in the job in your organization?
   g. What do you do if and when you don’t have enough “talent” to meet your needs or if you aren’t able to find a qualified candidate for an open position?

3. Tell us about the kinds of professional training and support you provide for your faculty

   a. What are the kinds skills or aptitudes for which you find the need to offer ongoing learning/ PD to your teachers/educators?
   b. If you outsource PD, where do you tend to send them?
   c. If PD is done in-house, what kinds of programs are you offering?

Let’s now focus on this point in time, which I imagine is one of great uncertainty and what you imagine staffing needs are going to be in the coming academic year.

4. First, what are the most likely scenarios that you are planning for in light of COVID-19, and what are the implications for staffing?

5. Tell us about the staffing decisions you have made or are making for the coming year (we imagine this will include redistributing staff, letting staff go, and probably hiring new staff)

   a. If you ARE hiring how are is that process different than in the past?

6. What special skills are you looking for in your teachers, and what kinds of skills are you needing to develop in your existing faculty?

   a. Are these skills different from those you looked for in the past?
7. Aside from what we’ve discussed, are there other questions and areas we should be focusing on as we move into the development of the broader community-based employer survey?

We’ve come to the end of our time and I want to thank you once again for your participation in this focus group. It was extremely helpful. We anticipate the employer survey will be in the field in all eight communities in November, and we hope that you will complete it and enthusiastically encourage your colleagues to do so. We also want to share that given the complexity of this time; the study sponsors have asked us to go back into the field next summer to reassess the "marketplace."
## Appendix D
### Demand-Side Employer Survey

Please take note of the following conventions:

1. Block titles introducing each section as well as other headings will **not** be visible to respondents and are used for organizational and analytical purposes only.
2. All italicized information within brackets is for the online survey programmer and will also **not** be visible to respondents.

Mapping the Market – Demand-Side Survey

This survey is part of a major research study of the experiences and career arcs of those who are working or have worked in Jewish educational settings in the U.S. This component of the study explores the "demand side" of the Jewish education marketplace: how programs prepare educators for the field of Jewish education; what employers, like you, look for and need in their staff; where employers find their staff; and where and how employers invest in their professional growth. The project is being overseen by the Consortium for Applied Studies in Jewish Education and is funded by the William Davidson Foundation and the Jim Joseph Foundation.

Please respond to the following 10-minute survey. In appreciation for taking the time to complete this survey, you will be entered into a drawing to **win one of three $1000 prizes for your organization**.

Your participation in this research study is voluntary. You have the right to withdraw at any point during the study, for any reason, and without any prejudice. Information will be collected for research purposes only, and all data are confidential. All public reporting on this information will be done in the aggregate. Nothing you share here will be attributable to you. The risks associated with participating in the study are minimal and are not greater than anything you may encounter in your daily life. Should you have any questions, feel free to contact Tehilla Becker, Project Associate, at tbecker@rosovconsulting.com.

I have read the information above and I give my consent to participate in this study: [Required]
- I give my consent [if chosen, continue to Block I]
- I don’t give my consent [if chosen, end survey]

Is your organization located in [pipe in community from embedded data]?
- Yes
- No

[If ‘No’ is selected] Where is your organization located? ________________ [open-ended]

### Block I: Educator Positions That Need to Be Filled

*First, we'd like to understand which positions you look to fill in a typical program year.*

1. Which of the following best describes your organization’s sector?
   a. Jewish day school
   b. Jewish supplementary school (e.g., Hebrew school, Sunday school, afterschool program)
   c. Jewish preschool or early childhood care
   d. Jewish overnight camp
   e. Jewish day camp
   f. Jewish youth group/movement
   g. College campus Jewish organization (e.g., Hillel, Chabad)
   h. JCC
   i. Other. Please describe:
2. [If selected ‘Jewish day school’ in Q1] Which of the following vacant roles do you typically seek to fill each year? (Select all that apply)
   a. Jewish studies teacher
   b. Hebrew language teacher
   c. General studies teacher
   d. Experiential educator (e.g., Student Activities Coordinator, Director of Student Life)
   e. Teaching assistant
   f. Special needs support/para-educator
   g. Other. Please describe: __________

3. [If selected ‘Jewish day school’ in Q1] How many of these positions do you seek to fill in a typical year? [dropdown menu for each: 1 to 4+]
   a. [If selected in Q2] Jewish studies teacher
   b. [If selected in Q2] Hebrew language teacher
   c. [If selected in Q2] General studies teacher
   d. [If selected in Q2] Experiential educator
   e. [If selected in Q2] Teaching assistant
   f. [If selected in Q2] Special needs support/para-educator
   g. [If selected ‘Other’ Q2; Pipe in ‘Other’ text from Q2]

4. [Carry over displayed items from Q3] What kind of certification and/or degree do you require for each of these positions? (Select all that apply)
   a. Degree in General Education
   b. Degree in Jewish education
   c. A professional certificate in an area of education
   d. Degree in an area of Jewish studies
   e. Other
   f. No degree/certificate requirement

4.1 [If Selected ‘other’ in any of the matrix options] What other certification/degree do you require?

