



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

in co-operation with

UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA
School of Social Work

THE CHAI REPORT:
18 YEARS OF HUC-JIR SCHOOL OF
JEWISH COMMUNAL SERVICE ALUMNI SPEAK

Thesis approved by

Samuel B. Feiler
Stanley Unger

THE CHAI REPORT:
18 YEARS OF HUC-JIR SCHOOL OF
JEWISH COMMUNAL SERVICE ALUMNI SPEAK

by

Deborah Burg-Schnirman, Ruth Dubin, Theodore Flaum,
Holly Hollander, Esther Li-Dar, Jeanette Macht,
Karen Michel, Lisa Ney

A Thesis Presented to the FACULTY OF THE SCHOOL
OF SOCIAL WORK OF THE UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN
CALIFORNIA in co-operation with HEBREW UNION
COLLEGE-JEWISH INSTITUTE OF RELIGION, CALIFORNIA
SCHOOL in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of
MASTER OF SOCIAL WORK

May, 1988

HEBREW UNION COLLEGE - JEWISH INSTITUTE OF RELIGION
California School

UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA
School of Social Work

THE CHAI REPORT:
18 YEARS OF HUC-JIR SCHOOL OF
JEWISH COMMUNAL SERVICE ALUMNI SPEAK

A Thesis submitted in partial
fulfillment of the requirements
for the double degrees

MASTER OF ARTS
IN
JEWISH COMMUNAL SERVICE
and
MASTER OF SOCIAL WORK

by

Deborah Burg-Schnirman, Ruth Dubin, Theodore Flaum,
Holly Hollander, Esther Li-Dar, Jeanette Macht,
Karen Michel, Lisa Ney

May, 1988

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS AND DEDICATION	iv
ABSTRACT	v
INTRODUCTION	vii
CHAPTERS	
I. LITERATURE REVIEW	1
II. METHODOLOGY	55
III. PROFILE OF RESPONDENTS	61
IV. FINDINGS	73
V. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	143
BIBLIOGRAPHY	165
APPENDICES	169

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS AND DEDICATION

We would like to thank the following people without whose help and support, this endeavor would never have been accomplished:

- Those individuals who participated in our study by sharing much of themselves, both personally and professionally;
- The thesis group of 1983 whose work offered both inspiration and a starting point;
- The Alfred Gottshalk Fund for its generous financial support;
- The USC School of Social Work for providing us with computer time;
- John Brekke for his patience, encouragement and advice;
- Harold Urman for statistical analysis;
- Ruby Bubis for warm bowls of soup;
- And, last but certainly not least, those individuals in our lives who mean the most to us, spouses, roommates, and "significant others," without whose patience, love, support and encouragement this project could never have been completed.

Finally, this thesis is dedicated to Jerry Bubis and the Field of Jewish Communal Service, Past, Present and Future.

ABSTRACT

The Hebrew Union College-Jewish Institute of Religion (HUC-JIR) created the School of Jewish Communal Service to bring the Jewish component to the practice of community organization and service. The school has evolved from one first attracting professionals in the field of communal service to one primarily devoted to the education of entry level Jewish professionals.

In the "Chai" (eighteenth) graduation year of the school, the need emerged both to follow up on a previous study of the curriculum and, more importantly, to re-evaluate the direction of the school vis-a-vis the field of Jewish Communal Service. The school, in order best to educate, and to provide skills and knowledge for future professionals, needs to respond to emerging trends in both the general society and the Jewish Communal field.

To accomplish this, the School of Jewish Communal Service (SJCS) requested that a study be done to ascertain the needs of the professionals in the field. A questionnaire was designed to survey the alumni and ask three broad questions. These are: Who are the graduates of HUC? What is the impact of the HUC program? What influence did attending HUC have on you as a professional?

The research team identified several trends in the field. The questionnaire responses were evaluated independently and then compared to the trends in order to analyze needs and formulate recommendations for the school. The research shows that the school is educating professionals for a constantly changing field. It is recommended that the school keep abreast of trends concerning the effects of women, technology and job satisfaction on professionals among others. The school also should be aware of the changing demands of the students. Primarily, alumni perceive a need for skills in certain areas; a continuation of the emphasis on the Jewish component; a concern with financial issues; and advocacy on the behalf of professionals.

Overall, the survey evidenced that the Hebrew Union College-Jewish Institute of Religion School of Jewish Communal Service provides an education critical to professionals in the field. The school has an immense and everlasting positive impact on its alumni.

INTRODUCTION

The Hebrew Union College - Jewish Institute of Religion emerged in the sixties as a response to the developing need of the American Jewish community to explore and come to new terms with its ethnical heritage and values. One of the factors which contributed to this growing awareness was the Six-Day War in Israel and its impact on the American Jewish community.

Since then, the school has come a long way in adapting, developing and changing to new needs, trends and phenomena which took place within the Jewish community as well as within the general changing society.

This study addresses the need to explore the alumni's perception of the program, how the program met their needs in the field as practitioners and the level to which the program responded to their motivations and expectations.

The study explores current trends in the general society as well as in the Jewish community and examines how the program has responded to new skills and knowledge required. Additionally, the study investigates: 1) the extent to which the Jewish component is still perceived as the main reason to participate in the program; 2) what role does Jewish knowledge have in the field; 3) how does

it affect the alumni in terms of her/his Jewish professional identity.

Chapter two reviews the literature in the field. It describes the history of the school, addresses major skills that are required in the field and examines current trends affecting the profession as well as the program.

Chapter three discusses the methodological basis of the study. The emphasis is on the construction of the questionnaire and the study's limitations.

Chapter four provides a profile of the respondents. It compares and describes the attributes of all alumni of the School of JCS and the population of this study.

