



LIBRARY COPYRIGHT NOTICE

www.huc.edu/libraries

Regulated Warning

See Code of Federal Regulations, Title 37, Volume 1, Section 201.14:

The copyright law of the United States (title 17, United States Code) governs the making of photocopies or other reproductions of copyrighted material.

Under certain conditions specified in the law, libraries and archives are authorized to furnish a photocopy or other reproduction. One of these specific conditions is that the photocopy or reproduction is not to be “used for any purpose other than private study, scholarship, or research.” If a user makes a request for, or later uses, a photocopy or reproduction for purposes in excess of “fair use,” that user may be liable for copyright infringement.

This institution reserves the right to refuse to accept a copying order if, in its judgment, fulfillment of the order would involve violation of copyright law.

HEBREW UNION COLLEGE - JEWISH INSTITUTE OF RELIGION

California School

/WHAT IS HILLEL?/ or
MISSION IMPOSSIBLE

A Thesis submitted in partial
fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of
Master of Arts
in
Jewish Communal Service

by

Eve Deena Ben-Ora

August, 1981

HEBREW UNION COLLEGE -
JEWISH INSTITUTE OF RELIGION

The Thesis of Eve Deena Ben-Ora is approved.

Bruce Phillips

Norman Miller

פֿיִיִם קֶצֶר וּפֿאַמֿלֿכֿפֿ מֵרֹוֹבֿפֿ

וּפֿאַדֿעֿלֿיִם עֶלֶצֿיִם

וּפֿעֿשֿכֿר פֿרֵגֿפֿ

וּבֵעֶפֿ פֿבֿיִתֿ קֹוֹחֿן

דֵאָדֵאָ עֶלֶיִן פֿאַמֿלֿכֿפֿ זאַמֿר

דֵאָדֵאָ אֹוֹפֿ בֵּן־חֹוֹרִין עֶפֿבֿטֿלֿ מֵאָפֿ

בֵּרְקִי אִבּוֹתֿ

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank Dr. Bruce Phillips for all of his kind support and expert guidance in helping me formulate the idea for this thesis and the methodology with which to complete it. I appreciate his sense of humor. It is an invaluable teaching device and he uses it wisely. His patience helped me in dealing with irrationality since he understands that creativity can emerge out of panic.

I am also thankful for Laurie Topel's constant badgering to try Jazzercise. Without Jazzercise I would have finished this thesis, but not in very good shape. It was something to look forward to beyond the long days in class and at field work and the long hours at the typewriter.

I thank my friends and colleagues from the School of Jewish Communal Service, Class of '81. Their constant caring support served to buoy my spirit. It made coming to classes a therapeutic process rather than a drudgery. They never seemed to tire of my complaints and always had an encouraging word to say.

I am grateful to my parents for convincing to come to HUC-JIR in the SJCS program. Though it was a painful process at times, the experiences I have had will serve

me well in the future.

I would like to thank Rabbi Laura Geller for her inspiration and guidance in this project and for giving me the time and opportunity to carry it through. It is also to her credit that I ever came to Hillel in the first place.

And, finally, to my then fiance, now husband, Avi Michael Schulman. He was there in the thick of it, and I can only admire and respect him because he was able to console me and cajole me. He was there from beginning through the middle to the end. He endured fits of frustration, an apartment strewn with paper and not being able to go out on Saturday nights. He did my laundry and massaged my neck. I know we will be together for a very long time. I wish for us blissful happiness for the rest of our lives.

edb

August, 1981

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Chapter

I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. METHODOLOGY	7
III. HISTORY OF HILLEL	21
IV. CLIENTELE.	37
V. THE CHARTER	49
VI. THE ROLE OF THE PROFESSIONAL	76
VII. THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, THE LAY BOARD--THEIR ROLE	90
VIII. RECOMMENDATIONS	100
BIBLIOGRAPHY	116

I. INTRODUCTION

Experiences from life teach in the most effective manner, though these lessons from life are often the most painful. This thesis topic originates from my field placement at USC Hillel in the Fall-Spring of 1981. It rapidly blossoms into a complete research topic because of the vagueries and inconsistencies that the college campus exhibits.

B'nai B'rith Hillel began as an organization developed to meet the religious, social, cultural and educational needs of college students. Its specific function changed with time according to the needs of the students and the mood of the campus, but its essential nature remained the same. The importance of maintaining a Jewish institute on the college campus emerged and still holds true today. One could argue that the "natural tendency for Jews to gather" rings just as true on the campus as it does in the adult Jewish community. The high ideals that Jewish parents pass on to their offspring about the value of a good education allows for a built-in constituency in those students who paid attention and a built-in support system with those parents who practice what they preach.

The high ideals for which Hillels strive lead to exciting programs that are generally carried out by an

innovative and professional staff. In response to the wide variety of students' needs, Hillel provides a program that includes Israel, UJWF campaigns, classes, regular services, and social events. The students themselves represent a broad cross section of age groups. They come from all over the United States; they have a wide variety of backgrounds and varied interests. The uniting factor seems to be the desire to meet and spend time with other Jewish students. Some come on their own volition; some at their parents' insistence. Others are dragged in by their friends, but all leave with a sense of a Jewish presence.

Hillel also is responsible for representing Jews and the Jewish community to the university administration. Though the voice may have no other sanction than the fact that it is there on the campus, the Hillel staff serve an important function to the community, the students, and the university where it is situated.

The history of Hillel has many facets that will be dealt with in a later chapter, but one important trend is mentioned here, because it is related to the primary purpose of this research. Originally, Hillel was loosely structured and only later came to be sponsored by B'nai B'rith. As money tightened, the responsibility for funding Hillel, in many cities, fell to the federations, as it did in Los Angeles. Hillels would be in far greater financial straits if this support had not been forthcoming, but in the pro-

cess, a new responsibility fell to the Hillel staff.

As it goes, Hillel programs were planned and money allocated on an ad hoc basis. This was an effective means when Hillel was small and was under the jurisdiction of B'nai B'rith. With the intervention of a goal-oriented planning body, Hillel must now be accountable, provide concrete data of its successes and failures and be clear and precise as to what it wants to accomplish, who it is trying to reach and whether it is meeting its goals. In order to legitimate the amount of the budget allocated to Hillel, the federation needs and deserves to know how that money will be spent.

My experience as an intern at Hillel allowed me to witness as a professional, first hand, the diversity of Hillel programs. As a result, I discovered that many aspects were vague and undefined. There was no clear system of establishing priorities because everything must be a priority; everything was a goal, from the most complex program to raise the consciousness of the Jewish community to the plight of the Soviet Jews, an event to which hundreds flocked, to an informal shabbat dinner at a student's house.

Another vaguery involves the inability to determine the success of a program. Numbers is not an effective gauge when the professionals have no way to predict who and how many will come to any given program. When dealing with a student population, there are so many variables it is

impossible to deal with them all. Every year, new students come in; others graduate. Every semester varies as to who will be active. Every week, the programs' successes depend on who has mid-terms, when the football games occur, students who are incapable of planning their time effectively. This is not to mention the inevitable burn-out rate. Every day brings unexpected events before the Hillel staff, such as anti-Semitic posters in the students union or a member of the Unification Church trying to convert students right in the building.

A typical hour of staff time could include a set meeting with a student group (that most likely starts late because the students do not arrive on time). Meanwhile, while the staff person is waiting for the students to arrive, another student drops in for an informal chat, which is encouraged in such an environment. This is usually interrupted by one or more phone calls and then the other students for the meeting arrive. Once the meeting gets started, and it will still take an hour, if not more, other obligations get pushed aside in order to fulfill this previous obligation.

Thus, it is not surprising that Hillel does not have an effective means of evaluating its program. None of the people who I interviewed, none of the people with whom I worked, not even the board, federation or National Hillel in New York could honestly say that they knew an effective

way to show that Hillel was indeed, doing what it was supposed to do. Perhaps this is an unreasonable task, this will be explored in depth in later chapters, but the necessity of attempting to do such an investigation becomes more crucial as community funds shrink and Hillels desire to expand and improve their programs.

Those who stand to benefit if Hillel is to continue and those who stand to suffer with its demise include the students who Hillel serves directly. They are the ones who get the immediate benefits, but may not exhibit those awards until many years later. They may only be the "saving remnant," but they have continued to show their support and they are the potential leaders of the Jewish community.

The members of the Los Angeles Hillel Council board (from here on known as LAHC board) are the proof that Hillel does perpetuate Judaism. This group of people declare their support for Hillel through their continual hard work in advocacy and fundraising. All of the people I talked to from the board were involved with Hillel at their undergraduate institutions. All of them are also involved with several other organizations besides Hillel. They truly have an invested interest in seeing Hillel survive.

Federation, as the funding agency, supports Hillel out of a belief in its ideology. This support is exhibited in the financial support it continues to provide. In order for federation to make an accurate estimate of how much to

allocate to the Hillel foundations, it needs to have an understandable means of determining the need. So far, this has been less than adequate. Hillel also serves as an arm of the federation in that it has a UJWF campus campaign. Though the dollar amounts may be insignificant, there is a great deal of awareness raised and commitment solidified by enabling college students to have this kind of involvement.

The Hillel professionals are firmly committed to providing a strong Jewish presence on campus. They want to do the best job that they are able and will do whatever it takes to be successful. They owe it to themselves, however, to also participate in this quest for a clear presentation of Hillel, its goals and objectives. This serves to make their jobs easier, more fulfilling and their work will have a much greater potential to be of its highest quality. These are the people who have the daily contact with the student. They are the line workers, constantly in demand and in need of concrete support that what they are doing is valid.

II. METHODOLOGY

The study of a body of information takes patience and unceasing devotion to detail. Any piece of knowledge that is missed leaves gaps in the study.

The choice of methodology for this thesis was a result of analyzing the positive and negative aspects of survey research and ethnography. In survey research, the data are collected in a series from one piece of datum to the next. Often, there are few obvious relationships between the pieces. The information is gathered by means of a questionnaire which is structured along specific lines. This is generally a one-time analysis. The area that I chose to study was not conducive to this means and this also was not my interest to use this method; rather I chose an ethnographic method.

Qualitative research or ethnography involves looking at all components of the whole simultaneously and not necessarily in the order in which the final study will be set down. In this instance, the relationship between the multiple parts is essential. This is based a great deal on inductive reasoning. The observations are taken as a result of this system and there can also be more than one explanation. Often, the results are unpredictable and

new lines of study may develop as a result. In fact, this is expected.

The information is gathered in the form of field notes, either first hand observation or through interviews. The format is relatively unstructured as it develops in the course of the field note development. The data must be evaluated continuously since the need to make connections arises with each new piece of information. These field notes make up the raw data of an ethnographic study.

Once the field notes are compiled, comments are made by the researcher. This is how the analysis is conducted through a system of using three types of notations:

substantive notes, theoretical notes and methodological notes.¹ The information can be correlated and compared with other information. Another result of this method is that often patterns of information emerge and these help to bring order to the gathering process. Furthermore, new questions may emerge to ask of other respondents, new ideas develop, new categories. It is a learn-as-you-go system that brings new surprises and frustrations with every interview.

The constant comparative method consists of four steps:

- (1) Compare incidents that are applicable to each category

¹ Substantive note (S.N.) = What transpired in interviews;
Methodological note (M.N.) = Things to watch for and ask about in other interviews;
Theoretical note (T.N.) = My own insights

- (2) Integrate categories and properties, i.e.,
how to do things
- (3) Delineate the theory by taking instances
and looking for them elsewhere
- (4) Write the theory

The signal for a stopping point is when there is saturation of information, i.e., the same points recur and a theory can be developed.¹

The overall framework from which the interviewees were determined was a cross-sectional model. I was interested in talking to people involved in the various levels of the Hillel hierarchy. That is to say, I wanted to speak to staff members, both executive directors and program directors (there was one past co-director), their supervisor, members of the Los Angeles Hillel Council Board, and people in the Federation planning and budgeting department which is responsible for allocating Hillel's budget. The individuals were chosen based on information from informants and my own knowledge. The list was extensive. The actual group interviewed was chosen based on available time for them, their willingness to be interviewed and the quality of the interview I anticipated.² The number of interviews conducted was based on my own available time and the dead-

¹ The previous information gleaned from Research Methods class, December 1, 1980.

² The one exception just happened to be in town, though he was a suggestion.

line for this completed thesis.

All of the interviews were taped, with the permission of the interviewees. If there was anything they did not want repeated, they had the option to have it stricken from the record. This was abided by with complete consistency. The interviews were then transcribed, either verbatim or in summary form. This is what made up the substantive notes. Often I would make comments, observations, disagreements, complaints within the text of the field notes, i.e., T.N. These were later used as a part of the thesis along with the S.N. Also, if I noticed some trend or a question that needed follow-up I would make methodological notes and use these in later interviews.

The questions used in the interview guide proved to be useful. They were developed by brainstorming from experience. I decided what I wanted to hear about and formulated questions in order to illicit the desired response. This may appear to be a haphazard approach to study something, but using grounded theory, based on one's experience, this is a legitimate method. Once the questions were formulated they were then modified and reformulated and then applied. If a question proved to be effective, I continued to use it, if not, then a new question was formulated. Often, new lines of inquiry developed within the context of the interview. I had no hesitation to ask these questions and if they proved to be a good source of

information these too would be added to later interviews.

Considering the diverse group of people in my sample, some questions were not appropriate for everyone. The ones that were, however, I continued to use throughout the interviews.

The use of qualitative research, though perhaps not considered purely scientific, is an effective method and a legitimate one for the study of human interaction as William J. Filstead relates:

Qualitative methods are based on the premise that social reality is the shared creativity of individuals. Consequently, one needs to develop data gathering techniques which tap the perspectives of participants engaged in social interaction. In doing so, one develops a sense of the meaning of events grounded in the realities and considerations which shape them. Evaluators as well as policy makers are realizing, more than ever before, that the "natural science" model of qualification lacks the ability to tap the contextual understandings about the processes and structures involved in social interventions. The turning to qualitative methods or to multiply methods which provide this contextual grounding to the "hard data" has been employed in a wide variety of substantive areas.¹

The original intent of this thesis was to develop a model of evaluating Hillel program, but due to reasons that will be elaborated on later, this proved to be impossible at the present time. In the process of discovering this, however, I spent a great deal of time

¹William J. Filstead, "Using Qualitative Methods in Evaluation Research," Evaluation Review, Vol. 5, No. 2, April 1981, Sage Publications, Inc., 1981, pp. 259-268.

studying the genre of literature known as evaluation research literature.

"There has to be some reason--some theoretical justification--to expect a program to succeed."¹

The preceding quote is the basic factor involved in evaluation research. The object, however, is to go beyond this premise to determine how a program can succeed every time and whether or not it really does.

Steve Huberman makes an important point when he says:

It is important to distinguish between "evaluation" and "evaluation research." In "evaluation" we simply make judgements of program worth. We need not apply any systematic rules to gather and assess evidence. On the other hand, "evaluation research" necessitates the use of scientific methods to make an assessment of program impact.²

In social programs, where the emphasis is on improving the condition of people's lives it is important to both evaluation, i.e., judge the merit of programs, as well as conduct evaluation research--judging in scientific terms whether something is a success. In evaluation research the emphasis is on action settings.³

The task facing the evaluation researcher is multi-

¹Carol Weiss, Evaluation Research: Methods of Assessing Program Effectiveness, Prentice-Hall, Inc., p. 84.

²Steve Huberman, "Building Bridges: Towards Realistic Links Between Research and Planning in Jewish Communal Life," Journal of Jewish Communal Service, Fall 1980, p. 38.

³Weiss, Evaluation Research, p. 1

faceted. First the evidence must be collected and translated into qualitative language. Then, this information is measured against the criteria already in use. Finally, conclusions are drawn. But answers about how successful a program is cannot be determined through informal means. There is a need for a certain degree of objectivity since the ultimate use of the results is for the policy makers.