5. [If selected ‘Jewish day school’ in Q1 - Carry over displayed items from Q3] For each of these positions, how long does a new hire usually stay in their role? [dropdown menu for each: 1 year to 10+ years]

6. [If selected ‘Jewish supplementary school’ or ‘Jewish preschool’ in Q1] Which of the following educator roles do you typically seek to fill each year? (Select all that apply.)
   a. Teacher
   b. Teaching assistant
   c. B’nai Mitzvah tutor
   d. Hebrew language tutor
   e. Junior congregation leader
   f. Experiential educator
   g. Special needs support/para-educator
   h. Specialist (teaching music, nutrition, fitness, etc.)
   i. Other. Please describe: __________
7. [If selected ‘Jewish supplementary school’ or ‘Jewish preschool’ in Q1] How many of these positions do you seek to fill in a year? [drop down menu for each 1 to 4+]
   a. [If selected in Q6] Teacher
   b. [If selected in Q6] Teaching assistant
   c. [If selected in Q6] B’nai Mitzvah tutor
   d. [If selected in Q6] Hebrew language tutor
   e. [If selected in Q6] Junior congregation leader
   f. [If selected in Q6] Experiential educator
   g. [If selected in Q6] Special needs support/para-educator
   h. [If selected in Q6] Specialist
   i. [If selected ‘Other’ Q6; Pipe in ‘Other’ text from Q6]

8. [Carry over displayed items from Q7] What kind of certification and/or degree do you require for each of these positions? (Select all that apply)
   a. Degree in General Education
   b. Degree in Jewish education
   c. A professional certificate in an area of education
   d. Degree in an area of Jewish studies
   e. Other
   f. No degree/certificate requirement

8.1 [If Selected ‘other’ in any of the matrix options] What other certification/degree do you require?

9. [Carry over displayed items from Q7] For each of these positions, how long does a new hire usually stay in their role? [drop down menu for each: 1 year to 10+ years]

10. [If selected ‘Jewish summer camp’, ‘Jewish youth group’, ‘JCC’, or ‘College campus Jewish organization’ in Q1] Which of the following Jewish educator roles do you typically seek to fill each year? (Select all that apply.)
    a. Youth group advisor
    b. Counselor
    c. Fellow
    d. Experiential educator
    e. Engagement professional
    f. Song leader
    g. Trip leader
    h. Senior Jewish educator
    i. Jewish specialist
    j. Other. Please describe: __________

11. How many of these positions do you seek to fill in a year? [drop down menu for each 1 to 4+]
    a. [If selected in Q10] Youth group advisor
    b. [If selected in Q10] Counselor
    c. [If selected in Q10] Fellow
    d. [If selected in Q10] Experiential educator
    e. [If selected in Q10] Engagement professional
    f. [If selected in Q10] Song leader
    g. [If selected in Q10] Trip leader
    h. [If selected in Q10] Senior Jewish educator
    i. [If selected in Q10] Jewish specialist
    j. [If selected ‘Other’ Q10; Pipe in ‘Other’ text from Q10]
12. [Carry over displayed items from Q11] What kind of certification and/or degree do you require for each of these positions? (Select all that apply)
   a. Degree in General Education
   b. Degree in Jewish education
   c. A professional certificate in an area of education
   d. Degree in an area of Jewish studies
   e. Other
   f. No degree/certificate requirement

12.1 [If Selected ‘other’ in any of the matrix options] What other certification/degree do you require?

13. [Carry over displayed items from Q11] For each of these positions, how long does a new hire usually stay in their role? [dropdown menu for each: 1 year to 10+ years]

14. [Carry over displayed items from Q3, Q7, and Q11] Roughly, how many applicants are there for the following Jewish educator positions you advertise? (Matrix Table)
   a. None
   b. Between 1–3
   c. Between 4–6
   d. Between 7–9
   e. 10 or more

Block II: The Hiring Process
The next questions focus on the hiring process.

15. Which of the following strategies do you typically use to find qualified candidates? (Choose Top 3)
   a. Posting ads in local newspapers or magazines
   b. Posting ads in local Jewish press
   c. Using word of mouth
   d. Tapping the organization’s alumni network
   e. Tapping your own networks
   f. Posting ads on social media (e.g., Facebook, Instagram)
   g. Posting ads on general hiring websites (e.g., Indeed, Glassdoor)
   h. Posting ads on Jewish hiring websites (e.g., JewishJobs.com)
   i. Posting open positions on your organization’s website
   j. Posting ads on program or Fellowship listservs (e.g., WexNet)
   k. Contact training/certificate education programs (e.g., JTS, Pardes)
   l. Other. Please describe: ______________.
16. [If in Q1 ‘Jewish day school’ or ‘Jewish supplementary school’ or ‘Jewish preschool’ is selected] When you search for candidates, which of the following training programs, if any, do you contact to recruit their alumni? (Select all that apply)
   a. Hebrew Union College (HUC-JIR) Pre-Service Program (e.g., DeLeT, MAJE)
   b. Jewish Theological Seminary’s (JTS) Masters in Jewish Education Program
   c. A Yeshiva University (YU) Program (e.g., Pre-Service Master’s Program, Two-Year Teacher Program)
   d. American Jewish University’s (AJU) Masters in Teaching Program
   e. Middlebury’s Master of Arts in Teaching Hebrew as a Second Language Program
   f. Spertus’s Master of Arts in Jewish Professional Studies Program
   g. Brandeis’s MA-EdM Program
   h. York University’s Jewish Teacher Education Programme
   i. Pardes Day School Educators Program
   j. Fellowship programs within the Jewish community. Please Specify:
   k. Other. Please describe:
   l. No. I usually do not approach training programs [Mutually Exclusive]

17. Typically, which of the following is true regarding how wide you cast your net when searching for qualified candidates? (Select all that apply)
   a. We search for candidates in commuting distance of our location.
   b. We search for candidates in the surrounding areas within the state.
   c. We search for candidates in surrounding areas in nearby states.
   d. We search for candidates from all over the country.
   e. We search for candidates from abroad.
   f. Other. Please describe:

18. In assessing a potential candidate for a Jewish educator position, which of the following prior experiences do you find most desirable? (Select top 3)
   a. They attended Jewish summer camp
   b. They attended Jewish day school
   c. They attended a supplementary Jewish school program (e.g., Hebrew/Sunday school/Jewish afterschool)
   d. They participated in a youth group/movement
   e. They went on an organized group trip to Israel
   f. They are an alum of our organization
   g. It depends on the position
   h. Other. Please specify:
   i. We do not give preference to candidates that had any of these experiences [Mutually Exclusive]

17.1 [If selected g]. Please describe how these vary by position:________________.
19. In assessing a potential candidate for a Jewish educator position, which of the following pre-college or college leadership experiences do you find most desirable? (Select top 3)
   a. Cornerstone Fellow
   b. Madrich for Birthright Israel trip
   c. Jewish student campus leader (e.g., student leaders in Hillel, AEPHi), AIPAC, JLiC Fellow, Chabad board or student leader, Yavneh Fellows, etc.)
   d. Nachshon Fellow
   e. Youth Group Advisor (e.g., NCSY, BBYO, etc.)
   f. It depends on the position
   g. Other. Please describe: ____________________
   h. We do not give preference to candidates that had these experiences [Mutually Exclusive]

19.1 [If selected f]. Please describe how these vary by position: ____________________.

20. [Carry over displayed item from Q3, Q7, Q11] How difficult is it to find qualified candidates for each of the following positions? [Matrix to include the following answer choices]
   a. Not difficult at all
   b. Somewhat difficult
   c. Very difficult
   d. Extremely difficult

21. [Carry over displayed item from Q3, Q7, Q11] On average, for how long do positions stay vacant when open? [Matrix to include the following answer choices]
   a. Less than a month
   b. 1–2 months
   c. 3–4 months
   d. 5–6 months
   e. 7 or more months

22. Which of the following did you use to fill teaching vacancies during the 2019-2020 program/school year, pre-COVID? [Check all that apply]
   a. Hired a fully qualified educator
   b. Hired a less-than-fully qualified educator
   c. Added sections to other educators’ load
   d. Assigned educator of another subject or grade level
   e. Assigned administrator or counselor to teach
   f. Used long- or short-term substitute
   g. Expanded some class sizes
   h. Cancelled planned course offerings
Block III: Desired Attributes and Skills

Next, we’d like to understand what attributes you’re looking for when hiring Jewish educators, and what factors you weigh during the process.

23. Please select the top 3 educator characteristics you typically look for when you select job candidates: [Randomize, except ‘Other’]
   a. The ability to be a positive role model for learners
   b. The extent to which the candidate’s philosophy of learning aligns with the organization’s
   c. The ability to relate well with learners
   d. The ability to relate well with parents
   e. The ability to create a fun and stimulating environment
   f. The ability to relate well with colleagues
   g. The quality of the college/university the candidate attended
   h. Teaching credentials
   i. Prior experience
   j. Passion/enthusiasm for teaching
   k. Mastery of the subject matter
   l. The candidate’s positive reputation on social media
   m. Other. Please describe:

24. Typically, how important is each of the following skills to have when an educator starts a job in your organization? [Matrix scale: Not at all important, A little bit important, Somewhat important, Very important, Extremely important; Randomize items, except ‘Other’]
   a. Knowledge of subject matter
   b. [If Q1 ≠ g] Knowledge of child development (for relevant age group)
   c. Good organization skills
   d. Strong leadership skills
   e. High emotional intelligence
   f. Strong communication skills
   g. Comfort with religious pluralism
   h. Mastery of instructional methods/strategies
   i. The ability to be creative and flexible
   j. Technological proficiency
   k. Being able to detect mental health issues
   l. Working well with others
   m. Other. Please describe:

25. In your experience, to what extent can these skills be developed while on the job? [Scale: Not at all, A little bit, Moderately, To a large extent, To a very large extent]
   a. Knowledge of subject matter
   b. [If Q1 ≠ g] Knowledge of child development (for relevant age group)
   c. Good organization skills
   d. Strong leadership skills
   e. High emotional intelligence
   f. Strong communication skills
   g. Comfort with religious pluralism
   h. Mastery of instructional methods/strategies
   i. The ability to be creative and flexible
   j. Technological proficiency
   k. Being able to detect mental health issues
   l. Working well with others
   m. Other. Please describe: ______.
26. Typically, when selecting candidates, how important is each of the following to your organization? [Matrix scale: Not at all important, A little bit important, Somewhat important, Very important, Extremely important; Randomize items]
   a. They are very knowledgeable about Jewish texts
   b. They are very knowledgeable about Jewish values
   c. They are very knowledgeable about how to perform Jewish rituals
   d. They can easily converse in Hebrew
   e. They can easily comprehend Hebrew text
   f. They really enjoy Jewish learning
   g. They want to share their love of Jewish learning with others
   h. They want to contribute to the Jewish community
   i. They model the values of the institution
   j. Other. Please explain _____

Block IV: Training and Professional Development
Next, we’d like to know what professional growth opportunities are available for educators in your organizations.

27. Which of the following is true regarding future promotion opportunities for entry-level Jewish educators in your organization?
   a. There are no promotion opportunities for educators.
   b. There are limited promotion opportunities for educators.
   c. There are ample promotion opportunities for educators.

28. [If Q27 ≠ a] Please describe the typical promotion opportunities available for Jewish educators in your organization: _______________________________________.