Chapter five presents the data analysis in five sections: Motivations for attending HUC; Academic Debt; Subject Areas; and Alumni in the Workplace.

The conclusions of the study are stated in Chapter six while the recommendations and implications of the findings are discussed in Chapter seven.

Finally, an appendix is included. This consists of the questionnaire and cover letter, letters sent to organizations and training institutions to gather information and respondents' comments.

CHAPTER ONE

LITERATURE REVIEW

PART I: HISTORY OF HEBREW UNION COLLEGE - JEWISH INSTITUTE OF RELIGION'S SCHOOL OF JEWISH COMMUNAL SERVICE

Hebrew Union College - Jewish Institute of Religions (HUC) School of Jewish Communal Service (SJCS), located in California, has a rich if brief history. Founded in 1968 in response to the unique and ever changing needs of the American Jewish community, it has evolved in a short time from a program offering a single certificate to the professional already in the field, into a complex multifaceted school with seven double degree options to a wide range of students from throughout the country and abroad.

The SJCS emerged out of a social milieu characterized by an increased awareness of Jewish identity and ethnicity.

A new set of priorities for the American Jewish community began to emerge in the late 1960's. The combination of the events associated with the Israeli Six Day War and a resurgent interest in ethnicity in America led to a heightened American Jewish consciousness. Jewish leaders increasingly began to call for enriching the uniquely Jewish dimensions of the Jewish social agencies and to upgrade the Jewish commitment and background of the professional staff.¹

¹Bernard Reisman, "The Jewish Component in the Training Programs of Jewish Communal Workers", Journal of Jewish Communal Service (JJCS), LVIII, 1979, p. 95.

In response to this phenomenon, HUC's president, then dean, of the California branch of HUC, saw a new priority for the Jewish community - that of training and preparing Jewish professionals with appropriate Jewish education, including technical, psychological and sociological knowledge and skills.

In 1964 a feasibility study was conducted by Bertram Gold (then director of the Los Angeles Jewish Centers Association) at HUC in order to ascertain the needs for a SJCS. Gold wrote:

While professional training for the field of Jewish communal service has undergone a number of different phases and emphases, by and large it has looked to graduate schools of social work as the base of its professional education. At the same time, there has always been an accompanying question asked: 'What about the Jewish communal worker's need to possess a knowledge of the history, culture and religious traditions, beliefs and values of Judaism?'²

There was and still exists a tension between this Jewish component and broad social work components in education. Reconciliation of this dilemma continues to take place to this day.

Prior to the late 1960's, a number of writers have examined the nature of the need among communal workers for 'positive Jewish identification'. Others have tried to isolate the content of Jewish learning which the communal workers should apply in practice. A third group has wrestled with the nature of methods appropriate to workers in Jewish communal

²Bertram H. Gold, Feasibility Study for a Department of Jewish Communal Service for the Los Angeles of HUC, 1967, p. 1.

agencies. They have analyzed the various components - content, method and values - to determine whether the traditional discipline of social work is in fact, adequate to the conduct of professional practice in a sectarian setting.³

At the school's inception, extensive consultation and research was conducted by the appointed director of the school - Gerald Bubis - in order to shape the best possible program. The following early memo typifies the careful process undertaken.

"MEMO - Meeting held July 1968

Meeting with Arnulf Pins, Council of Social Work Education.

PURPOSE of the consultation was to begin some focusing in more specific terms on the objectives, contents and methods of the school.

A number of objections were set forth on a tentative basis.

- 1) Knowledge of the historical development of Jewish communal services;
- 2) An understanding of the current dynamics of Jewish American life;
- 3) An appreciation of Jewish values and knowledge of how to relate them to practice today; (it was felt that the Talmud could be used in its historical context with a case method approach relating it to contemporary American Jewish problems);
- 4) Knowledge and understanding of the survival of the Jew through history by an examination of the external and internal forces;
- 5) A knowledge of American Jewish history;

³Gerald Bubis, "The Birth of a School," Central Conference of American Rabbis Journal, 1971, p. 2.

- 6) A knowledge of the American Jew, his growth and development and the sociological institutions which he created;
- 7) A working knowledge of Hebrew; (tentative)
- 8) An understanding of world Jewry and the interdependence thereof;
- 9) An understanding of issues in American Jewish life including theological, social action, Zionist and ritual matters;
- 10) A knowledge of the dynamics of the Jewish - non-Jewish encounter; This latter would examine the sectarian components of self-hate, the Negro-Jew, the New Left, etc.
- 11) Knowledge of the life cycles of the Jew which could be passed by comprehensive exam and if not passed credit given through individual reading program; and
- 12) Utilization of Jewish programming for Jewish objectives integrating program principles into practice for direct practice or supervision.

It was felt that we might explore the possibility of an optional six-credit program for courses such as Hebrew, community relations, specialist material, and the like.

The possibility of a summer for the undergraduate between his junior and senior year with a major in Jewish studies tied in with an existing Bachelor degree will be explored too."⁴

Finally, the following passage reflects the recommended program goals and statement for acceptance by the National Technical Advisory Committee:

The School of Jewish Communal Service at HUC-JIR was created to help meet the personnel needs of

⁴Source: Statements from National Professional Advisory Committee Meeting for HUC SJCS: Meeting with Arnulf Pins, Council of Social Work Education, held on July, 1968 at HUC, Los Angeles.

the American Jewish community agencies. It is dedicated to the enrichment of American life.

The School seeks to awaken its students to their Jewish heritage and values and prepare them for service in the Jewish community.

The School will concentrate on values, knowledge, and skills most likely to develop a commitment to careers in Jewish community service.

Eclectic in its approach and contemporary in its outlook, the School hopes to contribute to its students' independence of thought and inquiry, to their creativity and open-mindedness, and to their desire to serve the American Jewish community and their fellow man.