Effective evaluation research increases the degree to which policy makers can make rational decisions.¹ Thus, through the scientific application of social science knowledge better decision making, improved program planning and better service to participants can result.² Rossi elaborates on this:

It is clear that evaluation research is more than application of methods. It is a political and managerial activity, an input into the complex mosaic from which emerge policy decisions and allocations for the planning, design, implementation, and continuance of programs to better the human condition.³

Politics are not totally separate from the policy making. This is the way of organizations. So that it is essential to have accurate information, devoid of politics to make decisions. "One of the problems in doing good evaluation research is that different people see different purposes for the evaluation and want to use its results in different ways. Unless and until the evaluator finds out specifically who wants what, with what end in view, the evaluation

¹Ibid. p. 2

²Ibid. p. 3

³Peter H. Rossi, Evaluation: A Systematic Approach, Sage Publications, Beverly Hills, 1979.

study is likely to be mired in a morass of conflicting expectations."¹

The primary function of evaluation research is to determine if a program is succeeding as compared to the goals that were set out at the beginning. By means of this process future planning can be accomplished and future programs can be improved.² Weiss identifies four key features within this definition:³

- (1) "To measure the effects"--research methodology
- (2) "The effects"--outcomes, not efficiency, honesty, morale, or adherence to rules or standards
- (3) Criteria for judging how well a program is doing
- (4) Social purpose of evaluation

Weiss also lists differences in the program components that are important to consider an evaluation that is accurate:⁴

Differences and components of programs:

Scope--where; what are the geographic limits

Size--how many people served

Duration--time limitation/one week, one month, one hour, indefinitely...

Clarity and specificity of program input--what does the program do; purposes.

¹Weiss, Evaluation Research, pp. 5-6.

²Ibid. p. 4.

³Ibid.

⁴Ibid. p. 5.

Complexity and time span of goals--how long
should it take to get the "goal(s)" accomplished.
Innovativeness.

These distinctions are important because different kinds of programs need different kinds of evaluations.

The classic design is the experimental model. This involves measuring the relevant variables for at least two equivalent groups--one involved with the program and one that is not. The one that is not involved is known as the control group. Circumstances for both groups must be identical, and measurably so, in order for the study to be valid. Other designs include quasi-experimental designs, non-experimental designs, comparative evaluation and cost-benefit analysis.¹

In general, some of the problems with the experimental model are that there is a need to keep the program constant to facilitate accurate results, thus not allowing the program to improve; decisions must be held off until a cycle has been completed; there are so many controls that the program becomes stagnant and not applicable to the outside world. There is a further problem, as Weiss points out, is that "the controlled experiment...is often impossible in action settings."²

Evaluation tries to describe the relationship between cause and effect, i.e., what is happening--all the components thereof and what it could and does lead to--the

¹Ibid. pp. 67-84 for details

²Ibid. p. 63.

"what is" compared with "what should be." In the Jewish community setting this evaluation takes place in an action setting. The service agencies "are not simply doing research; programs servicing people are in operation. The service program has to take priority: the research is, at best, secondary; at worse, an unwanted appendage."¹ It is important, however, for Jewish communal agencies to seriously consider the importance of the use of evaluation research. The accountability issue bears further consideration.

The funding agency has the right to know that not only are the programs successful, but also that the money is being spent in the most effective manner. In most instances a clear statement of the agency policy is not established, this is especially true in action settings where so much goes on simultaneously. Although factors of receptability by staff and community, available funds to carry out research, available staff to conduct research all play into the design of the survey; the information produced can lead to remarkable improvements at best, increased awareness of the agency function by staff, lay people and community at worst. There is a danger, however, in this kind of study.

Often there are unrealistic expectations placed on evaluation research. It may not produce unequivocal

¹Huberman, "Building Bridges," p. 40.

findings or conclusions. It may show that only minor changes are needed, but this would still allow for better agency awareness among the people involved and this is a valid result. In any case, continued study is recommended to determine what the long term effects are.¹

An example that would illustrate the point and is the basis of this thesis, would be Hillel. It is a classic action setting, there are many vagueries in the program and there is a need to be accountable since it receives 80 percent of its funds from the federation, i.e., community funds. There is also a need for better understanding of what Hillel does by the LAHC board, the Planning and Budgeting Committee, the Group Services Committee, and the community. This is evidenced by a study of Hillel conducted under the auspices of the Planning and Budgeting Department by an Ad Hoc committee made up of interested lay people and staffed by professionals involved with Hillel.

The committee was established to study "the agency's goals and objectives, including the impact of Hillel programs on the agency's target populations." This indicates the level of priority given to Hillel. This was a new committee formed to study an individual agency. A great deal of work was done, but it was only a first step. In the concluding remarks is the statement that "this

¹Weiss, Evaluation Research, p. 3.

report should be viewed as preliminary in satisfying the mandate of the Planning and Budgeting Committee." The recommendations are significant, but will be dealt with later. Some of them have been carried out, i.e., the function of the board of directors and its set up was changed this year; others have not been dealt with in any depth as far as I have been informed. The point remains, however, that there is a perceived problem in the federation that Hillel needs to be looked at in greater depth.

The lack of clarity regarding Hillel objectives often leads to difficult, even "no-win" situations for Hillel directors. There is a great deal of freedom allowed Hillel directors since for the most part they run their own show without any interference. During the time of Breira, a left-wing political group in support of Israel, but not for many of the policies that Begin brought forth, many Hillel rabbis were members. There is nothing in their contract that limited their rights to belong to such an organization; in fact, academic freedom is a value that is fiercely defended among Hillel professionals, but many were in threat of losing their jobs as a result of activities conducted during their free time.

A recent article by Professor Sol Modell makes stark accusations against Hillel director, Mark Cartun of Stanford, who was going to run a weekend devoted to anti-Israel activities. Several other Hillels in Southern California

were accused of the same lack of concern, though in less harsh terms. This is another case of the need to clarify Hillel to the public. Though these accusations were not based on facts, but on complaints by students. Granted, Hillel is focused on students; there is more involved in determining effectiveness of Israel programs than students complaining.¹ The L.A.H.C. board chose not to respond to these accusations as they felt there was nothing to say, but this also shows the need to build Hillel's image with some strong, factual evidence.

In a recent article in Sh'ma magazine, Arnold Jacob Wolf discusses the problem of money and how that affects the staff. It is his personal farewell from Yale Hillel where he was the director for 8½ years. He talks about the lack of appropriate salaries for Hillel directors. The salaries are too low to continue attracting the high quality people, and even when federations take over for B'nai B'rith, this is still not enough to cover all the needs. The money is tight everywhere. This is an indication of the need to further address the issue of accountability and make the dollars go farther with more efficiency.²

¹A mistake was made by Mark Cartun, but this was dealt with and was not of as grave a magnitude as the article suggests. Also, UC Riverside is not a part of the Los Angeles Federation-Council.

²Arnold Jacob Wolf, "Farewell to Hillel," Sh'ma, February 6, 1981, p. 53.

Several years back at USC Hillel, there was an incident involving a student and the director. The student accused the director of not doing enough Israel programming. This student felt that this should be the number one priority of Hillel, almost to the exclusion of other programs. There was disagreement between him and the staff and a great deal of resentment was built up. Once again this is a result, partially, of the unclear, unarticulated goals of Hillel. This leads to disagreement and dissatisfaction among those most intimately involved with this organization that was established with such noble ideals. A closer look is warranted, but with caution. Too much optimism about the results leads to more frustration. Chapter III looks at the history of Hillel.

III. HISTORY OF HILLEL

Even before Hillel had its official beginning in 1923, there was some initial Jewish student activity. In 1907 at the University of Illinois, a select group of Jewish students banded together to form a group called Ivrim. Its purpose was "to further the acquisition of a broader knowledge of matters pertaining to Judaism."¹ The group continued with fluctuations in success until 1912 when the Menorah Society took over for Ivrim at the University of Illinois.. Once again, the main function was perceived to be education. In the words of a faculty member at Illinois, this group was continued under the sponsorship of the Menorah Society for the purpose of "the up-building of Jewish learning and ideals in our university."² He adds, however, that he believes the ideal was too limiting: "I think we are not realistic. We aimed too high. We overestimated the willingness and ability of the rank and file of Jewish students to participate in a program which offered them nothing more than intellectual food. They had enough of it in their university courses."³

¹Alfred Jospe, "Changing Frontiers in the Campus Ministry," New Frontiers for Jewish Life on the Campus, International Conference of Hillel Directors, 1976, BBHF, Inc. Washington D.C., 1968, p. 20.

²Ibid.

³Ibid.

His complaint is that the focus was too narrow. The need was for a broader base of support and he foresaw the need for an added consistency with a professional staff.

The story continues, but with a different twist. In 1914, the Jewish community of Champaign-Urbana, where the University of Illinois is located, decided to build a temple. Isaac Kuhn, president of the congregation, felt it important to build the temple near enough to the university to encourage students to attend. This would bring another component: religious component came to the life of the college students. Mr. Kuhn was also successful in convincing the congregation to hire a student rabbi from the Hebrew Union College in Cincinnati. Rabbi Benjamin Frankel began a bi-weekly in 1921. In 1922, he began full-time after his ordination and began to have regular contact with the faculty, both Jewish and non-Jewish, at the university. Professor Edward Chauncy Baldwin, who taught a course in Biblical Literature, was one of these. He was especially surprised to discover the lack of Biblical knowledge his Jewish students had (he was not Jewish) and spoke of this to Rabbi Frankel.

At that time, there were about 300 Jewish students at the University of Illinois and through their work with the aid of Isaac Kuhn in Champaign and Rabbi Louis L. Mann in Chicago (because most of the Jewish students from the University of Illinois were from Chicago), the first

Hillel was formed at the University of Illinois, with Rabbi Frankel as its director.

The choice of a name was an onerous task. Traditional Judaism places a great emphasis on names of things. In the words of one of the first members of the first Hillel, Mrs. Roy (Roma) Elliot, is the process of name selection:

In starting the student program they realized the importance of selecting a name that would symbolize the best traditions of Jewish life. Certainly no name would carry greater significance than that of HILLEL--the gentle sage of over 2000 years ago who was one of the outstanding scholars and teachers in Jewish history. HILLEL, known for his character, his generosity, his devotion to learning, his modesty and his extraordinary patience, represented many desirable qualities...So the name was selected.⁴

Mrs. Elliot also provides a colorful description of what those early days were like as far as the facilities they inhabited:

One merchant donated the use of the storage loft above his store as office, recreation and study headquarters. Two wooden partitions created the office and library; a few wooden tables and some wooden folding chairs, a well-used upright piano--these were all donated by the local Jewish families for the original furnishings.⁵

This was set up by the community for the students. It was an environment conducive for informal meetings and gatherings. With the addition of Rabbi Frankel, continuity was also provided.

In order to further strengthen the organization as a

¹Roma Elliot, "How The B'nai B'rith Hillel Foundations Began," excerpts from a talk given at a Student Leadership Workshop.

²Ibid.

viable, continuing structure on the campus, a regular influx of funds was necessary. Rabbi Frankel turned to B'nai B'rith, as the then largest Jewish organization in the United States. In an impassioned speech at the quinquennial Convention in 1925, he asked for their financial support to not only strengthen the existing Hillel, but also to build a network of Hillels across the country. Through his insight and devotion, his dream has been actualized. Hillels can be found all throughout the United States, Canada, Australia, Brazil, Columbia, Great Britain, Holland, Israel, Italy, South Africa, Sweden, Switzerland, and Venezuela. But Hillel has continued to grow and change as times demand.

In the early days, Hillel was looked upon as a "home away from home." It strove to provide a warm, comfortable place for Jewish students on campus. These were the days when most of the students were first-generation children of immigrants. They were "in a setting in which the social and psychological effects of their under-privileged position were still quite real and often painful."¹ They were in the minority of many non-Jews, they were excluded from the non-Jewish fraternities and sororities and the YMCA was the outstanding religious organization that was also responsible for planning the orientation program for freshmen. "In this setting, being Jewish means being

¹ Jospe, "Changing Frontiers," p. 16.

strange; it meant not being wholly at home in the world or in the campus community. The frightened, half-frightened or insecure Jew who was seeking to gain an American nativity or identity, discovered in the Hillel Foundation an opportunity for a sense of at-homeness."¹ But Hillel continues to show flexibility as changing times and attitudes make their appearance on the campus.

The late twenties and early thirties show a new facet in Hillel responsibilities. "It became the Jewish conserving medium on campus."² The turbulence of the times brought broad reaching panaceas to cure all ills of the world and the Jewish students were swept along in the excitement. Their response to their Jewishness, however, was rejection. Jewish students focused their energies on the quest for human rights and freedom and could be found in prominent positions in these demonstrations. Their feelings for the need to fight for these same rights for their Jewish counterparts in Europe and the need to insure a meaningful Jewish life in America were seen as nonsense and unnecessary. These battles "were ridiculed as symptoms of a narrow and outdated parochialism which had nothing to contribute to the fight for the good life."³ They sought to differentiate themselves from their immigrant backgrounds, i.e., their parents, which had caused them so much pain in the past. They desired to be able to

¹Ibid.

²Ibid.

³Ibid., p. 17.

participate completely in the exciting new age that they found themselves in. At this time the responsibility of Hillel focuses on the need, in Abram Sachar's words, "to stem the hemorrhage of Jewish loyalty among Jewish college students."¹ Hillel Foundations turn their energies towards leadership development in order to prepare these young adults to take on the responsibility of continuing the Jewish community once they had graduated.

World War II brought another change to the focus of Hillel. Not only were Jewish students no longer in flight from their Jewish roots, they were intently searching for them. Not only were Jewish students more comfortable with being in America, but they were no longer in the minority. The late thirties and early forties saw a massive upswing of Jewish students attending the universities. Hillel could no longer afford to cater to the elite alone.

One of the reasons Hillel was such a popular place in the war years was because there were no other places for Jewish students to congregate. As one Hillel alumnus reminisces:

"It became one of the largest things on campus because it was the war years and the fraternities on campus were disbanded. The (Frat) houses were taken over by the service so all the fraternity men used Hillel as their center for activities."

He adds that at the programs there was a true family feeling and this is what people were looking for. So much so that "people were hanging out the doors...It was an active part in a lot of students' lives." The increased

numbers brought a new tenor to Hillel activities. The need for diversity begins when there is a more diverse constituency to serve.

At this time one could find Shabbat services, informal classes, social activities, even opportunity for drama productions. Hillel continued to provide a place for Jewish students to meet and many marriages were formed as a result of some of these meetings. In the time of WWII when the service men were using the Fraternities as dormitories, Hillel also provided a place for the wealthy students to congregate. But even before this time, it was part of the fraternity and sorority policy to spend a certain number of hours per week at the Hillel House. In those days, the students did not rebel against authority and were quite willing to come. Those days rapidly departed with the new generation of 60's activists.

Another Hillel alumnus believes that "the 60's were a great watershed. I think we were all the same up until then...All has been changed." In the 60's, campus ministries were in the forefront of supporting and advocating progress. There was a concerted effort to work with both faculty and students. There were causes to fight for, very concrete causes; to do this in groups was far more exciting and productive than alone. Much of it was anti-war, but there were other issues such as gay rights, women's rights and the allowance of female yell-leaders. A Hillel

rabbi relates his impressions of what it was like to work on the campus in those times:

"Working with students on campus was a way of working with people who really were being oppressed by the system and were trying to do some things that were very brave, sometimes silly, but often very brave and there was a great deal of conviction being showed around."

The 60's could perhaps be looked upon as an American-Jewish Haskallah. The Jewish students no longer had to be ashamed of their heritage. This was helped along by the black power movement. With this renewed interest, in spite of the volatile nature of the campus, there were bright flickerings of curiosity of what it means to be Jewish. Hillel and the Hillel professionals were there for the answers. The rabbi continues his impressions of working on the campus in this blossoming era:

"Ideas and ideologies and convictions were something that you risked being gassed for and being arrested for and at the same time it was the beginning of the new Jewish flowering. Of people exploring being Jewish for the first time realizing the magnificent heritage they or their parents had rejected for much of their lives. People who suddenly understood both the oppression of Jews and the importance of Jewish life and that religion and culture. It was the time when people were starting to study Torah seriously and to look at it not as a book that somebody read in schul, but as a literature which talked about how God was with human being. It was a very, very exciting time."

The activists of the 60's moved on or up, as the case may be, leaving their Hillel rabbis to lament their passing and their successors of the 70's to live up to their past activities. The general feeling about the 70's

is almost gloomy. As Mark Panoff says in Sh'ma magazine: "The activism and faith of the sixties have been replaced by what Christopher Lasch describes as a culture of narcissism...But more than this is the prevailing notion that our alternatives in life are shrinking, and that man is uncontrollably plunging to his own destruction. Despair, aggressions, selfishness and apathy permeate our lives."¹ The Hillel rabbis reflect this when they make comments in regards to the 60's such as: "I miss the activists dreadfully" or "In many ways it was the best time to be on campus. Many of us spent years mourning the passing of that time." Though they do mourn the passing of the exciting times of creativity and action, there is no idealizing the violence that also accompanied these times. Many Hillel rabbis served as draft counselors and felt no compulsion to step up and be recognized as the Jewish voice on campus, though the view taken may not be to the liking of the general Jewish community.