29. Do you offer "on the job" training/professional development (PD) opportunities for your Jewish educators?
   a. Yes
   b. No

30. [If Yes] In a typical year, overall, how much PD do you make available to each of your Jewish educators?
   a. Less than one day
   b. 1-3 days
   c. 4-5 days
   d. More than 5 days

31. [If Q29 = yes] Which of the following types of PD experiences do you provide for your Jewish Educators? (Select all that apply.)
   a. Coaching and/or observation from a mentor or supervisor
   b. Coaching and/or observation from a peer
   c. Coaching and/or observation from an outside consultant
   d. Induction support for new educators
   e. Individualized PD plans for each educator
   f. Content-oriented workshop or lectures
   g. Reading and discussing professional literature
   h. Attending a professional conference
   i. Collaborative learning projects with colleagues
   j. Financial support for pursuing graduate studies
   k. Other. Please describe: __________________________.
Block V: General Perspective on the Field

Next, we’re curious about what you think of Jewish education as a profession.

32. Thinking about your perception of Jewish education as a profession, to what extent do you agree or disagree with the following? [Scale: Strongly Disagree to Strongly Agree, 7-pt scale; Randomize items]
   a. Being a Jewish educator offers good job security.
   b. After receiving appropriate training, it would be easy to find employment as a Jewish educator.
   c. Jewish educator jobs are available in many places throughout North America.
   d. Jewish education is a noble profession.
   e. Being a Jewish educator can help improve society.
   f. The level of pay for Jewish educators is quite good.
   g. There are very few opportunities for professional advancement in the field of Jewish education.
   h. There are very few professional development opportunities in Jewish education.
   i. Healthy work/life balance is not achievable for Jewish educators.
   j. The working hours for Jewish educators are too long.
   k. Jewish education is a “high burnout” field.
   l. It is unclear how to advance to more senior professional roles in Jewish education.
   m. The financial prospects for Jewish educators are quite poor.

Block VI: Information about Organization

Lastly, we want to know a little bit more about your organization.

33. What is your organization’s affiliation? [Randomize]
   a. Chabad
   b. Conservative
   c. Haredi
   d. Humanist
   e. Modern Orthodox
   f. Orthodox
   g. Post-denominational
   h. Reconstructionist
   i. Renewal
   j. Reform
   k. Secular
   l. Other. Please specify:

34. How many employees does your organization have? ________ [Numeric validation]

35. How many Jewish educators does your organization have? ________ [Numeric validation]

36. How many participants (i.e., students, campers, learners) does your organization serve? [Numeric validation]

37. Which of the following employee benefits does your organization offer to its full-time employees? (Select all that apply.)
   a. Paid vacation
   b. Medical insurance/Health care
   c. Dental insurance
   d. Vision insurance
   e. Professional development stipend
   f. Reduced/free tuition for children at school
   g. Reduced/free congregational membership
   h. Reduced/free program fees
   i. Life insurance
   j. Retirement plan (401(k), 403(b), etc.)
   k. Short- or long-term disability
   l. Paid family leave
   m. Flex time
   n. Ability to work from home
   o. Other. Please describe: ________
   p. None of the above [Mutually exclusive]
38. In your opinion, which of the following benefits, regardless of whether your organization currently offers them or not, do you think would be most attractive to educators you seek to employ? (Select top 3)
   a. Paid vacation
   b. Medical insurance/Health care
   c. Dental insurance
   d. Vision insurance
   e. Professional development stipend
   f. Reduced/free tuition for children at school
   g. Reduced/free congregational membership
   h. Reduced/free program fees
   i. Life insurance
   j. Retirement plan (401(k), 403(b), etc.)
   k. Short- or long-term disability
   l. Paid family leave
   m. Flex time
   n. Ability to work from home
   o. Other. Please describe: ____________________________
   p. None of the above [Mutually exclusive]

39. [Carry over displayed item from Q3, Q7, Q11] What is the entry salary range for each of the following positions? [Matrix to include the following answer choices]
   a. Less than $30,000
   b. $30,000–$44,999
   c. $45,000–$59,999
   d. $60,000–$74,999
   e. $75,000–$89,999
   f. $90,000 or more

40. End Survey Message.

Thank you for taking the time to participate in this survey! Part of our research focuses on the language, details, and expectations listed in Jewish educator job descriptions. Would you be willing to share several Jewish educator job descriptions with us from the past 12 months? If so, you can upload them to this link. For Hebrew schools or day schools, these could be for “JS” teachers, Talmud, Tanakh, or other Jewish subjects, including Hebrew language. At camps or youth groups, this could be for Jewish educator/song leader positions or Jewish educators you bring to a convention/retreat.

Any files you upload will not be shared beyond the research study team, nor will our analysis reference any specific job description or posting. Any postings we reference will not be identifiable in our reporting.

Please feel free to reach out to Ariel Platt, at aplatt@rosovconsulting.com with any questions.
Introduction: Thank you again for making time for this conversation today—we are especially grateful given current realities of the world we’re living in. This interview is part of a major research study of the experiences and career arc of those who are working or have worked in Jewish educational settings in the US. This component of the study explores the “demand side” of the Jewish education marketplace—what employers who hire Jewish educators look for and need in their staff, where they find their staff, and where and how they invest in their professional growth.

The project is being overseen by the Consortium for Applied Studies in Jewish Education and is funded by the William Davidson Foundation and the Jim Joseph Foundation.

This conversation should last approximately 45 minutes and your responses are entirely confidential, meaning we will not attach your responses to your name when we report our findings.

Additionally, I’d like to ask your permission to record this session for analysis purposes. Is that alright with you?

Do you have any questions before we begin?

First, can you tell me a little bit about where you work and your role there?

I am going to begin with questions about your practices and considerations before the era of COVID-19. Later we will discuss the impact of COVID-19.