The School of Jewish Communal Service hopes to develop and transmit:

Knowledge and understanding of the American Jew, his growth and development, his social institution, and their historical antecedents.

Awareness of and familiarity with contemporary Jewish communal services in the United States and Canada, and their developmental history.

Understanding of issues, conflicts, and ideologies within Jewish life here and abroad.

Knowledge and appreciation of Jewish values, culture, practices, and beliefs.

Proficiency in synthesizing the application of these objectives with the values, knowledge, and skills acquired in schools of social work or related fields, and in bringing them to bear in practice.

A positive attitude towards the goals of Jewish communal life.⁵

⁵Statements from National Professional Advisory Committee Meeting for HUC SJCS: memorandum of meetings held from July 31, 1968 to October 15, 1968 at HUC, Los Angeles.

The original program of study in the SJCS offered a certificate upon completion of twenty credits over two summers.

A balance was sought in the curriculum between the pragmatic and the idealistic; the cognitive and the emotional; the best that Jewish life might be and the way it is. An attempt was made to begin with the contemporary and move backward through time in trying to understand: a) the Jewish individual and the family; b) the intellectual and ideological issues confronting her/him as a Jew and as an American; and c) the community instruments which the Jew has created to encapsulate her/his values, meet her/his needs, and discharge her/his communal obligation.⁶

After the first summer, Bubis stated:

The School of Jewish Communal Service at Hebrew Union College - Jewish Institute of Religion has come upon the American scene at a propitious moment. We hope to defy convention, mix disciplines and settings, ages and backgrounds. We hope to remain responsive to ever dynamic needs of the American Jewish community.⁷

By 1984, sixteen years after the school's inception, the school continued to offer a Certificate program in Jewish communal service (JCS), and had expanded to include a master's degree in JCS; two joint masters' degrees: JCS/Judaic Studies and JCS/Jewish Education through HUC in Los Angeles; and three double masters' degrees in conjunction with the University of Southern California (USC) in social work, gerontology and public administration. In addition, there were two double

⁶Gerald Bubis, Op. cit., p. 5.

⁷Ibid, p. 7.

masters' degree programs available through Washington University at George Brown in St. Louis and the University of Pittsburgh.

This particular group of options was the deliberate outgrowth of a specific set of premises:

1) Jewish community organizations in America are increasingly complex bureaucratic systems. 2) their need for professionals, while growing, no longer draws upon one profession, social work, as was the case in past generations. 3) No one professional school can combine the varied professional requirements in one program. 4) Regardless of the particular professional preparation required - social work, education, administration or gerontology - an integrative body of knowledge, skills, methods and values can be offered to bind together those working in the field of Jewish communal service.⁸

By 1988 the program had changed in a variety of ways. In addition to the traditional coursework, students of the communal service school are now involved in extensive non-academic arenas as well. There are weekend retreats, seminars, workshops and numerous 'community-building' activities. There is also a biennial three-week seminar in Israel, which began in 1972 and is sponsored in conjunction with the Institute for Leadership Development of the Jewish Agency and the Institute of Contemporary Jewry at Hebrew University. It focuses on Israel/Diaspora relations, human service and geopolitical issues in Israel and allows

⁸HUC, Los Angeles, Self-Study, Prepared for Representatives of the Western Association of Schools and Colleges, HUC, Los Angeles, June, 1984, p. 93.

students to become intellectually and emotionally immersed in daily social and political life in Israel.

Students of the SJCS come from increasingly diverse backgrounds. Classes may contain Israelis, South Africans, Swedes, Canadians and Latin Americans. Students have ranged in age from 21-58. Over the years the ratio of men to women has changed from higher percentages of men to much higher percentages of women. (Table 1-1.)

TABLE 1-1: PROGRAM ENROLLMENT BY GENDER AND YEAR

Gender	Years of Attendance			Total
	68-75	76-81	82-87	
Male	25	19	27	71
Female	9	46	46	101
Total	35	65	73	173

Missing Observations = 7

HUC SJCS offers a highly dynamic educational experience.

Over the years, many who are affiliated and/or familiar with the school feel that there are great areas of thought which while somewhat intangible in nature, represent a total learning experience. Much of what the school wishes to impart cannot be taught through texts or lectures but must be lived in order to be fully appreciated.⁹

⁹Leslie Goldfarb, Marie-Jeanne Lambert and Deborah Schlossberg, Evaluation of Hebrew Union College - Jewish Institute of Religion School of Jewish Communal Service Curriculum, (Master's Thesis, May 1983), p. 42.

The HUC JCS community feeling is something many students feel yet struggle to articulate. Perhaps it is best embodied in the words of a former student who wrote: "Much of what the school is, is difficult to write on paper. It is an embodiment of interactions, questions, friendships and growth".¹⁰

¹⁰Rosa Kaplan, "Summary of Responses to Alumni", Survey Conducted Jan - March, 1978, p. 1.

PART II: COMPONENTS OF A TRAINING PROGRAM

Introduction

JCS is a mixture of fields of service which demand diverse skills coming from social work, public administration, education, research and the religious arena. The search, discussion and debates related to the ideal training for competent and skilled Jewish communal workers (JCW), as well as to what Jewish content is, goes back to the early 1900's. The ongoing dialogue involved and involves questions as to the extent Jewish components and values have to be introduced into communal work practice, and introduced to clients. Should such intervention be perceived as an infringement of self-determination? What role do social work values and skills play in this profession? And how should they be integrated into the communal practice?^{11,12,13,14,15,16}

¹¹Gerald Bubis, "Professional Education for the Jewish Component in Casework Practice," JJCS, 50, 1976, p. 270-277.

¹²Gerald Bubis, "The Jewish Component in Jewish Communal Service - from Theory to Practice," JJCS, 56, 1980, p. 227-236.