Today there is a clear swing to the right. It is unclear if the campus influences the nation or vice versa, but for the first time at Brandeis there was a Jewish group campaigning for Reagan. It seems as though Jewish students are becoming much more self-interested. They are seeking "Jewish insularity." "Rather than concern for poor Jews they're concerned with their own middle class status." The present trend has also been described as being passive,

listless and politically "out and out conservative." There seems to be a tendency to show one's Jewishness in a physical sense, but not to back it up in any other way, i.e., there may be more students at activities of special interest, but there is a real hesitancy to take any responsibility for planning activities. As far as Jewish education, "people are casually interested in their Judaism, or not at all." One director relates her impressions of present attitudes of college students:

"I think there is a growing reluctance of young adults to affiliate with anything. It seems like they have more and more difficulty making commitments of a long range nature. It seems to me that more and more they've turned into consumers; buy individual services as they need them. I'm struck by the numbers of people who go to Israeli dancing on a regular basis, but who won't buy a Hillel activity card so they can get in cheaper. It's almost an economic matter. They just don't want to be committed to having to go dancing every week..."

Another rabbi also notices this trend towards students as consumers:

"We are on the brink of an upswing; it's an exciting time and we can't tell what it will look like. The kind of Jewish consumerism that went on during the 70's show physically and through the Jewish involvement and the activities."

The same rabbi observes another tendency of the Jewish student today. That is, looking for issues to fight for or defend, but needing to manufacture them in a way that was not really necessary before:

"Since you can't fight Arabs and you can't fight the Nazis, the real Nazis, not the people who are around today, the easiest enemies to fight are other Jews."

So if you maintain that Jews are the real enemies of the Jewish people or at least enemies close to home, you can have a wonderful time attacking whatever Jewish group down the street you don't like or you feel is not carrying out your special interest. And that I think is a very dangerous business."

So, the demands and challenges for today's Hillel professionals are compounded to a degree never imagined at the inception of Hillel. The programs have great variety and the kinds of students who come to Hillel have changed drastically, but then, so have the times; Hillel has survived these changes in a creative and viable way. There continues to be a need for Hillel Foundations on the campus.

There are many others who have contact with Hillel other than the students who are directly affected. On many campuses there is a chaplain who oversees the workings of the religious organizations. Often, there are coalitions formed, either temporarily for a single program or on an ongoing basis, with non-Jewish campus ministries. Most often this occurs with the Catholics, since they usually have the most consistent on-going program. Sometimes Hillels have no outside contact, but do have some kind of interchange since the campus ministry is a rather isolating position and any kind of camaraderie available is quite welcomed. Nevertheless, it is important and valid to consider what place Hillel has on the campus and do this through the eyes of a non-Jew. (It is already

obvious why the Jews would want to have a Jewish place on the college campus.)

A specific example of this expressed need for a Jewish place on campus comes from the USC chaplain Al Rudisill. He acts as the intercessor between campus ministries and the university. He was at USC before HUC was built, before there were any links between USC and the Jewish community, and when the original Hillel had burned down. He saw that most of the Jewish "action was elsewhere, it was on the west side." He felt a definite need to have a Jewish representation on the USC campus. He relates his impressions of those times:

The federation and the Jewish community had pretty much decided that it was not worth putting money into a new Hillel. What they were simply saying at a time when the resource thing was hitting all of us institutionally (the Federation-Council was looking at UCLA and Northridge, particularly Northridge was just booming...and there were so many Jewish students out there...) maybe we just shift our strategies to other priorities...And it was unthinkable to me in a university that was just beginning to become so much more pluralistic and you could just see the trends. I was in a position to see those trends...so that I could be a prophetic interpreter and point out that this university was moving towards 4000 international students...That it was unthinkable that the Jewish community not be a dynamic part of that. And they saw that.

So part of his reasoning for the need to have a Jewish place on campus is to have the Jewish students and the Jewish community represented on a vibrant, pluralistic campus. He also felt the importance of having that Jewish influence reach a part of Los Angeles that had not been

touched at that time in any significant way and was being threatened with complete extinction. Another reason he points out for the importance of a Jewish place at USC is the need to combat anti-Semitism.

Dr. Rudisill makes the observation that Hillel takes anti-Semitism seriously. He is very aware and sensitive to the problem, but cannot figure it out. He suggests that it is perpetuated by "some nuts who will hate whoever." He suggests there is a historical sense of persecution and that the overt acts are more easy to combat than "systematic racism." Both require some response or the educated decision not to respond. This is the role that Hillel plays on the campus.

It is also important for the Jewish community to know that the campus at USC is serving the Jewish students:

The Jewish community knows that there is a Jewish presence here. They see it through Hillel, regardless of where USC is at. They see it, they feel it, they know it, they can own it and claim it.

Thus far, the focus has been on the historical development of Hillel and the basic need to have a Hillel on campus. This will be looked at in more detail later in the sequence, but what about the changes in the students? The brief look at the history of Hillel has shown how the organization has changed and that it has survived, but the students themselves have also changed. No longer can fraternity and sorority members be forced to go to Hillel

activities. There is a general problem with numbers in attendance, but for the most part, once students get inside the doors and have a reason to be there, they automatically meet people and feel comfortable. This is a part of the stages of group/relational development. The problem is that it takes time and that is a valuable commodity among college students. There is no way to coerce college students to do anything. In fact, more and more, they are demanding consumers. Perhaps, this indicates that Hillel has to change its focus to be an agency that offers concrete services; but what happens then to the integrity of the agency that was set up with such broad, but admirable goals? The students need to have a voice in what goes on in their Hillel; after all, it is there for them. They truly lack the insight and experience to shape their Jewish destinies without some guidance.

Most college students come to school with some kind of experience in a Jewish environment. They have become Bar/Bat Mitzvah, been to Hebrew school at their synagogue or Temple, and many even went through Hebrew High School if such a program was offered in their city. They often come in looking for a comfortable place to meet people. Others come in with challenges of "entertain me." Many stay to find out what really goes on at Hillel, but many feel uncomfortable with the people, the rabbi, the

building and look elsewhere. This does not mean that Hillel has failed. There is a need for the gap between Hebrew High and marriage to be filled. This intercessor is Hillel.

One rabbi felt that there is a direct correlation between Hillel involvement and later involvement in the Jewish community as adults. Perhaps this is true. Every member of the LAHC board who was interviewed for this thesis had some Hillel involvement as undergraduates and most were actively involved as presidents. The support that the Jewish community gives to Hillel (the federation provides close to 80 percent of Hillel's funding) indicates a certain sense of priority for what goes on at the campus. (Some would argue that they need to give more, but this will be dealt with later.) Though there are no statistics to prove this, it is certainly logical to suppose that Hillel, in bridging the Jewish gap, serves to replenish the organized and informal Jewish community with future leaders and participants. The opportunities for students to be leaders within the Hillel structure also contribute to this training, though this does not always happen in a systematic way. Often, the student who is willing to do the work is given a position of responsibility rather than the one who is fully qualified.

The unique factor of having rabbis as directors of the agency also serves to insure a certain amount of

education. This tends to be informal because of the demands placed on students by their regular class loads making them reluctant to study anything that they do not have to study, even if it is fun. But there are plenty of opportunities for informal education to take place, and this is often the most lasting kind of learning, whether it be in a dramatic presentation by the students of the parshat hashavuah or learning about kashrut while preparing the kitchen for Pesach. These activities occur with regularity at Hillel, and though it is difficult to assess the effectiveness of such a manner of instruction, students seem to enjoy it. These are also the kinds of activities they will remember in the years to come and perhaps that is the greatest reward Hillel, as an organization, can expect.

The remaining chapters will focus on what is happening in Hillel today as perceived by those connected to the organization: the staff, the lay board, and the federation. Each has its expectation and impressions, sometimes meshing and sometimes differing. This is part of the initial step needed before a true evaluation research can be conducted.

IV. CLIENTELE

Hillel developed internally from a group of students who wished to form a cohesive Jewish group on campus. It became more sophisticated when it linked up with a national organization. Once it began to receive local community support, it had to become even more accountable to its sponsors. It has developed a core group of professionals in response to both continuity and accountability, but it has fundamentally remained an informal community of students. Much of the day-to-day business such as outreach and publicity are accomplished through word of mouth. Most of the important student-staff conversations result during off-hours, are usually impromptu and are always unexpected. Most of the most significant learning occurs between the students who have met at Hillel, but develops when they are away from the building and in their dorms or apartments. The "basic desire of Jews to congregate together" is evidenced in Hillel. The task of the professional is to tap those informal networks to pass on the "mission statement" sent down by national and mandated by the outside organized Jewish community.

The constituency of Hillel is diverse in make-up and

extensive in number. The "mission statement" distributed through National Hillel in Washington, D.C. states: "B'nai B'rith Hillel Foundations, founded in 1923, is the oldest and largest Jewish campus organization in the world, devoted to the sponsorship of religious, educational, counseling, cultural, service and social action programs for Jewish university students and faculty...As the center of Jewish community on campus, Hillel serves all Jewish students without regard to institutional affiliation or background."

One of the rabbis interviewed concurs with this view:

"The way I conceptualize Hillel is through the constituent areas that we work with. So that I see Hillel as serving the Jewish students, faculty and administration and personnel as the representative of Jewish interests on campus, and as the representative of Jewish college-related interests to the Jewish community and campus community. Now, not all of that feeds into that goal directly. That's why I find that way of conceptualizing Hillel as somewhat problematic."

His concluding sentence, however, sums up what the general feeling among professionals is concerning the vagueries of serving this kind of constituency.

The problem becomes knowing who you are serving because without this knowledge, there is no effective means of determining if this is being done with the most efficiency. It is generally agreed that no Jewish agency is completely successful at reaching out to every potential constituent, and Hillel is no exception, however Hillel cannot really ever know exactly who it is they are trying to

reach.

The distinction is blurred in another way. In the Planning and Budgeting department, the committee that was responsible for Hillel's allocations had the title "High School and College Age Youth Committee" and was responsible only for overseeing Hillel and high school youth groups. Recently this was changed to the "Group Services Committee" which serves Hillel and Jewish Centers Association. The reasoning behind this is:

It was the feeling of the leadership that both Jewish Centers Association and Hillel are primarily group-serving agencies and that it would make sense to put them together under one heading. We were trying to combine the number of committees that we had in order to reduce the number of tasks and make the fields of service more applicable to what agencies were doing. So we formed the Group Services Committee that reviews Hillel and JCA's budget... The other feeling was that there shouldn't be one committee for an agency and like agencies should be reviewed together.

Thus, the division is now based on the modality of service delivery, rather than the age group served. This merger certainly makes the allocations process less encumbered since there are fewer committees meeting and the agencies involved also "felt it was an appropriate melding." However, this new classification still does not clarify Hillel's purpose. There is a large group work component, but this classification does not include everything else that Hillel is set up to do.

The agency is not a case work agency, so it is not set up to receive students as clients, though counseling

on an informal basis does occur. College students also have a peculiar status in that they are no longer youth. That was their classification in high school via youth movements, (U.S.Y., B.B.Y.O., S.W.F.T.Y.--the "Y" in each case stands for youth). Yet, they are also not adults. Most of them are not old enough to drink (at least in Los Angeles); many of them still live at home, are not financially independent and not always expected to behave in adult roles. Still, they are expected to take on leadership roles in Hillel. The responsibility of planning and executing programs falls to the students, but the dilemma remains because even when they are defined as just students, there is still no accurate way to determine how many are needed to prove a program successful.

The federation leadership seems to be aware of the problem and are satisfied with the way it is being handled. In response to a question concerning numbers of participants necessary at a program to consider it successful, one federation professional responded as follows:

My concern is how many students are continuing their quest for....Jewish knowledge. How many of them will assume responsibility in the Jewish community. How many of them will be contributors...I doubt there are any Jewish organizations that reach the majority of Jews. So I'm not as bothered by that kind of measurement. I think it is faulty. Especially in Los Angeles which is a predominantly unaffiliated community.

Thus, judgement of the adequacy of Hillel outreach is measured not by quantity but by quality. He is interested

in maintaining a high level of involvement in order to preserve the Jewish community in some organized form. He also makes a distinction among the kinds of programs that are expected to bring in many students (such as Pesach celebrations and kosher meal program) and those which are not, such as counseling sessions and classes. The first examples will get a turnout because these services fulfill a need on the campus that could not otherwise be met. The other programmatic examples should not expect large turnouts because they are geared to small groups. He also exhibits an understanding of the many informal counseling sessions that go on and are even more difficult to quantify. It is significant that board members and Hillel staff do not all share this perception, nor do they share the feeling that federation understands the difficulty in reaching students.

A program director similarly states her lack of anxiety over the problem of low turnout:

"It does not bother me. I think that it is a challenge constantly to try to make greater inroads in that, but I don't dwell on that as a major thing because I think again, Jerry and I are only two people and there's a reality that has to be faced. My time and energies are so valuable that I can't waste myself worrying about those things. My concern is to really move ahead and get programs going, make contacts with students and to do what has to be done, with whatever we have to work with. I don't mean that I ignore those things, but I don't think that we are a massive organization. The fact that I work with the Jewish coalition to help develop the Jewish awareness days on campus and we have programs on campus, where within one week we may have 1000 to 1200 people attending those events, I think that's pretty good."

Another director agrees:

"It is a problem (lack of turnout) that is built into the turf. We have to accept it. We can't knock our heads against the wall for the ones we aren't reaching. We will possibly never reach a large amount."

In spite of this recognition, Hillel professionals still tend to be concerned that more students do not attend events. The Hillel professional will, in fact, have a goal for attendance which, if not met, results in a sense of disappointment. In spite of the frustration felt by the Hillel professionals, the outside campus observers perceive Hillel as doing a good job. One campus minister comments:

"There are 2000 Jewish students out there and you can't reach them all. Hillel's very visible and if they really need what Hillel represents they know how to find you, you're not hiding. You've got a dynamic program and those vibes go out into the Jewish community--into the dorms--and the Jewish kids around campus are gonna know that and finally that's their choice. You can't just finally assume responsibility. We all struggle with that."

This may well be part of a larger Jewish pattern:

There seems to be a tradition of attending Jewish activities once a year. Perhaps there are some special Jewish connotations to it. And the unaffiliated is what ever all that means in the Jewish community and that is part of the reason they agonize over it.

The issue becomes more complex when one considers the composition of the constituency. The "mission statement" charges Hillel with serving students and faculty, but there are other groups who may need consideration, such as staff and families, but since they do not meet the stated criteria.

they cannot be included. Hillel often does serve people other than college students, such as college-age people who work but may wish to take part in the Hillel activities. They may want programs at times when students would not be able to attend, such as during finals or vacations. It is apparent that they would have these expectations that Hillel will be available since Hillel staff and students emphasize the need to make everyone feel welcome, and the students are usually the same age as the working people, but "the mandate is the campus. They are not funded to service beyond this scope." Thus, when the group asks for service and is also given to understand that Hillel serves everyone, the professionals and even the students are put in a difficult position. Further, in order to properly serve the college campus as the mandate sets out, this group must be defined and located. There is agreement that this too is a nebulous area.

The constituency of Hillel is fluid. There is no way to control or even predict who will come to an event. In fact, there is no guarantee that anyone will come. This is a source of frustration for the professionals in trying to plan programs month by month and year by year. One professional describes the dilemma in terms of a lack of Hillel community:

There is not a Hillel community. A temple will have a membership and you can count your members from A to Z...and you interact with them in a variety of ways.

They attend worship, they send their kids to Hebrew School, etc. And it's predictable and you program accordingly...So there's a community to be served, yet at the same time has expectations of support, involvement, and leadership. Around student centers, there's not that defineable a community.

Thus, even though Hillel may have an extensive mailing list, this list cannot include all potential members, since everyone is eligible for Hillel activities and involvement.

(There usually are no fees for attendance.) And even when Hillel succeeds in identifying new potential students, there is no guarantee they will come.

The problem of attracting students to Hillel programs has been discussed and debated throughout the years of Hillel's existence. Over 20 years ago, at the National Hillel Directors Conference of 1959, one participant suggested that students turn away from Hillel because:

- (1) It is normal to rebel against old standards once they leave home;
- (2) The services are not what they are used to;
- (3) They are burned out from extensive activity in high school;
- (4) They have a loss of status from high school and they do not want to expend effort to regain it in college;
- (5) They are not willing to sublimate their individuality for the good of the community.¹

¹American Conference of Hillel Directors, 1959, B'nai Brith Hillel Foundation, Washington D.C., p. 66.