Interviewee Name:
Interviewee Position/Title:
Organization Name:
Date:

1. This study is about the career trajectory of “Jewish educators”—how do you define the role of Jewish educator within your organization?

2. Generally speaking, does your organization employ people with the role of “Jewish educator”? What title does this person usually hold?
   a. Is the role national? Local? What does that position entail?
   b. Is the position of Jewish educator permanent or one that is occasionally filled and at other times taken on by others (occupying other permanent positions)?
   c. What training do they usually bring to the job?
3. In a typical hiring process, what are the skills you look for in a Jewish educator?
   a. What skills, experiences, and/or aptitudes are most helpful for a Jewish educator in your organization to have, whatever their specific role?
   b. Are there any credentials that have special value?
   c. How do you go about assessing those skills, aptitudes, and credentials?

4. How important is it to you that the demographic profiles of those you hire (Jewish or otherwise) aligns with, or reflects, the demographic profiles of those who participate in your programs?

5. Given your comments about what you generally look for in your Jewish educators, where do you look to find your educators?
   a. What programs do you tend to hire from (if any)?
   b. How hard/easy is the hiring process in general?
   c. How long is a position usually open before it is filled?
   d. What is your typical hiring season?
   e. How local is the hiring process? Are most of your educators local or do you need to go further afield (nationally or internationally) to fill your positions?
   f. How long do you anticipate a new Jewish educator hire will generally stay in the job in your organization?

6. What do you do if and when you don’t have enough “talent” to meet your needs or if you aren’t able to find a qualified candidate for an open Jewish educator position?
   a. Of the various skills, experiences, and/or aptitudes you are looking for, which ones are most difficult to find in a candidate?
   b. When candidates come up short—whether they end up being hired or not—are there trends in common shortcomings?

7. Once you’ve hired your Jewish educators, tell me about the kinds of professional training and support you provide for them.
   a. What are the kinds of skills or aptitudes for which you find the need to offer ongoing learning/PD to your teachers/educators?
   b. If you outsource PD, where do you tend to send them?
   c. If PD is done in-house, what kinds of programs are you offering?

Let’s now focus on the current moment, where COVID-19 is a reality and I imagine you are navigating great uncertainty.
8. First, what are the most likely scenarios that you are planning for in light of COVID-19, and what are the implications for staffing?
   a. If you ARE hiring, how is that process different than in the past?

9. What special skills are you looking for in your educators, and what kinds of skills are you needing to develop in your existing team?
   a. Are these skills different from those you looked for in the past?

This brings us to the end of our interview. Are there any final thoughts you would like to share regarding the hiring and training of Jewish educators for your organization (or those like it)?

Part of our research focuses on the language, details and expectations listed in Jewish educator job descriptions – would you be willing to share any recent ones you might have? Any files you upload will not be shared beyond the research study team, nor will our analysis reference any specific job description or posting. Any postings we reference will not be identifiable in our reporting. I can follow up via email to ask for them more formally. Thank you!

I want to thank you once again for your participation in this interview. It was extremely helpful. As a follow up to this interview, we are going to send a request for any job descriptions/postings for Jewish educators your organization has released in the past year. We appreciate your submitting these so we can incorporate them as part of our analysis.
Appendix F
Supply-Side Organizational Interview Protocol

**Introduction:** Thank you again for making time for this conversation today – we are especially grateful given current realities of the world we’re living in. This interview is part of a major research study of the experiences and career arc of those who are working or have worked in Jewish educational settings in the U.S. This component of the study explores the “supply side” of the Jewish education marketplace – how programs prepare educators for the field of Jewish education – what skills, competencies and dispositions they seek to develop in aspiring educators and how they understand their role in the market of professional Jewish educators (across formal and informal sectors).

The project is being overseen by the Consortium for Applied Studies in Jewish Education and is funded by the William Davidson Foundation and the Jim Joseph Foundation.

The conversation should last approximately 45 minutes, and your responses are entirely confidential, meaning we will not attach your responses to your name when we report our findings.

Additionally, I’d like to ask your permission to record this session for analysis purposes. Is that alright with you?

Do you have any questions before we begin?

**Organization Name:**

**Programs Offered:** (e.g. "MA in ____, Center for Special Education, Certificate in_____ etc.")

**Interviewee Name:**

**Interviewee Position/Title:**

**Date:**

1. First, can you tell me about your educator training program(s) and its mission.
   a. What is the goal of the program(s)?
   b. How long is the program(s)?
   c. Is the program(s) primarily virtual or in person? Full time or part time?
   d. What are the core program(s) requirements / core courses and or internships?
   e. Is the program(s) subsidized or tuition-based?
      i. If tuition-based what is the cost of tuition?
   f. How many students typically enroll in each year?
   g. How many alumni does your program(s) have? Do you know how many of those are serving as full time Jewish educators? [ballpark is fine]
2. **What does the term “Jewish educator” mean within the context of your program(s)?**
   a. For what imagined role of Jewish educator is the program preparing its participants (i.e., front line educator, administrator, etc.)? Has this changed over time?
   b. What skills, experiences, and/or aptitudes are most helpful for an educator to have?
   c. How do you go about assessing those skills, aptitudes within the program?

3. **What sectors / markets is the program(s) serving primarily?** (Day schools, camps, congregational education, youth groups, Hillel, etc.)

4. **Tell us about your recruitment.**
   a. How would you describe the profile of your typical applicant (their background, level of education, intended career)?
   b. What criteria do you look for in applicants?
   c. What programs do you tend to draw your students from in general?
   d. Who would you say is your “competition” in the field?
   e. How do you market the program?
   f. What is your sense of what motivates your participants to enroll?
   g. Is the program primarily local in its recruitment (drawing from potential educators who live nearby) or more national/ international in its reach?