¹³Gerald Bubis, "Professional Trends in Jewish Communal Service in America," JJCS, 62, 1985, p. 304-311.

¹⁴Eric Levine, "Jewish Professional - Professional Jew: Commitments and Competencies for a Jewish Mission," JJCS, 62, 1985, p. 40-48.

Because the American Jewish communal agenda is increasingly complex, the demands on the Jewish agencies are increasing. Thus, there is a growing awareness of the need for workers to become knowledgeable in a wide range of skills.

More and more workers need to be multi-disciplinary, able to mix and match techniques and strategies in order to respond adequately and appropriately to the demands of their job and the needs of the community.¹⁷

The ensuing discussion focuses on two main issues: 1) the different skills needed in the field of JCS (i.e. social work skills, communal work skills and generic skills; 2) the ongoing debate as to the integration, relationships and priorities of these skills in the field.

Social Work Component

"Social work has been the dominant profession in Jewish communal services for the past four decades"¹⁸ Although the optimal educational preparation a JCW can

¹⁵Bernard Reisman, "The Jewish Component in the Training Programs of Jewish Communal Workers," JJCS, LVIII, 1979, p. 95-102.

¹⁶Bernard Reisman, "Social Work Education and Jewish Communal Service and Jewish Community Centers: Time for a Change," JJCS, 13, 1982, p. 41-49.

¹⁷Eric Levine, Op. cit., p. 40.

¹⁸Gerald Bubis, "Introduction to Professional Education," in Turbulent Decades, ed. Graenum Berger, New York: Conference of Jewish Communal Service, 1980, p. 1201.

receive today combines social work with general skills as well as Jewish studies, social work will remain a key component. There are currently seven programs with the aim of professional preparation of JCWs and all of these programs use a social work education model as a foundation.¹⁹ Additionally, Bubis states:

The guild and gatekeeper roles of any group in power suggest that social workers will continue to demand the Master's degree as the best preparatory education for communal service under Jewish auspices.²⁰

The educational foundation provided by schools of social work have been found to provide many of the essential skills and competencies needed by JCWs. These skills and competencies include: self-determination, self-discipline, conceptual skills, diagnostic skills, communication, interventive skills and community organization.

Dubin discusses the principle of "self-determination." He states:

there is no principle in social work theory that is more meaningful and practical than the principle of self-determination. . . . It is the one enduring concept that governs our purposes philosophically and our practice methodologically. It is the underlying credo that goes to the heart of the very existence of social work.

¹⁹Gerald Bubis, Op. cit., p. 304-311.

²⁰Gerald Bubis, Op. cit., p. 1200.

It is a principle peculiarly fitting communal service as well as social work.²¹

This principle can be seen in every facet of JCS and can be considered one of the most essential skills of the Jewish communal professional. It is necessary to adhere to this principle if agencies are to achieve its goals of providing sustained well-being for the individual, enhancement of groups and leadership in the community.²²

Another concept discussed by Dubin is "self-discipline". Self-discipline relates to maturity and developing a "professional self". He discusses the importance of reconciling personal needs with the development of the professional self. Quite often ego needs interfere with the professional's capacity to focus on the needs of others. Introspection and the development of this "professional self" are integral aspects of social work education.²³

Conceptual skills and diagnostic skills are also a focus of social work education. Dubin states:

Much of the work of professional staff is and should be an orderly implementation of ideas, observations, and diagnostic insights. In short, the capacity for meaningful professional activity hinges on the worker's ability to formulate notions based on a conceptual understanding of behavior, of community and the goals of the

²¹David Dubin, "Essential Competencies for the Jewish Communal Professional," JJCS, 60, 1983, p. 12.

²²Ibid, p. 12-18.

²³Ibid, p. 12-18.

agency. The key is the worker's ability to relate his professional activity to a targeted need, identified through observation and definition.²⁴

In addition, some call for a stronger emphasis on the psychosocial orientation in preparation for the field. This is necessary in order to "prepare the professional to translate her/his professional being into substantive work based on analytic thought processes."²⁵

Communication skills are also an important social work component that are needed in the field of JCS. "For the Jewish communal professional, the key to marketing the service of her/his agency is communication skills."²⁶ The professional must be able to articulate and convey ideas and thoughts as well as to listen and hear. The use of these skills in the JCW's roles as a leader in the community, an advocate for the rights and needs of others, a role model, an educator and a salesperson are essential to the professional's effectiveness and success in the field.²⁷

Intervention, an additional skill focused on in social work school, is:

born out of the skills of diagnosis, conceptualization and communication. It is a

²⁴Ibid, p. 14.

²⁵Ibid, p. 16.

²⁶Ibid, p. 15.

²⁷Ibid, p. 12-18.

conscious and intentional act on the part of the worker to effect change based on goals established through observation and thought.²⁸

It is necessary for professionals to be able to intervene on many different levels in order to effect change.

The community organization model that developed in the social work profession is seen as the optimal educational base for entry-level professionals in the Federations.

This model stresses the general skills of the enabler who is able to motivate lay leadership, build structures and leadership for problem solving and development, geared toward the goals of increasing the resources of as well as participation in Jewish communal endeavors.²⁹

Thus, it appears that the social work framework, which includes many essential skills and competencies, is a key component in educating JCWs. However, there are those in the field who believe that we need to move away from a social work model - that with changing needs, the traditional social work schools are no longer meeting the diverse needs of the Jewish agencies and organizations or the community. Reisman is one such person. He believes that there is often a role conflict for students who enter a social work program with the intention of preparing for a career in JCS. The missions of social work schools and the needs of the Jewish community are not synchronized and may

²⁸Ibid, p. 16.