There was no solution given then, since the feeling was that there was nothing to be done about it; this is a natural development among college-age people. Today, the problems still exist.

The executive director believes that the programs may be attractive and the publicity well done, but that is also no guarantee that the students will come. They are never satisfied. They will complain about programs being too religious or not religious enough. There may be a faction that has purely social interests to the exclusion of any other kind of program. Most of the complaints, however, are not directly related to program areas. He suggests reasons similar to those put forth in 1959:

Students, like their parents, are ambivalent about being Jewish. These negative attitudes include feeling inadequate about their Jewish knowledge, their level of observance, that they will not be welcomed into a place that is Jewish in a way that they are not, and all of this gets played out in Hillel which is the only Jewish place on campus. There is the problem of the physical portrayal of those who come. They do not want to be identified with undesirable people and they do not necessarily look deeper than the surface. There is the feeling of being in a minority society and they grow up feeling negative about this. America does not promote being different.

A program director elaborates on this idea of rebellion:

College students are making a break from home, "going through the process of individuation." They are becoming individual people. They've

moved out of their homes for perhaps the first time in their lives. They just want to be themselves and explore and test things out; they're not really interested in becoming active in something that perhaps is similar to them or reminds them of home. It may not be a relevant issue in their lives at this point. And I think that is part of dealing with the age of the people we are dealing with. So I don't know if there is going to be a magical packaging that will make the difference. It's not cool to hang around a religious place.

Better packaging would be helpful, for Hillel can always use better advertising. Flashy signs, posters and newspaper ads will certainly attract attention, but this is not the only way to attract students. It takes much more work and dedication.

Over the years, Hillel has developed a reputation as being the place where only "losers" go. No one knows how this came to be and those people who do come to Hillel events realize that this stereotype is not fair. But it has far-reaching effects nonetheless. Since Hillel does have its basis as an informal community, word of mouth plays an important role in getting people to come to activities. If the word is not favorable, this discourages new people from coming. Whether or not the reputation is true, one program director points out that the bad reputation serves a purpose. The so-called "losers" also need a place to go.

In order to make the contacts, trust has to be built. This comes from personal outreach and contact. A student will respond more favorably to a sensitive conversation than to a well-structured advertising campaign. There has

to be open communication and understanding on the part of the staff and this is also their job to teach active students this skill. It is important for the programs to be relevant to what the student interest is without losing the character of Hillel and then the advertising can serve as a supplement to the personal interaction. As one director relates from personal experience:

When I was at Harvard, I felt very good knowing that Hillel was doing all the things it was doing. It helped Harvard be a more Jewishly comfortable place for me in the 50's when being Jewish was certainly not what everybody did and did it publicly. And I was proud that Hillel had such an outstanding program even though I never went to them.

If the clientele is vague, the community support for Hillel is not. Hillel has a favorable reputation in the community and the community in turn feels a responsibility for the Hillel. A federation professional elaborates:

When an agency doesn't serve whom they say they are serving, the kinds of programs they say are necessary, will cause them to lose their funding, or if those services are deemed by the Jewish community as no longer necessary. One would be incompetence, that we're not getting our money's worth or the service gets such a low priority given the current circumstances that it's not seen as a needed Jewish agency. I don't expect that the Jewish community at this time will say that Jewish college students are no longer a priority. I also don't think that Hillel, at this point, lacks credibility.

This is an optimistic statement of support for what Hillel does. There is little need to fear losing status, but it is important to consider what Hillel says it does and what Hillel is really doing in order to better communicate this

to the community that finds this agency a needed agency
in the Jewish community.

V. THE CHARTER

The previous chapter introduced the notion of Hillel as an informal community. This chapter elaborates on that notion and explores how that informal network is used by Hillel. This is something that is taken very seriously by the professional, but it is a source of frustration as well. Hillel is a place for Jewish students, all Jewish students, to congregate. But, once they get there, what will happen? The mandate states, in general terms, that Hillel is to provide "religious, educational, counseling, cultural, service and social action programs for Jewish university students and faculty." There remains, however, a constant tension between the "is" and the "ought." This is a result of the fact that the basic goal statement of the National Office in Washington extends beyond those vague, broad areas.

In the course of the interviews, the most common response offered concerning the perceived goals of Hillel can be exemplified by the following statement from an agency director:

"To provide a Jewish presence on the college campus. To promote Jewish awareness in the broadest sense, in a reconstructionist understanding of what Jewish would mean. That it's not just religious by any means, but a civilizational approach to what Jewish would mean.

Cultural, religious, social, philosophical, folk awareness of Jews, Judaism, Jewish tradition, Jewish experience on campus. To provide support for Jews who are into varieties of Jewish experience, information for those who would like to know more about Jewish civilization, to promote an understanding and tolerance of Jews, an acceptance of Jews among Gentiles on campus, to help Jews appreciate the respectability and relevance of Jewish tradition and experience, to offer counseling in a Jewish environment to people who have personal adjustment difficulties in the campus setting.

A member of the Los Angeles Hillel Council Board also presents a statement of what she views as the goals of Hillel, including the importance of "Jewish Presence," which is at best, only vaguely defined:

"To provide opportunities for building Jewish community. To create a Jewish presence on campus. To help address the questions and needs of Jewish college students around their own identities as Jews. To provide a social atmosphere for Jews to meet each other. To interact with Jewish culture. Opportunities for people to sort of test themselves out as future leaders in the sense that they have the opportunity to develop programming if they are interested. In a descending order of priority, I'd say that is basically what goes on."

(Jewish presence means) "that living in a pluralistic society and being on a campus that has many opportunities for exposure to ideas and culture and music and politics that Jews are participating in, that influx of information. Jewish input is given so that non-Jews know that they live in a society where there are Jews around. And for Jews to know that there is a place for them to go."

This emphasis on the importance of Hillel, both as a "Jewish presence" and a place for Jewish students to meet are recurring themes among all the people interviewed. These both could be considered goals, in that they are broad, far-reaching statements of qualities which are sought.

But they are not true goals because there is no way to measure whether or not they are being achieved. These are definitely important things to strive for on campus. In fact, this is what students, the university administration and the Jewish community look for when they turn to the campus agency, but the problem of accountability still remains. You cannot quantify what is not quantifiable. Any program that is being funded has problems in terms of reporting what it is doing and how it spends its time and how one can assess what is success. An outsider to the Hillel organization summarizes the dilemma nicely when he says "that no matter how clearly defined the goals are or how much rapport exists between Hillel here and the community, there's going to be at best a creative tension."

This question of accountability recurs more often as Hillels turn to their local federations for financial aid. Many problems are alleviated through this relationship, but others arise. At this time federations have not had enough experience with Hillels to have a thorough understanding of what the daily needs are in each foundation. As recently as 1980 new innovations are taking place within the budget allocations structure in the Los Angeles federation with the creation of the groups services committee that is responsible for the Hillel and JCA allocations. There are significant differences between the two agencies

as far as clientele, programs, location, and problems to face, but the merger was one that both agencies felt was a wise move.

The intimate knowledge in federation at the present time is limited. It has been suggested by several Hillel directors that the only way for federation to get a true sense of what goes on in Hillel is to spend several days there. This is perceived as being impractical and has not been undertaken. In responding to the question of what does Hillel do, a federation professional responded in terms of fundraising:

"I am not familiar with the Welfare fund campaign on campus. I am aware that they do have college campaigns and that's how I'm answering your question. Not only is Hillel a beneficiary of funds, but it also does fundraising. I also know Hillel is responsible for raising money through internal sources whether it be membership programs or friendship support association memberships, and other projects, that not only help their own operating budget but also the general Jewish community with the welfare fund campaign...I do not know the extent of that effort...I would make the statement that it is the responsibility to participate in insuring Jewish life, which I then translate into Jewish programs. Hillel is our vehicle on the college campus and I think it is imperative that they do so."

This is certainly a reasonable expectation on the part of the Federation in that this is their priority and the focus of their everyday activities. But from the point of view of the Hillel professional, the campaign is not a main focus; in fact it is seen as an imposition:

"On the other hand, there's resistance. There's great resistance to Federation. There's resistance because of the whole welfare fund campaign. A lot

of Hillel people resent having to do that, and resent what they feel are heavy-handed tactics of Federation in light of the campaign; so there's baggage coming into the situation from both sides."

The federation has its needs that it feels legitimate in expecting from Hillel and Hillel professionals feel frustrated by the expectations that federation places on them. This divergence comes less from a difference in what each hopes to accomplish on the campus, but from a failure to effectively communicate with each other on matters of mutual concern. This communication gap surfaced vehemently in response to the budget forms this year. (This will be dealt with in greater detail in the next chapter--"The Role of the Professional"--but some impressions deserve mention here.)

This was the first year of this particular form. A federation professional explained that this was an experiment in determining a more effective way to allocate funds. This program was not presented as an experiment to the directors, however. He was unconcerned with this resistance because the forms were filled out to his satisfaction, but the results remain unknown at this time, and the Hillel directors still do not understand the function of the new forms.

"What is unreasonable is that they expect Hillel to do on campus what no one else can do in their respective segments of the Jewish community. That's the unreasonable part of it all. The hands-off part; there's a certain element of unreasonableness in that there is resistance. There's great resistance

to federation in terms of giving them information, such as those kinds of forms. Part of that is based on the stupidity of the political process by which those forms are handed down to Hillel."

The problem is that Hillel emphasizes a humanistic approach in getting work done. This is not a concern for federation as it was expressed, and the forms had priority over personal needs. Even though the expectations of the Federation executives were met, this was not accomplished without creating anxiety and stress.

The board is also placed at a disadvantage by its inability to understand what Hillel does. As one member responds to the question on what areas is Hillel most effective:

"I wish I knew the answer to that question and you may think that as a board member I should, but we don't deal with programming as we do with other things: personnel, budgets, things like that. And that's one of the weaknesses we hope this new board will overcome. Then we will become familiar with the Hillel programs, because the Hillel programs are essentially the province of the staff, the rabbis, and the executive director. So, we don't determine what the programs will be."

Because board members have nothing to do with programming, their ideas about programming are generally based on their own past experiences in Hillel and are phrased in general terms: more speakers, discussion groups, which will attract the unaffiliated. The problem here is that Hillel is being asked to do what no other agency in the Jewish community is successful at doing. There is an understanding of this expressed in the interviews, but it is not generally shared

with the professional staff in the agencies, because there is no continuous contact between the policy makers and the professionals.

On the other hand, there is an understanding of the perception Hillel has towards federation. One board member puts it in quite graphic terms:

"Federation is perceived as Big Brother, as passing down certain rules, controls. Because Federation controls the purse strings, it can demand the elimination of certain programs and institute certain programs. Faculty programs were cut by federation arbitrarily. Federation with the UJWF tried to fund-raise on campus but failed miserably without Hillel support. There should have been an ongoing period of contact. Just organizing for fundraising is stupid. No liaison with Hillel is just coming in like a 'bull in a china shop.' On the whole, federation is very supportive; without the federation there would not be a Hillel in L.A."

The board members seek to support Hillel almost unquestionably. "Federation should give us all the money that we ask for and not argue," but there is an understanding of the need to be responsive to federation's demands. This "watch-dog" approach leads to a greater sense of responsibility to the students and the community:

"When someone funds you it is only natural that they will want to know what you are doing with their money. That is fair. They want to make sure we are meeting the needs of the students on campus, their constituents. It probably makes us more aware, conscious of what we are doing and to put our money and our attention into the more productive programs is more helpful to the students. The bad part is that maybe... actually I'm not sure there's too much bad. The money enables us to do lots of things we may not be able to do otherwise like expanding programs and trying new programs. I'll think a minute to see how many bad things I can come up with...I think federation

is very fair to us.

Programmatically there is no direct interference because this would not be an appropriate method of intervention by an agency that does not have direct contact with the agency, but any budgetary decisions will have programmatic repercussions.

Whenever the board or federation makes decisions concerning the budget of Hillel, there will be a direct effect felt on the programs. Thus, those decisions must be informed ones. The responsibility for providing this information falls to the Hillel directors. In Los Angeles, (and, for the most part, everywhere else) these people are rabbis. An example of what federation might want to know as far as program success would be as follows:

"First of all I would have to have them clearly delineated and under each one of those overall goals I would expect to see candidate programs to reach those goals. And after looking at the service statistics, the amount of dollars spent, the amount of unmet (needs) knowing those areas. I then would feel better able to determine whether the goals are being met. I would have to know the programs that were set up to meet the goals. Know that the goals were agreed upon through a student and board process."

This federation professional is using the language of evaluation research. The directors also need to communicate in such terms in order to accurately assess their programs by means of goals and objectives. For the most part, the people interviewed were unable to make the fine distinctions between goals and objectives, thus making it difficult to determine if these goals and objectives are being met. All

the support from the board is of no use if the directors are unable to communicate with the funding agency.

Using the terms and definitions as follows, the directors and program directors were asked to assess their agency in an informal way:

Goals-statements: usually general and abstract, of desired states in human conditions and social environments.

Objectives: specific and operational statements regarding the desired accomplishments of the social intervention program.¹

Another way to look at this model is that the goals represent the "end" and the objectives are the "means" to that end. It is the responsibility of the professional staff to outline their goals and objectives each year through their supervision meetings, in their staff meetings, and even in their professional conferences. Part of this responsibility includes setting up criteria for determining priorities. These could include self-evaluation of individual abilities, values of the professional, the university, the Jewish community and the society in general. The problem in doing this, however, is the difficulty of eliminating and concretizing. One program director states this pluralism nicely:

"I think we are in the business of selling Judaism to the Jews and I think we are in a position to help people become involved Jewishly through many doors because we have a gamut of programs. I think our

¹Rossi, Freeman, and Wright, Evaluation: A Systematic Approach, Sage Publications, Beverly Hills, 1979, p. 54.

definition is very difficult because we have a variety of activities that people can engage themselves in, and express themselves Jewishly. Because that definition becomes vague because we have so many things to offer, we sometimes get slipped by because we are not specifically zionist although we are zionist, we're not specifically orthodox, reform, reconstructionist, although we have those elements available to the students. We are not specifically Falasha or Soviet Jewry or South America Jewry emphasized, but we have all of that. We find that we have to be very creative in the kinds of things that we present. We have to make these various kinds of activities and interests available to the students."

In essence, Hillel has a responsibility to be everything for everybody, but it cannot ever be one thing. Since the staff is given no specific guidelines within which to work, they feel the responsibility to cover every area. There is no request for Hillel to do less.

The other problem that arose through the interviews was the staff's inability to distinguish between goals and objectives. They understand the need to provide diversity, but they are unable to bring it into focus in a way that will allow them to present what they do in a logical, systematic manner.

(Describing long-range goals of Hillel)

"To help create a sense of Jewish community on campus; to help Jews meet each other, to feel positive about being Jewish. To provide an opportunity for education, for spiritual assertion for young Jews. To really develop quality individuals, quality Jewish individuals who are in a point of formation in their lives. To really deal with the real community relations issues on campus. I'm confused and really unable to separate out goals from objectives..."

A program director adds: "I've never really thought about that question. I guess I've tended to use the words

somewhat interchangeably." Without a clear understanding of the differences between goals and objectives, it becomes impossible to communicate what the agency is trying to do and what the agency actually accomplishes. Without a well-defined direction, it becomes difficult to remain consistent and achieve solid results.

When the director cannot articulate for him-/herself what the goals are, it is also difficult for them to draw these out from students, which is part of the process for involving students in planning programs. One director describes this dilemma:

"With something like Jewish Awareness Week, a good first step would be to say, what are our goals, and then after articulating the goals, you can come back later and say: Did we fulfill them. And that's where an education process has to go on. The couple of times I've done that, it's not been too successful, I haven't been real good at drawing out goals or helping them to shape goals. It's usually been real general, and general goals are very difficult to evaluate whether they have succeeded. So it's a rough process. It's not as good as it could be."

This is the responsibility of the staff, especially the director, since the director sets the tone for the agency. The staff have to be willing to experiment and take risks before they will see exciting results. But in order to do this, they have to have a pre-set idea in their minds of what they hope to gain and how they will know if this has been accomplished. This comes partly from interaction with students. One program director shares her views.