5. **[For training programs or executive MA type programs]** Is helping your alumni/participants find work in the field / take up different positions than the ones in which they are currently employed something that is part of your program’s goals? If not, why not? If so, how is this goal addressed?

6. **[For pre-service programs]** We are interested in how educators find job placements.
   a. Does your program have any field service requirements of its alumni?
   b. Does it make any promises in terms of placement?
   c. Where do your alumni typically find employment?
   d. What kind of job placement services does the program offer?
   e. Do you have a sense of how long educators will stay in a job?
7. How do you gauge (if at all) the success of alumni in the field?

8. How has the curriculum you offer changed in the last decade (if at all)?
   a. How, if at all, has COVID-19 impacted your program in terms of funding, enrollment, and
      program content?

9. What do you see in the future of your and other similar programs in the next 5-10 years?
   a. What are the emerging trends in the filed of Jewish education in the next 5-10 years, and
      what do you think the implications of those are for staffing Jewish educational programs?

I want to thank you once again for your participation in this interview. It was extremely helpful. As part of
our study we are also looking at course listings from various training programs. Are these listed on your
program website? [if not ask if they can share]
Email Language-

Subject line: Following Up: Confirming Details about your Program

Dear [First Name],

Thank you for speaking with our team about the training and development you provide to Jewish educators. As part of our due diligence and to ensure we capture specific data about your program(s) accurately, we are asking if you would please confirm certain details about your offerings by filling out this form. It should not take longer than 5 minutes.

The data you submit through this form will be used to populate a public-facing “inventory” of the Jewish Educator Professional Development landscape. We hope this deliverable will be available to the public by Summer 2021.

Should you have any questions, feel free to contact Tehilla Becker, Project Associate, at tbecker@rosovconsulting.com.

Thank you again for your help in this important research.

Sincerely,

The Rosov Consulting Team (Frayda Gonshor Cohen and Ariel Platt)

1. We’re interested in information about the following programs you offer for Jewish educators.

   a. Program 1: PLUG IN
   b. Program 2: PLUG IN
   c. Program 3: PLUG IN
Please answer the following questions about [program 1]:

2. Is [program 1] a pre-service or in-service program?
   a. Pre-service
   b. In-service
   c. Program participants are either pre-service or in-service

3. Which of the following elements does [program 1] include? Please select all that apply.
   a. Capstone Project
   b. Cohort
   c. Coursework
   d. Experiential Education
   e. Havruta Learning
   f. Independent Study
   g. Internship/Practicum/Job Embedded
   h. Israel/Travel
   i. Mentoring/Coaching
   j. Observations
   k. Online/Hybrid Classes
   l. Project Based Learning
   m. Seminars

4. Which of the following content areas does [program 1] cover? Please select all that apply.
   a. Art
   b. Brain Science
   c. Change Management
   d. Child Development
   e. Classroom Management
   f. Education Theory
   g. Hebrew
   h. Inclusion
   i. Israel
   j. Jewish Text
   k. Jewish Wisdom
   l. Leadership
   m. Mental Health
   n. Professional Development
   o. Relational Engagement
   p. Spirituality
   q. Student Learning
   r. Self-Reflection
   s. Technology
   t. Other. Please specify: __________
5. Which of the following forms of certification do participants receive on completing [program 1]?
   a) A recognized academic degree (e.g. BA, MA)
   b) Certificate other than academic degree
   c) No certification is offered on completion

6. Is [program 1] selective? (e.g. is there an application process and could someone possibly not get accepted?)
   a) Yes, our program is selective
   b) No, there is no selection criteria (e.g. assuming there is space, anyone can sign up)

7. Can individual educators sign up directly to [program 1] or do their employers have to sponsor them?
   a) Individuals can sign up
   b) Sign up has to be through an organization
   c) Individuals or organizations can sign up to this program

8. In what venues do participants/alumni of your program work? Please select all that apply.
   a) Adult Education
   b) Campus
   c) Community Federation
   d) Congregations
   e) Congregational School
   f) Day School
   g) Early Childhood Education
   h) Israel Experience
   i) JCC
   j) Jewish Innovation Organization
   k) Overnight Camp
   l) Social Justice Organization
   m) Youth Serving Organization
   n) Other. Please specify: _______
9. Of the following possible goals, please select the three that are most important desired outcomes of program 1:

a) Participants will gain increased knowledge
b) Participants will gain skills or tools to better their practice (Pedagogy)
c) Participants will feel (re)inspired about their profession
d) Participants will gain knowledge of their professional capacities
e) Participants will develop a personal vision for Jewish education
f) Participants will become contributors to change in their profession
g) Participants will develop a community of practice
h) Participants will experience personal Jewish growth
i) Participants will learn how to change institutional cultures
j) Participants will adopt a stance for inquiry and/or lifelong learning
k) Other. Please describe: __________

10. On average, how many participants take part in program 1 every year? [open ended]

11. Since the inception of program 1, how many alumni are there?

12. What is the per participant cost of the program before grant funding/subsidization? [open ended]

13. To what extent do you offer subsidies to participating individuals/institutions?
   a) Full Subsidy
   b) Partial Subsidy
   c) No subsidy

Please answer the following questions about program 2:

Same questions as above, with program 2 embedded.