²⁹Andrew B. Hahn and Arnold Gurin, "Jewish Federation Professionals: Status and Outlook," JJCS, LVI, 1979, p. 134.

lead to professional conflict when the student enters the field.³⁰

General Skills

Generic skills blended with traditional ones to remain relevant while serving general and Jewish community needs are discussed in the literature.

Kahn states his idea about this issue:

I have been very encouraged by the evolving schools of Jewish communal service. The graduates have enriched the field. They bring a special Jewish knowledge and commitment, as well as a variety of professional skills and experiences. Yet, even here, the skills we need for the next era have not been sufficiently stressed. Management systems, training for our students in Jewish communal schools is just one example.³¹

A majority of executives want their workers to become more competent in the area of generic skills in addition to their Jewish skills.³² The most important skills as listed by 70% of all employers were: fundraising, being able to work and mobilize lay people, computer skills, community relationship, program development and public competencies.³³ Therefore, it is understood that:

³⁰Bernard Reisman, "Social Work Education and Jewish Communal Service and Jewish Community Centers: Time for a Change," JJCS, 48, 1972, p. 384-395.

³¹William Kahn, "Jewish Communal Service and the Professional Today and Tomorrow," 62, 1985, p. 241.

³²Gerald B. Bubis, Bruce A. Phillips, Steven A. Reitman and Gary S. Rotto, "The Consumer Report: Hiring of Entry-Level Jewish Communal Workers," 62, 1985, p. 103-107.

³³Ibid, p. 103-107.

better preparation is needed to engage in the day-to-day tasks of work in the field. . . more 'how to' rather than 'why'. The schools of JCS are doing fine on values and attitudes. They need to do better on skill development.³⁴

The emphasis on the generic skills is largely elaborated by Kahn. He includes in management training, the aspects of personnel management, performance measurement, knowledge in management systems, information systems, organizational design, measurement and evaluation. Kahn also addresses the need to develop computer competencies in graphic techniques, word processing and records management, which all respond to the expansion of organizational systems.³⁵

Other authors discuss the need of social work schools to include generic courses in their programs. Blotstein states that such content must be integrated with other materials pertaining to administrative functions of social work practice.³⁶

Poole and Theilen state that in an era of federal budget deficits and declining resources, schools of social work have to respond by training future professionals to become proficient in certain community planning skills

³⁴Ibid, p. 105.

³⁵William Kahn, Op. cit., p. 239-242.

³⁶Stanley Blotstein, "A Day Late and a Dollar Short: A National Survey of the Teaching of Financial Management in Schools of Social Work," Journal of Social Work Education, 21, 1985, p. 34-42.

including: creative resource budgeting and packaging, constituency building, policy development, financial management, coordination and program design and evaluation.³⁷

Streeter, Sherraden, Gillespie and Zakour also emphasize the importance of training social workers in administrative functions. Interorganizational and collaborative work is essential in the Reagan era in order to maintain an adequate level of services.³⁸ Pins and Ginsberg had already observed seventeen years ago the new trend emerging in social work schools which pointed towards providing more knowledge and competency in policy, planning, community organization, administration and supervision. Students were encouraged to become more capable of identifying dysfunctional service delivery and bringing about system change.³⁹ Hahn and Gurin discuss the fact that Federations today handle large sums of money

³⁷Dennis L. Poole and Gary Theilen, "Community Planning and Organization in an Era of Retrenchment: Structural and Educational Approaches to Serving Human Needs," Journal of Social Work Education, 21, 1985, p. 16-27.

³⁸Calvin L. Streeter, Michael W. Sherraden, David F. Gillespie and Michael J. Zakour, "Curriculum Development in Interorganizational Coordination," Journal of Social Work Education, 22, 1986, p. 32-39.

³⁹Arnulf M. Pins and Leon H. Ginsberg, "New Developments in Social Work Education and Their Impact on Jewish Communal Service and Community Center Work," JJCS, XVIII, 1971, p. 60-71.

which make management skills necessary as well as grantmanship and government funding skills.⁴⁰

Bubis and Kahn also discuss the importance of marketing, purchasing, business management and grant writing skills.^{41,42}

Several authors underscore the need to provide JCWs with these skills especially since executives had been fired or involuntarily retired as a result of lacking these skills.⁴³ Other executives who stay in the field and struggle with the expanding system's needs and problems without having the skills and competencies to deal with the problems, have a very difficult time.⁴⁴ Attention should be paid, therefore, to the jeopardy of executives in the field.

It is the rare executive today who does not try to equip himself with the necessary tools to acquire new sources of government income and learn the managerial skills necessary for the accountability process.⁴⁵

⁴⁰Andrew B. Hahn and Arnold Gurin, Op. cit., p. 125-139.

⁴¹Gerald Bubis, "Professional Trends in Jewish Communal Service in America," Journal of Jewish Communal Service, 62, 1985, p. 304-311.

⁴²William Kahn, Op. cit., p. 239-242.

⁴³Gerald Bubis, Op. cit., p. 304-311.

⁴⁴Solomon Greenfield, "Perspectives on Executive Function," JJCS, 56, 1971-1980, p. 165-171.

⁴⁵Gerald Bubis, Op. cit., p. 305.

In the context of inter-organizational relations, other relating skills are discussed, such as: governmental, lobbying and advocacy skills.^{46,47} Those skills are perceived as essential in planning, fundraising, working with lay people and with other minority groups which appear, according to Bubis, to be among the main roles of JCWs.

The communal workers must provide a delicately orchestrated leadership role, for the most sophisticated approach to solving problems which confront many ethnic groups in America. Alliances and coalitions are needed with others who share the problem and need solution from the same source.⁴⁸

The public relation, advocacy and lobbying skills are viewed as generic skills that should be used by JCWs to be involved politically and economically with the larger society as well as with other ethnic groups. This enables them to maintain the current needs of the Jewish community as well as becoming idealistically involved with current social issues facing other social groups.