"It's very difficult. I see it sometimes when I see

students graduate and continue to be involved. If they join synagogues. We have a couple's havurah who are really graduates of Hillel who are married with families. Some have been around for about ten years already. They want to maintain that connection. When I see a lot of active Hillel people go into Jewish communal work, and we do have people who want to go on. When a lot of students come in to me and say I want to go to Israel and spend time there. And a lot of them are doing it; it seems... Those things are good. I feel also our goals are reached when we receive recognition from the campus community. That they recognize us as the Jewish voice on campus, and call us for a response to an issue... That we are making an impact. And also the individual student... who comes in maybe eight years later and says thank-you so much; you gave me something in my life... And the hope that they remain affiliated with the community. I don't want to see them assimilate."

This is a subjective list of what a Hillel professional can hope to get out of their work. The lack of immediate gratification precludes the need to have professionals in the agency who are very dedicated to their work. This is an unrealistic expectation because it is too difficult to measure this in a systematic way. This is also difficult for job satisfaction to be maintained for a long period of time since no one can really know if the job is being done to its best ability. Hillel directors and program directors tend to be an idealistic, dedicated group of people, but that cannot be maintained consistently over a long period of time. This also leads to problems in goal-making and supervision, program planning year by year and month by month. This indicates a real problem with evaluation. Without clear cut goals and ways to measure whether these have been achieved; no true means of evaluation is possible.

The other side of this problem, professionals who depend on student responses for their basis of evaluation, they are likely to be disappointed and frustrated as a result: The students do not really know what they want in terms of where they are heading developmentally and what the skills are they need to have to be able to accomplish what they want to do. They need a very special kind of guidance that will not infantilize them, yet pass on to them the tools necessary to interact in the adult world. In their mind, the priority is taking and passing tests, meeting people, having a good time and just basic psychological and physical survival. The staff have to be there to challenge them to achieve greater depth of personality. And they cannot fear doing this. Students pick this up immediately. They want to be liked and accepted and in a non-threatening environment such as Hillel provides; this kind of challenge can truly be possible. In this sense, the executive director's enumeration of what he or she expects from the staff is especially important. The staff have to be real "menschim" in order to carry out this task. And they also have to be committed to what they are doing at their foundations. They have to be confident that what they are doing is right in order to convey this feeling to the students they come in contact with. So much depends on the personality of the director. Even if no direct teaching takes place, the exposure can also be an

important part of a Jewish college student's Hillel experience.

The final factor involved with professional difficulty in articulating and delineating goals and objectives has to do with the lack of time, both in real terms and the amount of seriousness with which the problem is perceived. A reasonable expectation that has also been expressed by their supervisor is to set out specific goals at the beginning of each year. More often than not this does not happen due to a perceived lack of time. In response to this idea several professionals share their impressions:

(At the beginning of each school year do you and your program director map out your goals?)

Director: "No, we should, but we don't. I think it is a good idea, but the day-to-day concerns and practical planning of things often takes precedence."

Program Director: "At the beginning of our second year we set very broad goals, but it was still a month-to-month decision. Students have little input often because there is not enough time."

This should have top priority since effective planning at the beginning of the year leads to a more organized time once the year gets under way. It may seem like an imposition at first, but in the long run, it pays off. At the beginning of the year, at one of the case Hillels, for example, each staff member was responsible for writing down their personal and professional goals for the year, articulating specific and general areas for emphasis. Half-way through the year, they looked at them to see how far

they had come and then again at the end of the year. It was an informal way of determining what was good about the year and what needed further emphasis, but it brought a great deal of satisfaction to look back at the long list from the first part of the year and see everything checked off. This added to the job satisfaction of all involved. Though it was painful and perhaps embarrassing to speculate about what they wanted to see happen during the year (because of the fear of failure) the final result was proof enough that this technique could and should be more widely employed.

A reality orienting principle does have a connection to the lack of available time in a Hillel professional's day. BaMakom, a journal for the B'nai B'rith Hillel Foundations, edited by Richard N. Levy, Executive Director of L.A.H.C., was forced to discontinue publication due to the lack of input from contributors, i.e., Hillel directors. A note in the final issue reads as follows:

This issue of BaMakom, the fifth in the series, is, alas, our final one for the foreseeable future. The crowded schedules of the Hillel director have compelled us to make this publication an "after-hours" project. By now it is clear that we are unable to maintain publication on any kind of regular basis, and we believe it best that we suspend our use of the present format.¹

This journal covered areas of concern to the professional in Hillel such as supervision, the language gap between directors and federations, sharing information among

¹ BaMakom, Fall, 1969, p. 2.

professionals. It had quality information that was well written. Its demise exemplifies the dilemma the Hillel professional faces with the time limitations. The motivating force behind this problem centers around another issue.

The goals of Hillel are so all-inclusive that they are set up to fail.

"Hillel is given this responsibility to undo all the negative that had been done to young Jewish kids in their elementary and high schools in terms of their imagery about Judaism. So, for those who had positive imagery, they wouldn't have troubles with Hillel and could utilize it. If they didn't it was sort of difficult for Hillel to be in the role of the Jewish center or the Jewish place to go when Jews didn't have that initial identification as a Jew. Hillel didn't do that very well, but also I think it is an impossible task to accomplish."

In order to determine whether a program is successful, three basic criteria need to be adhered to. There needs to be measurable objectives, a means of testing these objectives and the leaders must be motivated with what they are doing.¹ Hillel tries to relate to all aspects of religious, social, cultural, and educational programs and to all students, but these are unreasonable expectations, since there is no way to measure these against the objective criteria previously mentioned. In fact "there is no federation agency that is successful with the numbers game. Maybe it's the natural thing." They are also responsible for training future leaders in the Jewish community and to assure that

¹Rossi, Freeman, and Wright, Evaluation, p. 59.

Jewish identity is passed on so that college students will continue to be Jewish once they graduate and, better yet, to become a part of the affiliated community.

There is agreement between federation and Hillel professionals about the responsibility of Hillel to reach out to all. A Hillel director and federation professional both comment (respectively):

"In Hillel we tend to be nose counters, a lot of us resent it, myself included, but that kind of emphasis together with our own curiosity about how many people are coming and responding or not, has led us to be nose counters."

"The overall goal is to serve the multiplicity of Jewish needs of college-age youth. Those needs include social, cultural, educational, religious, counseling. I also see Hillel needing to work with faculty and most currently needing to do, what we call, defense work on campus in terms of confronting Arab propaganda..."

Hillel strives for participation and the target population is the university student, but there are many who, for a number of reasons such as apathy, "burn-out", ambivalence, etc., do not want to participate. Are they still to be considered a part of the constituency or can they, legitimately, be put aside and allow the Hillel professional to focus his/her energies toward those who do desire involvement?

In the words of one program director, "the kid with the largest magen david is the kid least likely to come into the building. It's like they wear it like a shield, literally saying leave me alone. I'm Jewish and I don't

want you to bother me about it." She elaborates on this idea and expresses her frustration with this group of students:

"I never feel satisfied with reaching the unaffiliated. By that, I mean, Jewish kids who are out there who never come in and never have a contact. Some of them I don't worry about because I know they're synagogue-involved already or they are involved in some level as youth group advisors or hebrew school teachers. I'd like to be a resource to them and I am sometimes, but they're not actively involved here. But there's thousands of others who are not interested at all. I don't take that as a sign of failure though, because even though I know the Jewish community takes it as a sign of failure if we don't reach them all, they are a microcosm of what's going on in the larger Jewish community. Just as there are thousands of Jews who are not affiliated in any way, so it is on the campus. You can't be everything to everybody, and by trying to be sometimes, I think we lose. I'm not advocating that we change that policy. We hope for spill over."

The sense of frustration is truly evident, but she does resign herself to the fact that it is a problem that cannot be overcome. The frustration is perpetuated, however, because others, who are not directly involved with the campus, have a similar perception, but an alternate game plan.

One board member responds to this:

"Least effective at attracting large numbers of students on campus. It does not do a good job at that. It is thought of in a lot of circles as a place for unattractive students to congregate. And somehow or other, that image has to be overcome. Programming or something has to be different to attract more desirable constituency. It just may be true that the unattractive students are attracted to Hillel because they've no other place to go. But I think it's important that we keep working in order to turn that around."

Another board member shares the understanding of looking at

numbers, though this would be only one of the criteria in a series, but she would also look to the personality of the rabbi to discover what is keeping students away. The rabbi sets the tone, is the person whom students usually wish to make contact and is the person who represents the agency to the university and the community. If the rabbi is unapproachable, this decreases the chances of a student being interested in developing a relationship with this person and, thus, the agency.

The agony over the unaffiliated afflicts the general community as much as the Hillel community. No one has the answer to solve the dilemma. The question remains, then, as to how much energy needs to be expended on behalf of this impossible situation. The directors are the ones who are to face it directly. It affects their everyday work, it is the result of early "burn-out" due to frustration on the part of devoted people committed to the furtherance of Jewish identity. It is also the source of a creative tension, i.e., the need to search out students against the realization that they all will not come. The expectations are high, even insurmountable. The problem that it poses, however, is more far-reaching than how many students are not coming. Burn-out is also related to the need for effective evaluation. With goals of involvement so unreasonable, there is no way for success to be achieved. No one wants Hillel to lower its standards, but there is a

need to have more realistic expectations in order to have a clear idea of how successful Hillel really is. There are other factors of consideration that also need clarification before any systematic means of evaluating can be established.

The importance of reaching out to all students cannot be diminished, but there are distinctions between students on the campus. Graduate students make up a large portion of the potential constituency on campus, but their needs are fundamentally different than undergraduates, who make up the majority of active students in, what is known as, "mainstream" Hillel activities. If Hillel is also responsible for this group, then it must serve different needs. Graduate students are older, more experienced in life, school, etc. They generally are not going through as intense a socializing process as undergraduates. They will generally have more sophisticated interests as far as what they expect in programs and they generally will not want to interact as much with the undergraduates. They are certainly invited to all Hillel functions, but when they express a desire to congregate among themselves, is Hillel responsible for providing an outlet? The prevalence of graduate groups at various universities (UCLA, USC, Northridge, etc.) indicates a need, but the funds are not always available. Should Hillel focus only on undergraduates and use the money in a concentrated area or is there room to

expand the scope as would seem necessary based on the demand?

Another constituent group worth of consideration is the faculty groups. This group has nothing to do with students, though they meet at the building. Its existence does nothing to further the goals of enhancing and perpetuating Jewish student life. There is no direct relationship between a faculty group meeting and the enhancement of Jewish identity, but once again, the fact that the groups do meet with some regularity indicates the need. It adds to the diversity of Hillel as well as the prestige on campus. In many ways, Hillel must have support on the campus because the agency does not operate in a vacuum. The network of faculty contacts leads to a positive working relationship between the Jewish agency and the school which makes it possible for Hillel to exist. This is a difficult matter to quantify in order to legitimate having this kind of group continue. Hillel is on the campus as the Jewish representative to the university. It is important for that impression to be a positive one. This is done through these contacts. Hillel also represents the university to the Jewish community.

The university offers a unique environment to accomplish all of these tasks. Thus, there is room for experimentation. One Hillel director reflects:

"I think we do...I don't think we're duty-bound to reflect everything that exists outside on the campus, but I think we are duty-bound to reflect the interests and needs of the Jewish people on the campus. We're the representatives of the Jewish people. We try

to project Jewish life as it is, and as it should be. Present Jewish life as innovative and not visionary; My ideology is to reflect interest of Jewish communal life, experimenting possibilities in Jewish life, trying to correct the wrongs. The campus is an ideal place for 'counter-cultural' Jewish life. Representing and reflecting Jewish communal and Jewish peoplehood needs and interests on the campus is necessary so that when Israel is attacked...from P.L.O., I believe that Hillel is charged with the responsibility of representing the case of Israel, but at the same time I think our purpose is to engage in and offer on the campus counter-cultural correctives and to engage in experimentation and innovation--to try things out and not be afraid of failure."

This experimental nature often leads to controversy and misunderstanding, as in the case of Breira (see chapter 3).

This natural leaning towards innovation is necessary in order to reach students, and it is one of the main attractions of Hillel work. This is something that the Jewish community must understand in order to accurately judge Hillel in its own right. There are good things going on in Hillel that the university and the Jewish community deserve to know about since both are ultimately affected by the successes and failures of the campus organization.

Hillel professionals describe what they do using the terms "Jewish presence." It was the phrase used most often by the people I interviewed, both lay and professional. They understand it, however, in a variety of different ways. One layperson says "it means a department of Jewish studies, newspapers and a table of information on campus. Jewish presence on campus means Chabad, the Bayit (at UCLA). There are many Jewish organizations besides Hillel. All

that means a Jewish presence." Another layperson explains it in terms of services, discussion groups, contacts with administration, speakers with a Jewish viewpoint such as a woman speaking about feminism who also happens to be Jewish. He feels that a Jewish viewpoint is "basically different than a gentile viewpoint and upbringing." The professionals have another way of looking at Jewish presence.

One member of the board who is also a professional in the Jewish community feels that "money and having a presence in terms of decision-making in the Federation" are key functions to Hillel's success. She names several rabbis who do sit on committees and she feels this is important since Hillel does do a UJWF campaign on campus; the link is there, but the Hillel office is not in federation so it is important to insure Hillel's voice is heard. This is also important because "Hillel is much more in the limelight, much more scrutinized, much more under a microscope." This is another way of understanding Jewish presence, i.e., in terms of having a physical presence in the Jewish community and having a voice in policy from the Hillel professionals. This will become increasingly more of a priority for Hillel if it hopes to continue to have the freedom it desires in order to carry on with the creative programs that will attract as much of the undefined constituency as possible.

Another definition of Jewish presence was offered by a

federation professional. He understands the phrase to mean defense. This can be extended to encompass being a catalyst for getting a big name speaker to campus or having a say in determining the commencement speaker. These are more culturally oriented and less connected directly with Hillel.

In order to understand why this presence is important, it is instructive to consider what would happen to college students if there was no Hillel on campus. A Hillel professional speculates the results:

"They would start their own groups or more of them would not do anything Jewishly. Those to whom being Jewish was important would start groups that would die after they left, as has happened. Many would miss out on the programming and they would not have an official Jewish advocate for them on campus. There would be more mixed marriage; faculty would not be as interested; future adult Jewish community would be different, because the future depends on present involvement. More conversions away from Judaism would occur because there would be no one inhibiting or opposing. Terrible disasters would happen. Chabad would only take up a small portion of the slack. There are campuses who don't have a Hillel where those drastic things don't happen, but I think around the country if there were no national organization like Hillel with a national backup to local institutions, then every Jewish student would be easy prey to all sorts of grasping hands."

It is only to the advantage to the Jewish community to provide this outlet for Jewish students. It is the responsibility of the professionals to do all they can to reach out and the Jewish community should feel a responsibility to help in this task. One federation professional explains why:

"Hillel is a training ground for Jewish responsibility

and while I don't think they are necessarily a training ground for Jewish leaders, I have the expectation that they are continuing the Jewish education, and as I mentioned, responsibility to college students."

Intermarriage is another reason for the Jewish community to be supportive of Hillel. A Hillel professional explains:

"Get Jewish students to meet other Jews to help them deal with shyness and loneliness to give them the kind of confidence in themselves that would enable them to wait until they met a Jewish partner and not let themselves fall in love with gentiles in part out of the fear they better take what they can get and not wait for someone who is Jewish. People have often had negative experiences with Jews of the opposite sex which I think relates to everyone's Jewish ambivalence and we should help people deal with that. There's a sickness about being Jewish in the diaspora and it needs the ambivalence or self-hatred that it causes and leads people to do a lot of those things that we beat our chests about what's happening in the Jewish community. Including the active Jews who turn away from any involvement with non-Jewish causes with the feeling that they don't do anything to help us, why should we do anything to help them."

This leads into the other main reason given by people working in Hillel to legitimate its existence.

Above everything else that Hillel does, programs, outreach, public relations, involving faculty, there is a need on the college campus to have a place for Jewish students to meet. This responsibility was expressed by lay committee members and professionals thus indicating another basis of common understanding between these two levels on the hierarchy. The purpose of the program may not make any difference to the level of observance or education, thus

content is not the issue. The groups can form in large masses for Israeli dancing or in intimate study sessions on Shabbat afternoon, so numbers are of no consequence. The goal is to get students together and the objective is to use whatever works. The unifying factor is that it is in a Jewish place with other Jews being facilitated by Jewish professionals who are committed to the furtherance and continuity of Jewish identity. This ideology, however, does not translate well on to paper when it comes time for budget evaluations.