Please answer the following questions about program 3:

Same questions as above, with program 3 embedded.
14. Are there any other Jewish educator training or Jewish educator PD programs that you offer that you’d like to tell us about?
   
a) Yes
   
b) No

15. [If Q14=a] Please name any additional Jewish educator training or Jewish educator PD programs you would like to tell us about.
   
a. Program a: _______
   
b. Program b: _______

Please answer the following questions about [program a]:

Please answer the following questions about [program b]:

16. We apologize if we didn’t refer to your program(s) by the correct name. Please let us know if it should be referred to in some other way: ________________

17. If there’s anything else you want us to know about your program(s), please share it here.
## Appendix H

### Map of Supply-Side Programs for Jewish Educators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Year Founded</th>
<th>Average # Participants per Year</th>
<th>Pre-Service</th>
<th>Content</th>
<th>Certification</th>
<th>Signups</th>
<th>Alumnus in Sector</th>
<th>Program Goals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American Jewish University</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Childhood Education Extension Program</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA Completion Program in Early Childhood Education</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA in Teaching</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA in Education</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA in Education for Early Childhood Education</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentor Teacher Training Program</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avodah</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish Service Corps</td>
<td>1918</td>
<td>75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justice Fellowship</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ayeka</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Becoming a Soulful Educator</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BetterLesson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BetterLesson Professional Learning</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>2000+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brandeis University</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA in Teaching (Elementary/Secondary)</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brandeis Legacy Heritage Teacher Leadership Graduate Program</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ed. M. in Teacher Leadership</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Center for Israel Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day School Initiative</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consortium of Jewish Day Schools</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum Mentoring - LeEMALEU'AHNASI</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>100+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear U'Makdim</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>100+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speakers Bureau</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>100+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foundation for Jewish Camp</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foundation for Jewish Camp Fellowship</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Washington University</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master's Program in Experiential Jewish Education</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master's Program in Israel Education</td>
<td>2021</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA in Curriculum and Instruction with a Concentration in Jewish Education</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certificate in Israel Education</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gratz College</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master of Education with Concentration in Jewish Instructional Education</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish Education Undergraduate Certificate</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS in Nonprofit Management, with Jewish Educational Administration concentration</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCIJ program (non-degree professional development)</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hebrew Teaching certificate</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*This list was compiled by Rosov Consulting in Spring 2021 from organizations identified either by employers in the eight communities that participated in the CASJE “Career Trajectories of Jewish Educators” study or by additional key informants as constituting the primary providers of preparation and development services today. It is not meant to be exhaustive of all programs. Empty cells represent data not provided from organizations.*
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Year Founded</th>
<th>Average # of Participants per Year</th>
<th>Pre/Service</th>
<th>In-Service</th>
<th>Content</th>
<th>Certification</th>
<th>Signups</th>
<th>Alumni in Sector</th>
<th>Program Goals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hadar Institute</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedagogy of Partnership</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>☀</td>
<td>☀</td>
<td>☀</td>
<td>☀</td>
<td>☀</td>
<td>☀</td>
<td>☀</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer Institutes</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>☀</td>
<td>☀</td>
<td>☀</td>
<td>☀</td>
<td>☀</td>
<td>☀</td>
<td>☀</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hebrew College</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congregational Education Initiative</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>☀</td>
<td>☀</td>
<td>☀</td>
<td>☀</td>
<td>☀</td>
<td>☀</td>
<td>☀</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hebrew for Educators</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master of Jewish Education</td>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hebrew Union College-Jewish Institute of Religion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DidiF</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>☀</td>
<td>☀</td>
<td>☀</td>
<td>☀</td>
<td>☀</td>
<td>☀</td>
<td>☀</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive MA in Jewish Education</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>☀</td>
<td>☀</td>
<td>☀</td>
<td>☀</td>
<td>☀</td>
<td>☀</td>
<td>☀</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master of Educational Leadership</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>☀</td>
<td>☀</td>
<td>☀</td>
<td>☀</td>
<td>☀</td>
<td>☀</td>
<td>☀</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hillel International</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Springboard Fellowship-Euro Jewish Education Specialist</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>☀</td>
<td>☀</td>
<td>☀</td>
<td>☀</td>
<td>☀</td>
<td>☀</td>
<td>☀</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institute for Jewish Spirituality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educating for Jewish Spiritual Life-Local Consortia</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>☀</td>
<td>☀</td>
<td>☀</td>
<td>☀</td>
<td>☀</td>
<td>☀</td>
<td>☀</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Asynchronous Course</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>☀</td>
<td>☀</td>
<td>☀</td>
<td>☀</td>
<td>☀</td>
<td>☀</td>
<td>☀</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish Gateways</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Center for Professional Learning</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>☀</td>
<td>☀</td>
<td>☀</td>
<td>☀</td>
<td>☀</td>
<td>☀</td>
<td>☀</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish New Teacher Project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day School Teacher Induction Program</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>☀</td>
<td>☀</td>
<td>☀</td>
<td>☀</td>
<td>☀</td>
<td>☀</td>
<td>☀</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrator Support Program</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>☀</td>
<td>☀</td>
<td>☀</td>
<td>☀</td>
<td>☀</td>
<td>☀</td>
<td>☀</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish Studio Project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creative Facilitator Training</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>☀</td>
<td>☀</td>
<td>☀</td>
<td>☀</td>
<td>☀</td>
<td>☀</td>
<td>☀</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish Theological Seminary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davidson School MA in Jewish Education</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>☀</td>
<td>☀</td>
<td>☀</td>
<td>☀</td>
<td>☀</td>
<td>☀</td>
<td>☀</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish Day School Standards and Benchmarks: Enhancing Instructional Leadership</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td></td>
<td>☀</td>
<td>☀</td>
<td>☀</td>
<td>☀</td>
<td>☀</td>
<td>☀</td>
<td>☀</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day School Leadership Training Institute</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>☀</td>
<td>☀</td>
<td>☀</td>
<td>☀</td>
<td>☀</td>
<td>☀</td>
<td>☀</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish Early Childhood Educational Leadership</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>☀</td>
<td>☀</td>
<td>☀</td>
<td>☀</td>
<td>☀</td>
<td>☀</td>
<td>☀</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legacy Heritage Fund Limited</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Innovation Institute</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>☀</td>
<td>☀</td>
<td>☀</td>
<td>☀</td>
<td>☀</td>
<td>☀</td>
<td>☀</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Teacher Leader Fellowship at Brandeis</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>☀</td>
<td>☀</td>
<td>☀</td>
<td>☀</td>
<td>☀</td>
<td>☀</td>
<td>☀</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts Institute</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>☀</td>
<td>☀</td>
<td>☀</td>
<td>☀</td>
<td>☀</td>
<td>☀</td>
<td>☀</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Teacher Tech Institute</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>☀</td>
<td>☀</td>
<td>☀</td>
<td>☀</td>
<td>☀</td>
<td>☀</td>
<td>☀</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M³ Institute for Experiential Jewish Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer Educators Cohort</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>☀</td>
<td>☀</td>
<td>☀</td>
<td>☀</td>
<td>☀</td>
<td>☀</td>
<td>☀</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camp Educators Cohort</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>☀</td>
<td>☀</td>
<td>☀</td>
<td>☀</td>
<td>☀</td>
<td>☀</td>
<td>☀</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immersive Experiences Circle</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>☀</td>
<td>☀</td>
<td>☀</td>
<td>☀</td>
<td>☀</td>
<td>☀</td>
<td>☀</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Jewish Pedagogues Circle</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>☀</td>
<td>☀</td>
<td>☀</td>
<td>☀</td>
<td>☀</td>
<td>☀</td>
<td>☀</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The M³ 18/18 Executive Fellowship</td>
<td>2021</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>☀</td>
<td>☀</td>
<td>☀</td>
<td>☀</td>
<td>☀</td>
<td>☀</td>
<td>☀</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relational Learning Circle</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>☀</td>
<td>☀</td>
<td>☀</td>
<td>☀</td>
<td>☀</td>
<td>☀</td>
<td>☀</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mapping the Market: Pre-Service and In-Service Training for Jewish Educators
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Year Founded</th>
<th>Average # of Participants per Year</th>
<th>Pre-Service</th>
<th>In-Service</th>
<th>Content</th>
<th>Certification</th>
<th>Signups</th>
<th>Alumni in Sector</th>
<th>Program Goals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mendel Teacher Educator Institute</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Lion Institute (for Early Childhood Education)</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Lion Institute for Congregational School and Youth Directors</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middlebury College</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA in Teaching Hebrew as a Second Language</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pardes Institute for Jewish Studies</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experimental Educators Program One Year Certificate in Jewish Studies</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day School Educators Program M.Ed. with Hebrew College</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pardes Jewish Studies In-Service Teacher Training Program</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shalom Hartman Institute of North America</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Cohorts</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus Professional Cohorts</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camp Professional Cohorts</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day School Cohort</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Songleader Boot Camp</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish Educator Track</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Childhood and Family Engagement</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soferos Institute for Jewish Studies</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certificate in Jewish Leadership for Educators</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SINRA</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SINRA’s Teaching Kollel</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Chai Center</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#Week Day Schools</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>400</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tamid University</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish Education Post-Baccalaureate Certificate</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership in Jewish Education and Community Services (LJEC)</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yeshiva University</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affiliated College of Jewish Education</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affiliated Undergraduate Program (in Jewish Education)</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affiliated Online Masters in Jewish Education</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affiliated Masters in Jewish Education</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mapping the Market: Pre-Service and In-Service Training for Jewish Educators
The Collaborative for Applied Studies in Jewish Education (CASJE) is an evolving community of researchers, practitioners, and philanthropic leaders dedicated to improving the quality of knowledge that can be used to guide the work of Jewish education. The Collaborative supports research shaped by the wisdom of practice, practice guided by research, and philanthropy informed by a sound base of evidence.