Jewish Component

Aspect of consciousness and Jewish identity as major components in establishing a Jewish communal education program are often discussed. Kahn identifies the need for

⁴⁶William Kahn, Op. cit., p. 239-242.

⁴⁷Gerald Bubis, Op. cit., p. 304-311.

⁴⁸Gerald Bubis, Op. cit., p. 308.

professional leaders to provide opportunities to raise Jewish consciousness. Therefore, he emphasizes providing workers with the necessary time, money and courses in Jewish education in order to raise their knowledge and skills.⁴⁹ Levine suggests that the social work based principle of conscious use of self should be rephrased into three inter-connected action principles: 1) Jewish conscious use of self; 2) conscious Jewish use of self; and 3) conscious use of Jewish self. The first principle will be dealt with later when the issue of integration of social work values with those of Jewish components will be discussed. The second principle points to staff person's needs:

to act in a disciplined, responsible, Jewish way - to be a competent representative of Jewish tradition/heritage/community. This demands separating out, even controlling, one's own Jewish biases and feelings, and using oneself Jewishly without reservation to promote all facets and versions of Jewish life.⁵⁰

Also, the third principle applies to the use of one's own sense of personal Jewish identity, values, beliefs, passion and vision. "It demands that one is not neutral to the outcomes of Jewish communal work and that one places her/himself as a Jew into the community or client process".⁵¹

⁴⁹William Kahn, Op. cit., p. 239-242.

⁵⁰Eric Levine, Op. cit., p. 45.

⁵¹Ibid, p. 45.

Jewish consciousness and identity are transmitted to or intensified within the students through the Jewish atmosphere at school. There are various opportunities to experience different ways of practice and alleviating ambivalences and feelings concerning identity issues. Introducing the Jewish calendar and Jewish values to the students as well as bringing them closer to the local Jewish organizations are part of these efforts. "Jewishness of the physical environment on a year-round basis thus becomes a beginning tool of education."⁵² Ballin and Prum indicated double masters' graduates manifested a stronger Jewish identity by the time of graduation. Graduates were comfortable with themselves as Jews and their use of self as professionals which stemmed out of their strong cultural awareness.⁵³

Another Jewish aspect is the extent to which professionals use themselves as role models.

Bubis, when discussing Jewish components in JCS, states that "we have no right to have Jewish expectations, however defined, for others, if we don't have them for

⁵²Gerald Bubis, "Professional Education for the Jewish Component in Casework Practice," JJCS, 50, 1976, p. 271.

⁵³Jan Ballin and Miriam Prum, Motivation, Expectation and Career Fulfillment of Workers in Jewish Agencies, (Master's Thesis, 1978).

ourselves."⁵⁴ "Role modeling", according to Bubis, can be enhanced through the "organizations of which they [workers] are part by virtue of the resolution passed and the actions taken by the organization with regard to the various concerns which confront us."⁵⁵ Also, Levine believes that Jewish communal servants "should suffuse their professional and personal lives in a spirit and practice of Judaism at all times."⁵⁶ In this way, integrating between conscious Jewish use of self and conscious use of Jewish self, the communal worker can become a role model for the community. Kahn emphasizes the importance of professionals in being a role model for lay people. The views of tomorrow's professionals should take action in the Jewish community and in the general community as was done in the 1960's precisely because of their Jewish consciousness.⁵⁷

Role modeling and leadership seem to be interwoven with each other. The lay people have Jewish expectations when they turn to JCWs. They look to the professionals for leadership and guidance.

The professional role should not only be limited to operations and implementation, but must entail full partnership with the laity. Professional

⁵⁴Gerald Bubis, "The Jewish Component in Jewish Communal Service - from Theory to Practice," JJCS, 56, 1980, p. 232.

⁵⁵Ibid, p. 232.

⁵⁶Eric Levine, Op. cit., p. 44.

⁵⁷William Kahn, Op. cit., p. 239-242.

leadership means active participation in decision-making processes and sharing the responsibility for the outcome of our efforts It is our obligation in our professional and personal lives to exercise a responsible leadership role in communal affairs.⁵⁸

Reisman also perceives the ideal as one where people can turn to the professional as a model for Jewish identification.⁵⁹

Jewish commitment is another aspect of the Jewish component. Dubin values Jewish commitment as inextricably related to the essentials of practice. The Jewish commitment is a value that the Jewish practitioner brings along with the generic and social work skills. Commitment encompasses within it the concepts of continuity, mission and the community needs. The understanding, identification and knowledge of those aspects are the basis for the JCW's commitment.⁶⁰

The ethics, competency and knowledge of the professional must equip him to see that he can and must help in the shaping of Jewish life and in the setting of priorities for the directions Jewish life must take.⁶¹

JCWs, according to Bubis, must encourage students to feel concern for Jewish individuals within the demographic,

⁵⁸Eric Levine, Op. cit., p. 42-43.

⁵⁹Bernard Reisman, "Managers, Jews, or Social Workers? Conflicting Expectations for Communal Workers," JJCS, 13, 1982, p. 41-49.

⁶⁰David Dubin, Op. cit., p. 12-18.

⁶¹Gerald Bubis, "Professional Education for the Jewish Component in Casework Practice," JJCS, 50, 1976, p. 274.

political and cultural context. The concern can be based only when understanding those aspects. Levine discusses Jewish commitment and the current community needs. Religiosity needs to be reframed in order to avoid delegitimization and diversity within the Jewish community. By espousing variety, the continuity of the Jewish people will be insured. In this context, JCW's role, therefore, needs to include participating in the shaping and experimenting of religiosity as a part of their own Jewish commitment as well as being a role model.⁶²

Action and advocacy reflect the values that the Jewish community stands for in order to maintain its prosperity and continuity. They are perceived by Bubis as another way of expressing commitment to the Jewish community's needs.⁶³

Central to Jewish continuity, Reisman states that "detachment and objectivity in the realm of personal Jewish beliefs and practices are not virtues for Jewish communal service workers."⁶⁴

The need of the community and its continuity is discussed by Bubis. The American Jewish community is:

⁶²Eric Levine, Op. cit., p. 40-48.