There is something wrong with the way Hillel conducts its business aspect. This is a result of the vague expectations that are too broad to be measured, but this is inherent in the agency. Hillel is a business in that it has a budget to watch over and staff to supervise, but it is also a social service agency, a religious institution, an education insitution, and it is the only one available for college students. There is never enough money, but it is committed to doing it all. Hillel has certain responsibilities to fulfill, but there is no way it can force participation. It simply has to be there. It is a humanizing agency, more so than any other in the Jewish community, but it also must face up to reality. It is the problem of the Hillel professional to pick up where others have left off. They have to make up for all of the negative Jewish experiences the students have had as well as present

their agency, with its idealistic goals and dreams, to a community that struggles to keep its debts to a minimum. No one else but the Hillel professional can explain Hillel because they are the ones both with the knowledge and the vested interest. The reasons this is so difficult will be discussed in the next chapter.¹

¹For unified collegiate kinship, the history is structured towards hindsight in nurturing grandchildren.

VI. THE ROLE OF THE PROFESSIONAL

This chapter focuses on the role and responsibilities of the Hillel director. The role is clearly delineated, but the responsibilities place the director in a state of tension. The essence of this tension finds its basis in the title--is the Hillel director a campus worker or an executive director? How can these two essential components of the job be balanced without one suffering for the sake of the other? Max Ticktin briefly describes the expectations of a Hillel director:

Hillel directors are the Jewish presences on the university campus. Not only are they enablers of programs and activities, but as persons and as models, they are also Jewish teachers, passionate and affirmative Jewish educational presences. They have Jewish knowledge, commitment and experience appropriate for the pluralistic interests, wants and needs of the various segments of the Jewish campus community.¹

This dichotomy is a result of the intervention of federation as the funding source for Hillel. Rabbis, who are trained as religious leaders are put into positions where they have other kinds of responsibilities.

When Hillel became federated, a whole new vocabulary sprung up to describe it. It no longer was "a home away from home." It became an "agency." Students became clients and the rabbi became an agency director. There is no place

¹Max Ticktin, "What Does a Hillel Director Do?"

in the rabbinical school curriculum for budgeting and fundraising, but Hillel rabbis are increasingly being called upon to perform these functions. This transition has not always been enjoyable. Hillel rabbis tend to fear budgets and as a result may not deal with them in an effective way. It is easier, in the short run, to put aside those things that are unpleasant, but in the long run only trouble can result. It becomes necessary for the Hillel rabbi to learn to combine the idealism that probably led them in to Hillel work in the first place with the reality of what it means to be an agency director. One rabbi shares his manner of filling this gap:

I've gone into the fundraising business. At first I was dragged into it much against my will, hated it, contended that I wasn't trained for this, that I shouldn't spend my time with this and that it was going to detract from my time on campus. In the end, if you want your Hillel foundation not to go down the tubes and if you want enough money to do everything that you want to do (I don't believe in saying no to student initiatives--I encourage "grassrootsness" and some of the best things at Hillel have been student initiatives)--to stymie student initiatives is counterproductive. And I realize that when you are faced with budgetary difficulty you have several options; you can say no, you...cut back. That's one possibility, but you don't want to do that. The other alternative is to go out and get more money so you don't have to say no and that is the alternative I chose to pursue.

A Hillel rabbi is controlled by many role expectations, even today. The chaplain at USC points out that "the minute you say rabbi, it conjures up a whole series of images and expectations and stereotypes of what that role is which puts pressure on that person." Furthermore, the

job depends on that person's ability to motivate people. It is difficult to reconcile this externally imposed ideal person (and to some degree this is reinforced by the rabbis) with the daily demands of the job. In addition a Hillel rabbi must know how to be a supervisor since s/he will certainly have staff working with them (and often student interns, as well). They will also have to know how to be a supervisee. This is when their ego has to be put aside and learn what they can for the good of the agency. There are also demands placed on the Hillel rabbi by the need to maintain their buildings. This is not to say that they need to be gardeners and electricians, but this is another aspect when their supervisory skills come into play. There is also a need to learn how to find bargains without getting cheated. Much of this is standard for agency directors funded by federation, but since Hillel is also a part of a national organization, B'nai B'rith Hillel Foundation, which is based in New York, the Hillel rabbi is also entitled to having the Jewish holidays off, if there is no program, as well as a sabbatical due to them after seven years of service.

The Hillel director also serves as a community organizer in that there is a desire to create a microcosm on the campus of the Jewish community. This involves certain administrative functions. The federation does not consider lack of time as an excuse for the inability to take care of

these responsibilities: "They cannot continue day-to-day concerns without getting the applications and part of their role as administrators is to support the work they are doing."

This is the tension between spiritual leader/charismatic versus administrator/supervisor. It is the continued complaint of Hillel directors that they are not administrators; they are spiritual leaders, but here, very clearly, federation has the expectation of them to be administrators. They are given administrative positions and executive director titles as agency heads, but they rarely have the training to fulfill both functions. The message is a confusing one in that the students, faculty, and university have the expectation that the Hillel rabbi will be well-versed in text and the history, to be able to teach, counsel, guide people in prayer; but the funding source, to whom the directors are ultimately responsible, insist on the rabbis having and utilizing skills for which they were not trained. It is a perplexing dilemma and will continue to plague many a well-intentioned rabbi who wants "to do good things on campus," when in reality the job entails much more.

The other problem with this is that the rabbi who is the good administrator and not charismatic also runs into problems with legitimacy and integrity. One rabbi in particular down played his rabbinic role as much as possible.

He had students do Shabbat services whenever possible; though he is conservative in training he would not wear a kittel at High Holiday services because he did not want to put people off by being dressed differently. But he often kept the books when he was in between secretaries and often managed to get wonderful deals on furniture, building supplies, etc. He also played an integral role in ordering supplies, supervising staff and student leaders, and hiring and firing assistant directors.

The dilemma continues in extending this model to what Hillel directors hope to get out of their work. They are a group of people truly committed to Judaism and perpetuating it through the college campus. They are a self-motivated group of people who, by nature of the unorthodox choice of Hillel work, usually resent authority and feel capable of regulating what they do without interference from the outside. Most give up money in order to come to Hillel, but the pay-offs are that they have more personal time and more political and personal freedom than in the congregational rabbinate. One Hillel rabbi shares his notion of what he expected to get out of Hillel work:

My dream of Hillel was that it would be a place where I could do serious things and not have to waste time on a lot of political board kinds of meetings...where you can try your hand at innovation, where you can dream where you could figure out what Jewish life should be like. To try to actually make things like that happen...Hillel with its tradition of academic freedom, is that place, par excellence, in the Jewish community. Whether it will always remain the same is up for grabs as

federations pick up more and more of the tab.

This perception results from the fact that Hillel directors are encouraged to cultivate their own individual interests, but at the same time they are in an environment that necessitates compartmentalization. It would be disastrous for Hillel professionals to keep their political views to themselves. This is understood by one member of the board when she says "I think we are in trouble if we only hear one point of view on the issues. It is important for Hillel to provide as many points of view as possible on the issues." This has to be done with sensitivity, keeping in mind who is sponsoring the agency, but free expression on the campus must be encouraged. On the other hand "Hillel is the only agency in which rabbis as a group are required to make their denominational loyalties recessive. I maintain, therefore, that the uniqueness of the position demands the formation of standards to correspond to this uniqueness."¹ This is where the federation needs to reconsider its position concerning the evaluation of Hillel and the Hillel professional needs to have and understanding of the gap that exists between them and other agency professionals. A board member summarizes this:

Other agencies probably have problems with their funders, but they are different. Hillel is trying to be a center, a synagogue, a Jewish Family Service,

¹New Frontiers for Jewish Life on the Campus,
International Conference of Hillel Directors, 1967, B.B.H.F.
Inc., Washington, D.C., 1968, p. 63.

a vocational counseling service, all that in one. And reform, orthodox, conservative and secular at the same time. It's hard for me to compare Hillel with other agencies. I think federation should take special time to understand what Hillel really is, its style and its approach. I think that a rabbi perhaps would not have the same language that a director of a direct service agency or special service agency would have, in terms of dealing with that kind of accountability issues. I think the rabbis have to scurry around the learn that stuff. They probably didn't see that in their vision in their role as a Hillel director. They thought of reaching and teaching and touching the kids and that kind of thing. So probably part of the responsibility is also on Hillel in terms of their expectations of what their professional role will be."

This suggests another problem that Hillel directors face beyond the problems of time pressures, unclear functions or roles that are difficult to delineate and being torn between two worlds. Hillel directors often complain about the kind of responsibilities they have to federation because they feel they were not trained for these tasks. One recent example in Los Angeles is connected to the budget forms that all agency directors were required to fill out in order to determine allocations for 1981-1982.

Carol Weiss, a noted evaluation researcher, explains why there was resistance to these forms:

"In human service professions, practitioners deal with individuals. They are very much aware of individual differences, and they gain esteem and professional recognition from their sensitivity to the facets that differentiate one human being from another and their ability to tailor service to individual needs. The evaluator, on the other hand, deals in statistics..."¹

¹Weiss, Evaluation Research, p. 101.

It is understandable that there is resistance since the evaluation takes time away from program areas, but it also presents a threat to the people and agency that is being evaluated. First of all, there is the feeling that the evaluation will only measure surface observations and will miss some of the more subtle program dynamics and secondly, the evaluation could be used to determine the necessity of the practitioner's job. There is also the possibility that innovations and changes will change the basic nature of the program. This would indicate that what the practitioner is so dedicated to may not be worthwhile.¹ These are sensitive areas that the evaluator needs to be aware of and be able to communicate to the participants of the evaluation to alleviate threatened feelings. In the instance of the budget forms for federation this year, much resistance was met because there was the feeling that it left out too many aspects of Hillel work and that it did not portray the entire function.

Studies have shown that the most effective way to deal in situations involving complex human interaction is face-to-face.² The personal touch that accompanies this kind of human interaction is essential to facilitate

¹Ibid.

²Stevens, William T. and Tornatzky, Louis G., "The Dissemination of Evaluation: An Experiment," in Evaluation Review, Volume 4, Number 3, June 1980, p. 342.

change. In a Hillel setting, dealing with insecure young adults, and making contacts with the university, this becomes especially true. Hillel directors understand this need; some passively, others actively. This was an that Hillel directors felt was not adequately dealt with in the forms. Without this important component considered, they did not feel that the form adequately reflected what they were doing and thus, they ran the risk of not getting adequate funding. One Hillel director vehemently opposed the forms. He explains why:

They attempt to evaluate staff time and budget by program area. It's absolutely impossible. There were two problems with that. One, our time is such that it's so inextricably mixed that you can't do it. When we have a staff meeting, the staff meeting concerns cultural events, religious events, social events, Israel events, and retreats. I mean, it's all of them at once. We have two-hour staff meetings. It's impossible for me to say that 25 percent of our time goes to social events. To evaluate my time by program area is too complex. The other thing is that it missed things. It missed areas. There's a lot that I do that is crucial to the sustenance of this organization which cannot be directly related to program. When I meet with the vice president of academic affairs, twice a year for a lunch and we talk about what's happening on campus today and what's happening in Hillel, it is not directly related to any of those, but if I didn't do it, we would be up shit creek when it came time to doing anything on this campus... Meetings with administrators, meetings with federations, supervisorial meetings with the executive director... There are so many kinds of things that I do that cannot be squeezed into directly relating them to programs... It's like fiction, it's like apples and oranges.

Another professional expresses similar feelings of frustration:

"Every year it's part of the game. Every year there's a different committee that's functioning in the federation. They need different information. Different individuals are on these committees. We do different forms every single year. I think it wastes our time. I think that it's part of the game. It's a nuisance, it's a pain in the neck. It takes us from doing things that we really should be doing. The entire federation budget system of re-doing budgets four times during the year, of being given an amount of money to work with and then immediately two months later it's withdrawn and there are other cutbacks...and at the end of the year there is only one year to my recollection where there was a cutback. But this hampers us. And it takes tremendous time on our part to make all that evaluation on different kinds of paperwork every single year."

This is a sense of frustration and impatience with federation and its system of evaluating programs and deciding how much money they will get. This is the sense I have gotten from others, but this is coming from a woman who has been doing Hillel work for 11 years. She has seen this again and again and still she feels the frustration and that it is an imposition on her valuable time. Though the budget process is necessary to the running of an agency, she has the view that the everyday kinds of activities to reach out to students and do what she gets paid for is far more valuable than trying to figure out how much time is spent doing it and the break down of the day. She adds further thoughts on the inadequacy of the forms:

"It was more a record of what is happening, so close to the picture, but the kind of things it asked to too difficult to judge. Based on time percentages, and how much of salary is part of that time period. Too complicated. I'm functioning with 16 different agencies every single day. I'm working out tremendous

details in completely different activities. And handling counseling situations and handling students who are coming in upset, who are interrupting those details. And there's such an overlap that you can't compartmentalize...."

She makes a list every day of things to get done. Often there are things added during the day, emergency things come up, or unplanned things occur such as phone calls. She does not always complete the list. Connections on campus are important to make and maintain. She makes herself available to the student groups on campus to help with leadership development; she knows the student leaders and the people involved with student activities because that is what Hillel is involved in. Some days this is more than others; it is difficult to predict, but it is essential to her work to have those connections. The amount of time she spends doing this kind of work does not mean anything. It has to be done and she has to spend whatever time it takes for it to get done.

If the form is inadequate, then it is up to the Hillel directors to improve it since they are the ones who know the agency the best and are best able to determine what is and is not good. They should be given the time to spend on such a project and have access to federation and communal workers to give input and share ideas. An evaluation to be effective, need not be all-inclusive. It only need present an accurate picture of the situation. No one person can do it, and the Hillel directors should

not have to do it alone. But inspite of the difficulties, there is the feeling that being associated with federation is better than not to be:

"There are tremendous advantages. It ties agencies and organizations together and allows for resources. It allows for useful connections like using the Community Relations Committee for response to things going on on campus quite often. There's going to be some stuff that's just got to get done. Whether it's filling out this form for National Hillel or whether it's filling out the budget stuff for federation. But I really don't think that these reports really clarify and tell them what we do. When you're dealing with people you can't put that into time categories, and evaluation and numbers quite so easily. And numbers are always so deceiving. There can be a program with only five or six people and these people get a tremendously moving experience out of it. This cannot really be judged in objective terms. For example, there was a rabbi at a foundation who had a particular interest in Judaic studies so that was the main focus of the programs. To me, that is not a Hillel. It's too limiting. I think one of the evaluations you can have at a Hillel is the breadth of the program that you offer."

The professionals in federation were basically satisfied with the information that Hillel provided to them. There was the realization from people I talked to that the form was difficult, it was difficult for everyone. This same form was given to every agency that federation funds. Hillel directors were able to finish the forms and turn them in basically on time. In terms of understanding the dilemma of Hillel, one federation professional says: "I think that Hillel does so many things that that's where the difficulty came in. First of all, it's agreeing on eight or nine categories of what they do over all and then apportioning dollars and time to it. Other agencies have

done it." Is this injecting a semblance of order into the apparent chaos of Hillel or is it imposing a false model on the agency? It seems to depend on which end of the budget form one finds oneself. But in time of tight funds, the importance of accountability increases.

Federation "as the prime funder of Hillel has the right to request that kind of information." They also do not see the need to prepare a special form for Hillel. It is perceived as another recipient of the welfare fund and this puts it in the same status as all the other agencies.

These forms are an important means for federation to get information about Hillel. This is also a new system that has not been proven yet. There is the possibility that it will need to be revised, but that will take time. The federation seems open to changes and improvements. There is the realization of the complexity of the issue and the resistance of the rabbis:

"Part of the reason is that they have to fill it out. Part of the reason is their claim that they aren't sophisticated enough to do that kind of breakdown. That it's hard to know how many hours one spends on counseling. That it's hard to know how many hours one spends on faculty outreach, on religious needs, those are the different categories that were formulated. It got done. It got done pretty much on time and now we have to assess if indeed it is a valuable document. It is the responsibility of the federation to ask for that kind of information as the holder of the Jewish community money. I regret that there was resistance to it on a local level, but I feel that at the unit level, there was not resistance. That the administrators level which was very cooperative. Maybe it's the wrong format in terms of how detailed we asked. I'm not sure of that, but there was

no argument on the fact that it was necessary to ask this kind of question. I'm sure we'll do some reshaping for next year, but the fact that we had to do this, was not contested. We have a better picture of what Hillel services are like, where the problems are and what the successes are."

The intention is not to make Hillel vulnerable, but to try to better understand Hillel in a more thorough way. There is still room for change and further refining of the process, but it will take time and cooperation from all parties involved. The staff input is essential, but it is also essential for the federation to be receptive to these suggestions. The problem of priorities will continue to plague all areas of the Jewish community. The burdens seem to multiply daily.