George Washington University’s Graduate School of Education and Human Development (GSEHD) advances knowledge through meaningful research that improves the policy and practice of education. Together, more than 1,600 faculty, researchers and graduate students make up the GSEHD community of scholars. Founded in 1909, GSEHD continues to take on the challenges of the 21st century, guided by the belief that education is the single greatest contributor to economic success and social progress.

Rosov Consulting helps foundations, philanthropists, federations, and grantee organizations in the Jewish communal sector make well informed decisions that enhance their impact. Working at the nexus of the funder and grantee relationship, our expertise includes evaluation, applied research, impact assessment, and the design and implementation of data collection efforts to inform strategy development and planning. Founded in 2008, we utilize our range of life experiences and knowledge to best serve our clients.

The William Davidson Foundation is a private family foundation that honors its founder and continues his life-long commitment to philanthropy, advancing for future generations the economic, cultural and civic vitality of Southeast Michigan, the State of Israel, and the Jewish community. For more information, visit williamdavidson.org.

The Jim Joseph Foundation seeks to foster compelling, effective Jewish learning experiences for young Jews in the United States. Established in 2006, the Jim Joseph Foundation has awarded more than $600 million in grants with the aspiration that all Jews, their families, and their friends will be inspired by Jewish learning experiences to lead connected, meaningful, and purpose-filled lives and make positive contributions to their communities and the world.