⁶³Gerald Bubis, "The Jewish Component in Jewish Communal Service - from Theory to Practice," JJCS, 56, 1980, p. 227-236.

⁶⁴Bernard Reisman, "The Jewish Component in the Training Programs of Jewish Communal Workers," JJCS, VIII, 1979, p. 100.

becoming the richest community of Jews in the world's history. Living in a society which allows them access to the highest levels of political decision-making and simultaneously, for the first time, allows them to be as assimilated or as Jewish as they wish⁶⁵

The JCW's Jewish commitment includes understanding the needs and risks of their community and seeing among their tasks transmitting to the fourth generation American native born community the will to continue as Jews.⁶⁶

In another article, Reisman advocates the ideal professional's "combine[ing] sensitivity to individual and group needs and a concern for Jewish continuity" ⁶⁷

Many in the literature discuss: "What Jewish knowledge consists of?" And "How it should be implemented in field practice?" Reisman, when discussing the Jewish area of knowledge in JCS, emphasizes the importance of acquiring knowledge about the Jewish heritage and in transmitting its teachings and values. He suggests that the Jewish components consist of: 1) Jewish knowledge as Judaica, contemporary Jewish context; 2) skills, as the relevancy of tradition in practice, creating a Jewish ambience (creation of Jewish atmosphere, rituals and customs), the capacity of presenting a personal positive

⁶⁵Gerald Bubis, "Professional Trends in Jewish Communal Service in America," JJCS, 62, 1985, p. 304.

⁶⁶Ibid, p. 304-311.

⁶⁷Bernard Reisman, "Managers, Jews, or Social Workers? Conflicting Expectations for Communal Workers," JJCS, 13, 1982, p. 48.

Jewish orientation and the capacity to respond to many mundane and menial tasks; and 3) values such as Jewish heritage, Jewish unity, diversity, ethnicity and personal commitment.⁶⁸

Bubis identifies educational foci of Jewish components as demography, social issues (events and responses of and to the community), social psychology related to identity formation and the roles of the JCW as affected by history, contemporary Jewish issues, values, Jewish tools (rights, birth, death, calendar) and Jewish adaptation in the light of the past and the present.⁶⁹ In one study, three fourths of interviewed Jewish communal executives wanted their workers to be more knowledgeable in contemporary Jewish issues, values and community organization. Approximately half of the executives also indicated that the knowledge of Jewish history, rituals and ethnic groups was an asset for professionals.⁷⁰

The understanding of Jewish family life, rituals and life cycles are discussed in terms of acquired Jewish knowledge.

⁶⁸Bernard Reisman, "The Jewish Component in the Training Programs of Jewish Communal Workers," JJCS, VIII, 1979, p. 95-102.

⁶⁹Gerald Bubis, "Professional Education for the Jewish Component in Casework Practice," JJCS, 50, 1976, p. 270-277.

⁷⁰Gerald Bubis, et al, "The Consumer Report: Hiring of Entry-Level Jewish Communal Workers," 62, 1985, p. 103-107.

Bubis emphasizes the need to increase knowledge about family life through programs in an effort to help professionals cope and build against future crises. "Havurot", "Shabbat Sedorim" and other activities and Jewish rituals connected to family life cycles are suggested as ways to preserve the community. They all have Jewish components within them.

Sensitizing a student to these potentialities can produce more consideration and concern for the therapeutic aspects of ritual, Jewish practice and concern in child care institutions, in big brother service, in foster care and in other settings.⁷¹

In the same context, there should be a growing awareness to lesbian and gay issues in the Jewish community.⁷²

Another mission or role assigned to JCWs and use of Jewish components is their role in transmitting Jewish knowledge and Jewish heritage to the community.

Ideally, Jewish professionals should have the ability to transmit Jewish ideals by functioning as a Jewish resource of knowledge and heritage.⁷³ Levine states that the JCWs, besides being specialists, need to function as educators, providing people and lay people with basic information on Jewish life, tradition, current events, etc.

⁷¹Gerald Bubis, "Professional Education for the Jewish Component in Casework Practice," JJCS, 50, 1976, p. 273.

⁷²Ibid, p. 270-277.

⁷³Bernard Reisman, "Managers, Jews, or Social Workers? Conflicting Expectations for Communal Workers," JJCS, 13, 1982, p. 41-49.

The JCWs must reach out to the community and to individuals through special programs and other sources of knowledge that will nurture the Jewish spark. "Acting in these capacities, we serve as important mediating structures, anchoring Jewish individuals to the larger community and channeling them to the appropriate Jewish connection."⁷⁴

Integration of Social Work, General Skills and Jewish Components

There are different approaches to the question of integrating social work, general skills and Jewish components. Literature that comes from the field of social work tends to emphasize the importance of self-determination. This often contradicts the concept of integrating Jewish components into the social work profession.

Hollis and Woods perceive the value of self-determination as one of the basic ethics of social work. They state: "the more a client can exercise autonomy, making decisions in directing her/his own life, the better, and the less the caseworker tries to take over these responsibilities."⁷⁵ According to them, the means that are chosen by the worker to bring about change must always go

⁷⁴Eric Levine, Op. cit., p. 43.