VII. THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, THE LAY BOARD--THEIR ROLE

Hillel is not an autonomous community or organization of students. It gets its support from the outside community. "It is the adult community which defines the nature and purposes of the agency, appoints its professional leadership, and determines its educational, administrative and fiscal policies. Nor do students have the power to establish or abolish a Hillel foundation, although student response or lack of it may be among the factors which determine the establishment of a new unit or the closing of an existing one."¹ In Los Angeles this responsibility falls to the LAHC Board of Directors. They act as Hillel's representative to the community through its relationship to federation. Their meetings are staffed by the executive director of LAHC, Rabbi Richard Levy.

Rabbi Levy is the main motivating force behind LAHC. He is the one who relates to the staff in the supervisorial meetings which he conducts regularly. He then relays information and perceptions to the board meetings so that they will know what goes on in each unit.

He has specific expectations for his staff which reflect their individual abilities. They have the dual

¹Jospe, Alfred, Judaism on the Campus: Essays on Jewish Education in the University Community, BBHF, Wash.DC 1963, p. 27.

duty of working hard on campus to be Jewish innovators and also to work hard on their personal lives as well. He expects them to spend time with their families and pursue their interests outside of their work. He believes that "the more Jewish things they do, the better models they are for Jewish students." They are to take living a religious life seriously and be willing to grapple with theological issues. They are expected to be "menschim" with each other and the people they work with. He understands the needs and dilemmas of a Hillel director:

"I think we have an excellent staff," claims Richard. Richard does not dictate priorities; they try to work together in determining things. "A good consensus, I think on all the things that should be done. The degree to which you do things and work on them often depends on things outside yourself, like student interest, like things that come up on campus." Often, things that must be dealt with are things the rabbis are not prepared for. Hillel does in-service training through conferences. (I went to one early in the year about coping with anti-Semitism on campus.)

These are some of the components that go to make up a Hillel director, but it is a board decisions ultimately as to who gets hired. The board, Rabbi Levy, and a few students compose the interview committee. An added consideration in the hiring process is to try to match the rabbi's personality to the tenor of the campus s/he will

work on. This is another area where Rabbi Levy's input is important, since he has the most intimate knowledge of the campus and these needs. He continues to be the focal point for LAHC as far as who has the control and the major part of the information concerning what goes on in Hillel and what should be happening. This also indicates that if any changes are to come that he would be the one to carry this through the directors. He is the one with the most perspective on the situation since he is in the middle of it all. It is significant that everyone who I talked to has a positive impression of Richard as an executive director and as a supervisor. He has the respect of his people, and is in a fine position to institute changes and improvements into the Hillel structure.

The board represents Hillel's case to the federation at allocation's time. Board advocacy is essential since there is no method for determining priority in the Los Angeles federation:

"One of the things that we do not have in L.A. is a community priority system. It is one of the things that the planning and budgeting department is working on. But we don't have that system yet. For example, I attended a meeting where a survey was requested about alcoholism in the Jewish community. And the group asked, where does our request stand. And the answer was it had as much chance of being funded as a day camp in the Conejo Valley or leadership development in the south bay. Because we don't have a master plan of priorities at this point. It's very difficult for me to say where does Hillel stand in terms of priority. The fact that federation assumes three-quarters of Hillel's budget and the fact that B'nai B'rith funds over 20 percent of Hillel's budget, to me is indicative that this community sees

Hillel services important enough to provide Hillel with the kind of subsidies that it does. But that's the only indicator at this point that I see, is the amount of dollars, there's no list."

Since allocations are determined on what has been done in previous years and "the need the agency presents" it becomes clear that Hillel must have a powerful advocate in order to get its fair share. This also indicates the difficulty that Hillel will have in being held accountable for its program effectiveness (as in other agencies) since there is no system of determining need, Hillel does not know where it stands. The effort is being expended. It is a difficult process and no city has yet accomplished this (except for Cleveland which is a medium-sized community when compared to L.A.). During this process it will be especially important to have a strong voice for Hillel.

The board supports Hillel both through fundraising and advocacy in the community. Much of their information comes from Rabbi Levy in terms of decision making. They have a presentation of the basic issues and then open the meeting up for discussion. These discussions are about policy, hiring, firing, other personnel issues, special projects. It is also responsible for developing a fundraising base. It is a power base designed to give feedback to the directors, interpret personnel practices to the community, help directors interpret their budget to the federation and to involve people with an interest in Hillel. A board member tells the story:

"My role as a supporter of Hillel and as past president of the LAHC board is not to determine programs. Mine is only a support role. I don't feel that sitting where I am as a worker and a volunteer for Hillel that I have any feel of the need on campus. I rely on the directors to tell me what the need is. And to set a priority and then my role would be either financial support, and/or telling the story of Hillel in the community to support Hillel in these needs by attending certain hearings, certain functions, but not to determine programs and really not to determine priority. The Retreat House was a need pointed out to the board by Rabbi Raben and the board carried through on it. There was a need for a house in Northridge pointed out by the executive director of LAHC and it happened. Rudisill helped convince the board for the need of a house at USC. It was the directors' decision, in conjunction with us, but I really rely on their judgement, from that we built the new house at USC."

"It's a good affiliation opportunity." The federation also has certain expectations of the boards:

"My belief is that anyone who sits on a board of a Jewish agency has to be a quality giver, and I distinguish that from the quantity giver, but I do believe that people who sit on boards of directors have to put their dollars where their votes are. Any board member who does not support the agency which he has been given a leadership position to, both in terms of financial support, and decision-making support; responsibility in committee work support is not fulfilling his or her function as a board member. And if this then is the requirement of board members to face up front with their multiple responsibilities, then I have no problem with that.. And I also use the term quality gift or appropriate giving, I would not expect college students to be excluded from the board...because a college student is capable of giving a quality gift."

The format of the LAHC board was changed this year in an attempt to make it more representative. It used to function more as a social gathering with meetings being held at board members' homes. There would usually be an elaborate dinner which gave the impression of being a party

rather than an important meeting. The board members were dissatisfied with this format; they were interested in doing some real work. The president and the executive committee now meet between board meetings to determine which issues to bring to the general meeting. This is where decisions are made. Rabbi Levy meets with the president before meetings of the entire board, and he attends the executive committee meetings and staffs the overall board meetings. "The old guard was not too willing, but they stayed with it." The board members all have multiple involvements in the Jewish community, but they feel a special connection to Hillel.

The degree of connections of the board members puts them in an ideal position to deal with the criticisms that Hillel is plagued with. They decide whether to respond to or ignore attacks against Hillel. A recent case involves Hillel's Israel programming. This is an important component of Hillel's activities, but only one of many. Recently Hillel directors have been accused of not doing any because they were anti-zionist. This refers to the involvement of several directors in Breira. The response to these accusations are a board responsibility:

"The group that believes in totally peaceful solutions to the problems in Israel...whether too many of the rabbis are too closely involved in that program or that the newspapers are falsely accusing the rabbis of being involved in that program. Some of the newspapers have said that Hillel doesn't do enough to combat the Arab propaganda or is not involved in enough Israel programming. The board gets involved

in that. The board will answer these. And be the one to support the rabbis in the community. And we've had a lot of that lately."

This board member, a past president of the board, stands firm behind the need to support Hillel even when there are controversial issues at stake. There is allowance of freedom for the directors as well as an understanding of the need serve as a moderating force. There are also times when the perception is to ignore certain critics:

"It is our experience that if you forget about it it goes away. It is not worth the trouble and time and cost to rebutt. We can't take the time to answer this critic, not every Jew reads this paper. We have also confronted them in person. They will not answer questions, and they walk out on you and they're unruly and very dogmatic. I've never met them personally, but this is what we have been told, that you cannot deal with them. There are people, and I don't know why, who are constant critics instead of looking on the good side of the things that we do, at the positive effect we have on the students."

This is based on the understanding that there will always be people who will disagree with what an organization is doing. They have to be listened to, but with the understanding that "you'll always have voices that are negative and they'll always be the loudest voices...You have to listen to them and react to them, but I don't think you have to go around wringing your hands over it."

The board is made up of a variety of people in the community with powerful connections that could be used to aid Hillel. One prominent board member is a developer of office buildings. Others have connections through spouses or on campus if they are university professors.

One way to use these connections is described by one board members in response to recent criticisms:

"We are very conscious of it...I'm going to get some advice, as a matter of fact, this week from a new found friend who is in the public relations business and I'm going to see what he'll tell me for nothing and what we can do for nothing.

This is one example of a good use of resources. More of this can and should occur. The people are on the board because they are in positions of power in the community. They should use their professional expertise on the board just as they would in their business lives. It has been said that many of the board decisions are based on emotions rather than fact and program effectiveness. One Hillel professional explains:

"The way this happens is by individuals who are on the Hillel board who are in positions of power who have some sort of feeling for Hillel doing the kinds of lobbying with other individuals on the board who are decision-makers. It's a matter of perhaps putting together a real good presentation at budget time, it's a matter of doing good PR in the Jewish Community Bulletin, having articles by Hillel directors being written in the Jewish papers. It's that kind of lobbying throughout the year. When it comes time to make the budget decisions a lot of it is not based on fact. A lot of it is based on emotion, on how they feel about the agency. A lot of the problems when Hillel directors are getting bad press because they are associated with leftist kinds of activities or are being branded as anti-zionist; that leaves something in their mind. When it comes budget time and that's the part that has nothing to do with the effectiveness of the programs. There's those two elements going on in terms of conveying information. It's the attitudinal approach in terms of the decision-makers having a positive attitude and it's also the effectiveness of the program. There's two kind of things happening there."

The motivation for involvement for many of the board

members is that they had a personal, positive experience with Hillel during their college years. Though the memories are often vague, there is a distinct feeling of connection to Hillel, though many of them have not been involved with it directly for 30 years. Some of the board members share their personal feelings about Hillel:

"I feel that young people are our future leaders and if we can help them understand and appreciate their Jewish roots, they will become good Jewish leaders for the continuity and continuing of Judaism and the Jewish culture. If we lose them on campus to either cults or disinterest, then we've lost our future leaders. We're talking about the leaders, not masses. You can't get everybody; but the ones who are involved are worth cultivating. The exposure to young people also helps present leaders in planning for present Jewish community. I think young people's ideas are extremely important and I don't think we should become stayed and not be dynamic...if I'm going to think back to what I did on campus and relate it to today's programs, then I've lost everything. What happens on campus today is today's history, but we don't have to repeat history and so I can build on my experience, but I'm interested in what's going on in today's scene on campus. And working with Hillel gives me the opportunity to learn and to see what's going on."

Also, another response:

"What I liked then is what I will like now. It's a Jewish place. I like being surrounded by my own people. I like to involve myself in Jewish activities. I have no negative memories; I was not turned off by being an active member of the Jewish community. I was turned on. Hillel was the first Jewish organization that I was ever involved in."

"I think I am very affectionate towards Hillel because that's where I met my husband. I love college kids, I'm very fond of Rabbi Levy, and Rabbi Berner. They were very nice to my son and daughter-in-law...I just like the atmosphere, the college atmosphere."

It appears as though board members derive a great deal

of satisfaction from being involved in Hillel and that involvement led to future involvement in the Jewish community. These positive feelings are important to perpetuate since this is also a part of the motivating force for people to want to be board members. There is strength in these feelings, but perhaps there is also a need to take the business of supporting Hillel, both financially and through public relations, more seriously. Hillel continues to be a viable institution, but it continues also to mystify people as to its complete function. Hillel should continue to be an enjoyable occupation for the professionals and an enjoyable cause to support for the laypeople, but there is room and a need for improvements in the basic structure of the agency.

VIII. RECOMMENDATIONS

This final chapter attempts to delineate suggestions for improvement. An attempt was made to keep these suggestions reasonable so that implementation would be possible. The first component of these suggestions would be to develop a more effective means of evaluation. Steve Huberman explains this need.

While Jewish communities are increasingly undertaking needs assessments and demographic surveys, not as much priority is being given to evaluative research. Jewish social services are frequently provided on the assumption that they are effective. Although programs are informally evaluated, more could be done to insure on-going verification that goals are being met.¹

One Hillel professional says this is impossible because "we don't translate well to paper, figures." The agency is not visible to the Jewish community since the contact is with college students who are marginally involved. He feels that "you can fill out all the forms in the world...and people still don't understand what we do." Other professionals, however, would disagree:

There is a great need for evaluation, not just interpreting to policy makers; but also within the individual unit. Individual staffs need to take slow, sometimes painful, steps to look at their objectives at the beginning of each program year

¹ Steve Huberman, "Building Bridges: Towards Realistic Links Between Research and Planning in Jewish Communal Life." Journal of Jewish Communal Service. Fall 1980. p. 38.

and try to measure reality with their objectives as the year progresses. I think it's essential to take those kinds of steps. And do that kind of planning which I suspect is not happening enough. It is up to the professionals to do the work. It has to be an honest appraisal, i.e., free risk and kept separate from getting money because that is a political process and we have to play the game in order to make it in the world.

This is another good distinction to be made: external versus internal evaluation. Both need to be done in a consistent way, but they must be kept separate in order to maintain the integrity and honesty. There is a need to evaluate oneself in order to grow and learn.

Steve Huberman offers a list of ways to implement program evaluation which can be utilized by Hillel. He says that "researchers, planners, and direct service providers need to collaborate in these areas:

1. Clarification of program goals
 - a. State goals in clearer, more specific, and, whenever possible, measurable terms.
 - b. Re-examine the assumptions which govern program operation;
 - c. Disaggregate programs into measurable component parts.
2. Development of an evaluation process which would be applicable to many different Jewish communal activities, but which allows for agency and client uniqueness.
3. Establishing procedures to insure that direct service providers are directly involved in the evaluation process. This would help insure that the research product confronts issues which are pertinent to the practitioners and that the research findings are implemented.¹

¹Ibid. p. 42.

Also see Weiss, Evaluation Research, p. 98 for her list of suggestions appropriate for action settings..

Offering a Jewish outlet on the university is an important matter. It is the last step for young adults before they leave the safe environment of the university setting and move out into the mainstream of life. College students deserve and desire a place to be Jewish while in their college years. At this time Hillel is the place for them to go. It should be the best place that the Jewish community has to offer. Those kinds of positive experiences last for a long time. They may not offer immediate gratification to those who are devoting their lives to the perpetuation of Judaism on the campus, but in the long run the pay-offs exist. Nevertheless, it is incumbent upon those involved with Hillel at any level, be it lay or professional, to take a good, long, hard look at what is being offered to the students at this time in their life when they are searching. Is it enough to offer a "Jewish presence on campus" or is this too much? We can afford to be more specific, clarify what is happening in order to find out really what the impact is, or are we going to continue to do program planning "Flying by the seat of our pants as we have for years?" These are serious questions as naive as they may sound, but they are questions that I did not find the people in the field dealing with seriously. I strongly believe in experimenting, but it has to be calculated, taking into account the variable and making adjustments based on relevant, reliable

information. It is something that directors and program directors need to take seriously and make a priority. The days are busy and full, but what good is it to work hard and never really know that what you are doing is going to accomplish what it is you are devoting your life to?

The manner in which the organization is run can also be improved. Many of these organizational improvements have a direct relationship to Hillel's connection to federation. This relationship is essential to Hillel's survival since B'nai B'rith is no longer able to pick up the tab for Hillel as much as it was able to in the beginning and universities are slow to take on this responsibility (Brandeis and The Claremont Colleges are two examples where this has occurred), so unless Hillel wants to do its own fundraising, which would be disastrous for programming since the amount of time to fundraise effectively is enormous, the dependence on federation must continue. Several suggestions for this improvement have come from several board members.

One suggestion includes actively recruiting influential people in the community to be on the Hillel board. These people should have connections to significant power bases as well as a feeling of connection to Hillel. But most important of all, they should use their business connections to aid Hillel. It is not enough to present the credentials, they must also be used. One board member suggests that

Rabbi Levy should "bring in a few more of the mainstays of the Jewish community. They need a few of the mucky-mucks in there and money people. Other than just the nice friendly people who just can't figure it out. Maybe someone on the planning and budgeting professional staff should be on the board. Steve Huberman, or someone like that who has a less political type job. It is important to note the need to continue to have the "human" factor on the board along with the "money people." That college connection to Hillel plays an important role in support in later years.

Another suggestion comes from a professional. Even though Hillel is a federated agency, its physical presence is not made known in the federation building itself:

"We're always being called in, so to speak, about policies that we would establish and programs that we would promote. So we're not totally free. On the other hand, it's nice to be associated with a community. You would think that we would be better known in the Jewish community than we are. I don't feel like they know us very well. In Los Angeles, when you go down to 6505 because Richard's office is not in 6505, we're not as well known there. He is certainly known, but I mean as an agency. Maybe if Hillel had an office there we would be better known."

Perhaps it would be worthwhile to explore the possibility having a Hillel office in the federation building.

There were suggestions, as well, concerning the importance of Hillel to package itself in a more professional manner. In a society that is commercially oriented, it forces agencies that want to attract students

to be convincing. This should also be the responsibility of each Hillel since the individual agency serves different kinds of populations so there is a requirement to individualize the publicity. The publicity is a form of community relations and would encompass all aspects of publicity. In order to do this effectively, more money needs to be spent in that area, but in an efficient way. One board member relates:

"Each Hillel should be responsible for its own PR, I think that things might change now that they have this "New Jewish Center" at UCLA because they can do programs for the entire community. They will begin to see the kind of quality Hillel provides for the students on campus. I think the rabbis should give themselves the opportunity for visibility outside of their roles at Hillel, which they do. I think the people who are on the planning and budgeting committee should be invited occasionally to a program. They should be on the mailing list of Hillel, to see the variety of things that are provided."

A position, created and approved by federation to serve this function, called the Community Service Person who would be responsible for publicity and fundraising will act as a liaison person to the entire region. There are doubts, however, as to the effectiveness of such a position. A board member explains:

"I think Hillel could spend more time doing better PR which supposedly they will be doing with this new position, but this is not how it should be done. It's like someone who is not on the campus is defending the campus. If the program director on every campus was in charge of public relations, I think that would infinitely be better. Give someone PR skills and pump out a few PR pieces every month and get a feature story in; that's how you do it. I'm sure this new position will enhance Hillel's

position in the federation. It may not be bad, but it bothers me that my money as a contributor to the Welfare Fund would be spent doing PR for Hillel to the funding agent. I'd rather see that person doing other things."

Another aspect of this publicity/public relations involves inviting board members and federation professionals involved with Hillel to select Hillel activities. This contact would be good for the board members in that it would give them an intimate look at what goes on in Hillel and it would give the Hillel professionals another means of communicating with the people who often represent and support them in the community. One staff member expresses her interest in such an interchange:

"Hillel was not a part of 'A Journey of Love.' That really hurt. We should have the board meet in the building. Most do not know what goes on at the campus. In St. Louis, they did. Students made presentations and the board had a better sense of what went on. Board members should come to events, have special programs with them included. I'd love to have them come and just sit here for a day and see what happens. They could come for Shabbat. I know they'd come away with a positive feeling because there is a good feeling here. More needs to be done to establish the relationship. Too much distance, time conflicts exist..."

This idea appealed to some board members and did not to others; it depended on their time commitments. Other professionals shared the feeling of needing this contact and others did not, but it is an idea worth pursuing for special programs. The main reason for this is the difficulty of communicating "feeling" to board members and the amount of time it takes for directors to present

what they are doing at the board meetings. But, any kind of personal interaction between policy makers and line workers can only be beneficial if it is conducted in a limited amount with prepared presentations that indicate a modicum of care in preparation.

The golden rule when stated as "he who has the gold, rules" indicates a degree of power as held by federation and the subservient stance Hillel is forced to take. It is regrettable that there is not more "gold" available to those in Hillel who are professionals. It is difficult to determine at this time if the amount of money allocated for programs is sufficient since there really is no objective means for judging this. This importance of determining this has been outlined in previous sections. But the issue of salary for Hillel professionals has not been considered. One professional, who left Hillel for personal reasons, expresses his feelings about the level of pay to Hillel professionals:

"I'm not convinced that paying \$3,000 to an Elie Wiesel is the answer to the Jewish problem on the campus. I don't know what we would be doing differently with a whole lot more money. It would make things a little easier. People would be paid what they should be paid. It pisses me off when I look at what I was being paid in Hillel and what people in federation are being paid. It's terrible the kinds of differences in salary that exist."

Most Hillel professionals consciously give up money to work in Hillel. As has already been pointed out, they tend to be a dedicated group of people. They are fiercely

devoted to the cause of bringing Jewish identity to the college campus, but there is no guarantee they will stay with their Hillel positions unless there is a greater monetary incentive. The work is demanding, but rewarding in a personal sense, but there is only a short period of time where this can or should be endured by a high quality staff. One board member indicates in his remarks that these suggestions for change are a possibility with this federation:

"The relationship is basically healthy and a good relationship, but it can't just be accepted without exploring ways to strengthen that relationship. Changing it as times change. And, after all, we are people. Everything is just people. It's not an organization; it's not to raise funds. And there are new people in the leadership role and that changes every year. We just keep working at it."

It has been said that Hillel has to spend a great deal of time defending its reputation. It seems, for the most part, that this is basically unnecessary. Federation and board people, who are the ones who would indicate this need to defensive do not seem to perceive a need: A board member and a federation professional respond to this dilemma:

"And I also think that Hillel shouldn't always be on the defensive. To understand that there are those in the community who are out to get those whose political positions are different than their own, and they are crazy. Richard's probably spent a lot of time defending his record and its unfortunate that that keeps happening. But I'm wondering, has their allocation been reduced? Have they lost any money? Has anybody lost a job? Those are important questions. Have these crazies really had an effect on Hillel and

on the allocation process."

"When an agency doesn't serve whom they say they are serving, the kinds of programs they say are necessary will cause them to lose their funding, or if those services are deemed by the Jewish community as no longer necessary. One would be incompetence, that we're not getting our dollar's worth or the service gets such a low priority given the current circumstances, that it's not seen as a needed Jewish agency. I don't expect that the Jewish community at this time will say that Jewish college students are no longer needed. I also don't think that Hillel at this point has that lack of credibility. Some question whether the specific problems evident are campus-to-campus problems or a more global, institutional issue."

Perhaps this reflects the non-turbulent times as far as politics on campus goes, because this was not the case in the 60's and 70's. These responses show a degree of support and commitment to the college student, inspite of the poor show of accountability. There are good things going on that are recognized by the community, but what really needs improvement is the method of reporting and the development of a language common to both the funding providers and the funding recipients. The object would be to ease defensiveness and tensions to allow for an objective evaluation of what Hillel is doing. An attempt was made at that with this years budget forms, but the attempt was gravely misunderstood by the people, Hillel directors, who had to fill them out. This is not because they do not want Hillel to have a connection to federation, but they were unqualified to fill the forms out. As a result, they felt incompetent, and, thus, threatened.. This

is another area of concern, worthy of consideration.

Time was spent in previous chapters on the role of the professional. How that has changed is the result of a great deal of discomfort for the rabbis who are the agency directors. In a conversation with national Hillel, Bill Rudolph describes Hillel programs as follows. "We've been doing Hillel programs by the seat of our pants for years." This cannot continue. It means that rabbis who are agency directors will need to learn skills that will enable them to be more efficient. As it stands, the only apparent reason for Hillel directors to be rabbis is because the first Hillel director, Rabbi Frankel, was a rabbi. At that time there was not the need for rabbis to have such skills as fundraising, budgeting, supervision, or even grant writing. The need for these skills is exemplified by a statement made by a federation professional in connection with the welfare fund campaign:

"The reality of the situation is that the welfare campaign is not keeping up with inflationary needs... Consequently agencies are being asked to pick up more shares of their funding. It was therefore incumbent upon Hillel to pick up more of the expense to put a cap on the amount of money they were getting. If they wanted to do more than we were able to provide for, they had to raise that money through other sources.

Thus, rabbis as directors will have to take a significant part in this fundraising effort in order to insure that in their agency they will not have to say "no."

Along with needing to raise more money, there is also

a need for agency directors to more effectively manage the money they are already receiving. This involves improving administrative skills as well as supervisory skills. There are other staff members who have to be held accountable for the financial aspect and if the director is lax in these areas, the whole agency suffers.

"The rabbinic model is a tough nut to crack" because once something is established, a major task becomes legitimizing its existence. This is the case with having rabbis as Hillel directors. There is a lot to be said for maintaining this unique institution. Rabbis have special qualities to offer the campus setting. As mentioned before the term rabbi conjures up distinct images about what that person will be like. This includes a sense of spirituality and love of religion that is rare and severely longed for in this technologically-oriented society. There is also a sense of validity accompanying the position that is effective in dealing with faculty and students alike. The rabbi, with ordination, is vested with an aura that inspires trust in those who seek him/her out. This component is an effective means of reaching out to students who may not otherwise see a need for Jewish involvement. It can also serve as a deterrent for those who are too threatened if they perceive someone to be too Jewish. This is where a Jewish communal service worker can play a valuable part.

If a rabbi can be trained in communal service skills, then a communal service worker can be trained in rabbinic skills. There is no reason why it would not be an appropriate expectation to have a communal service worker have an intensive training in texts, both biblical and rabbinic, history, practice, even to be able to officiate at certain life cycle events. This would greatly enhance the agency as it would allow greater mobility for the non-rabbinic staff.

A non-rabbinic staff member voices his frustrations:

"The program director position is a very limited position in terms of tenure, in the amount of time you can stay there. It's a burn-out job in that it's a lot of work and while it's a lot of fun, it gets to the point where the payoffs aren't worth the payouts, meaning that you are underpaid. I was underpaid and I got to the point of resenting that. And while the Jewish professional field is underpaid in most areas, Hillel is awful. The other one is that there is a feeling that there is nowhere to go and that unless you are a rabbi, you will not be a Hillel director. I think that is a major reason for program director's leaving though that was only a corollary for me."

He is very open and clear about his feelings towards Hillel as a professional and the kinds of opportunities it provides. He also supports some of my previous assertions of the need to further professionalize the agency.

"There are only two levels with few other opportunities. Money is an issue, and the work gets boring. It needs diversity. A certain amount of creativity must be allowed; people change, the programs change, but it basically remains the same. There is a certain narrowness to the range of the things you can do, compared to what else is out there in the world."

A person with these skills would be an appropriate choice to direct a Hillel on any campus, especially if there was a rabbi in close proximity to conduct other life cycle events, etc. This would also increase the opportunity for intense exposure to Hillel for someone who will be more comfortable in the position of an evaluator, to be able to explain the function of Hillel to a lay board and to the federation, to know how to run an effective public relations campaign and even to improve the quality of student interaction. With the added knowledge of Judaica, such a person would be highly qualified for the position. This would qualify them for a better salary thus increasing the calibre of staff devoted to the college campus.

The ideal situation would be to have a rabbi with communal skills and a communal service worker with rabbinic skills. Both would have specified responsibilities, but they would be able to support each other in a more complete way. There would be more of a collegial relationship that would allow for a great deal of interchange about the job. This kind of communication is essential to a smooth running agency. There is no need for the rabbi to be the director and thus in charge of administration, for which they may be unqualified. It would be a co-director position with equal salaries and confluent responsibilities.

These are just a few of the suggestions that have resulted from interviews and my own observations. They .

are suggestions for a future that all agree will be there and will be bright. Some of the interviewees share their perceptions of their view of Hillel's future.

"I think we can maintain our sense of what is important for Jews to be and try to help students and faculty be those kinds of Jews and try to push the Jewish community in those directions, a lot of good things will happen."

"I'm not a prophet...Hillel is performing a very important function. It does have the support and the confidence of this Jewish community of the need to provide services to college youth is there. So, for the present, I see Hillel's future bright. In terms of the personnel, a lot of it depends on the kind of personnel practices I talked of earlier. The kind of recruitment B'nai Brith does. Competition in other fields. When I speak to rabbinic students, I still see great interest in serving on a college campus."

"I don't see any significant changes happening. I just see it going along in the same way that it is. In terms of personnel, I still see it as rabbinically dominated and quite frankly, I think to a certain extent, that's good. There needs to be more room made for non-rabbinic personnel, but I think that one of the qualities of Hillel as an agency that makes it special is that much of the staff are rabbis. And that's a positive thing, I think. There just needs to be more room for the non-rabbinic staff to move to the higher levels as well. Money is going to get tighter in terms of availability of funds and I know the welfare fund this year is not doing very well at all in terms of where it is and where it was last year at this time, in terms of the dollars raised. So, money's going to be tight. So, I think there's going to be future problems with budgeting unless the political cards are played more effectively. But, I really don't see great changes. I think most people, most of the decision makers recognize a need for Hillel."

"I'm very optimistic. Hillel will continue to get stronger. Rabbis will make it work; they are very charismatic and this is the key. This is the strength. There will be a health feeling between students, programs and rabbis. This will lead to strength. Society is looking for roots; this is reflected in

students desires to go to Hillel. A culture search looking for people of their own kind helps us identify who we are. Israel plays a part in this strengthening as well."

"I think it's a very bright future for Hillel. Hillel will remain and grow and be even stronger."

These concluding remarks exemplify the attitude of anyone intimately involved with Hillel. They are able to see the problems and understand them, but there is still an unquestioned devotion to the institution. There can be no doubt that Hillel should exist; the question is, in what condition. The preceding suggestions are not idly. They are meant to be guides for a more professional organization that, though it has done much, has an incredible amount of untapped potential. It is a matter that needs serious consideration on the part of all who have a connection to Hillel because, as this thesis shows, they are the ones who are committed enough and close enough to Hillel to understand what needs to be done and will be able to implement new ideas.

This undertaking is only a small part of what is going on and should continue in Hillel. But each attempt is only a small part of what is necessary. My attempt is not my last. It is, like anything Jewish, a task that could span a lifetime.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

- American Conference of Hillel Directors, 1959, Jewish Identity and the Jewish College Student. Washington, D.C., 1959.
- B'nai Brith Hillel Foundation. Bamakom. Volume 1, Number 3. Los Angeles, California. Spring 1974.
- B'nai Brith Hillel Foundation. Bamakom. Volume 1, Number 5. Los Angeles, California. Fall 1976.
- Caplovitz, David and Sherrow, Fred. The Religious Drop-Outs-- Apostasy Among College Graduates. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications, 1977.
- Elliot, Roma, "How the B'nai Brith Hillel Foundations Began." (mimeograph).
- Filstead, William J. "Using Qualitative Methods in Evaluation Research: An Illustrative Bibliography." Evaluation Review. Volume 5. Number 2. April 1981. pp. 259-268.
- Friedlander, Albert, H., ed. Never Trust a God Over 30: New Styles in Campus Ministry. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1967.
- Harrison, Roger. "Understanding Your Organization's Character." The 1975 Annual Handbook for Group Facilitators. University Associations Publishers, Inc. 1975, pp. 199-209.
- International Conference of Hillel Directors, 1967. New Frontiers for Jewish Life on the Campus. Washington D.C.: B'nai Brith Hillel Foundation, Inc., 1968.
- Jospe, Alfred. Judaism on the Campus: Essays on Jewish Education in the University Community. Washington, D.C.: B'nai Brith Hillel Foundation, Inc., 1963.
- Jospe, Alfred, ed. The Legacy of Maurice Pekarsky. Chicago: Quandrangle Books, 1965.

- Jospe, Alfred. A Handbook for Student Leaders.
Washington, D.C.: B'nai Brith Hillel Foundation,
Inc., 1967.
- Marion, David J. "Dimensions of the Organizational
Universe: A Model for Assessment and Direction."
The 1975 Annual Handbook for Group Facilitators.
University Associates Publishers, Inc., 1975,
pp. 211-217.
- Modell, Sol, "Hillel Seems to be Unwilling to Fight
for Israel."
- Phillips, Bruce A. and Dimsdale, Bernard. "The Service
Delivery Information System: A Tool for
Accountability." Journal of Jewish Communal Service.
Spring 1981. Volume 57, Number 3, pp. 235-239.
- Planning and Budgeting Department of the Jewish Federation-
Council, Ad Hoc Committee to Study Hillel, April 30,
1980. (mimeograph)
- Porter, Jack Nusan. "Jewish Student Activism." Jewish
Currents. May 1970.
- Rossi, Peter H.; Freeman, Howard E.; and Wright, Sonia R.
Evaluation: A Systematic Approach. Beverly Hills:
Sage Publications, 1979.
- Schwartz, Howard. Jewish College Youth Speak Their Mind.
Publications Service of the American Jewish Committee,
1969.
- Stevens, William F. and Tornatzsky, Louis G. "The
Dissemination of Evaluation: An Experiment."
Evaluation Review. Volume 4, Number 3, June
1980, pp. 339-354.
- Tiffany, Randy and Yudkin, Marjorie. "Radical Jews A
Decade Later." Sh'ma. February 6, 1981, pp. 49-56.
- Weiss, Carol. Evaluation Research: Assessing Program
Effectiveness.