⁷⁵Florence Hollis and Mary Woods, Casework: A Psychosocial Therapy, New York: Random House, 1981, p. 26.

along with the goal of increasing the client's capacity of self-determination.⁷⁶

Also, Perlman states that "each individual has the right to self-determination: within the limits of reality each man has the right to be master of his soul and of his fate."⁷⁷

Most of the literature coming from the field of JCS sees it differently.

Reisman suggests that the question regarding the integration of Jewish components with social work values, goes back 100 years to the days when Jewish social welfare was first professionalized:

The tension between the Jewish component and the general social work component in the educational preparation of professional personnel for the American Jewish community has been a central and pervasive issue . . . As with other vital aspects in Jewish life, the response to this tension has varied over time, reflecting the shifting relationships between the Jewish community and the larger non Jewish society.⁷⁸

Bubis, too, raises this issue. He refers to the dilemma faced by a Jewish social worker when having to choose between a social work value and a Jewish value in cases where the two conflict. Is a value-free Jewish

⁷⁶Ibid, p. 26.

⁷⁷Helen H. Perlman, Social Casework: A Problem-Solving Process, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1957, p. 60.

⁷⁸Bernard Reisman, "The Jewish Component in the Training Programs of Jewish Communal Workers," JJCS, VIII, 1979, p. 95.

social worker fulfilling her/his Jewish mission? Can a social worker be value free? Do not advocacy and planning represent our own values and understanding of change?⁷⁹

Kutzik also addresses this subject. "The general compatibility of the values of the profession of social work with Jewish democratic values is as apparent as their incompatibility with antidemocratic Jewish values . . ."⁸⁰ Only when Jewish social workers are able to identify and use those Jewish values which are harmonious with social work values, and reject those that are not compatible with social work, will they be able to deal with this basic conflict in their practice and come to terms with both aspects.⁸¹

Kutzik is mainly concerned with the definition of Jewish content. He sees the importance in differentiating between the democratic and antidemocratic Jewish values, and is concerned with how those Jewish values are stressed and presented in each program, be it secular or an "ethnic" one.⁸² "Both social work and democratic Jewish values are

⁷⁹Gerald Bubis, "The Jewish Component in Jewish Communal Service - from Theory to Practice," JJCS, 56, 1980, p. 227-236.

⁸⁰Alfred D. Kutzik "Jewish Values and Jewish Social Service," in Turbulent Decades, ed. Graenum Berger, New York: Conference of Jewish Communal Service, 1980, p. 1151.

⁸¹Ibid, p. 1143-1157.

⁸²Ibid, p. 1143-1157.

based on the concept of the worth of human life, its preservation, and advancement."⁸³

In the field, there is a growing awareness of the need to perceive Jewish components and social work values as complementing one another by both being essential and effective professional practices rather than competitive aspects of professional practice.⁸⁴

In discussing the need to integrate both aspects into practice and training programs, Reisman states:

This is particularly pertinent as it applies to the Jewish component, which is not viewed as a separate professional identity, but rather as a part of an organic whole. Such an integrated approach to shaping the basic professional identity affects how students define their professional function and how they view their future career expectations.⁸⁵

Bubis points to the fact that Jewish components and social work values are integrated in the field. One example of this is that family service agencies have of late, found it important to increase their emphasis on the educational context with families. The focus is the education on Jewish content in relation to the family life cycle, rituals, celebrations, and other family events which are addressed through social work skills and values

⁸³Ibid, p. 1155.

⁸⁴Bernard Reisman, "The Jewish Component in the Training Programs of Jewish Communal Workers," JJCS, VIII, 1979, p. 95-102.

⁸⁵Ibid, p. 100.

(counseling, groups and advocacy) all of which involve a Jewish component.⁸⁶

Increasingly, there are counseling groups for divorced clients and there are some attempts in "non-dating" circles to evolve special ceremonies to mark the occasion of divorce in synagogues. This allows the therapeutic process of mourning to take place in addition to the Jewish aspects which are involved in it as well.⁸⁷

Levine is very clear about the need to integrate both aspects into practice. ". . . professional skills without a value commitment is not worth very much to the Jewish community."⁸⁸

Levine perceives JCS as not being objective or value free, and therefore, for the benefit of the Jewish community and its survival and growth, the JCW must combine Jewish values and knowledge with professional skills (of social work).⁸⁹

Tobin presents an idea that Jewish communal practice should be based upon Jewish ethics and language, as well as upon other professional skills such as management, political roles and the like. "The language, and

⁸⁶Gerald Bubis, "Professional Trends in Jewish Communal Service in America," Journal of Jewish Communal Service, 62, 1985, p. 304-311.

⁸⁷Ibid, p. 310.

⁸⁸Eric Levine, Op. cit. p. 310.

⁸⁹Ibid, p. 41.

therefore, the actions of Jewish communal workers, must be formulated and based in Jewish customs, traditions and laws."⁹⁰

Bubis discusses the issues of Jewish adaptation.

Adaptation, as well as continuity are dependent on creative strategies of survival. The current objectives, purpose and goal of the Jewish community can be understood today, in terms of symbolizing to the rest of the world the need to reach out for the deepest truth, through investigating, probing and challenging. The Jews' indestructible hope stimulates the force of history."⁹¹

Therefore, Bubis believes that the Jewish component in education for social work must carry on this potentiality. "This helps the social worker to see himself as an inheritor of responsibility, as a change agent, as a conveyor of competence and a purveyor of values."⁹² This idea represents the general notion that the integration of the Jewish component with social work values is the bridge between the Jewish community and the larger society in terms of needs, response to changes, and implications for practice.

⁹⁰Gary A. Tobin, "Ethics in Planning in the Jewish Communal Service Professions," JJCS, 60, 1984, p. 281.

⁹¹Gerald Bubis, "Professional Education for the Jewish Component in Casework Practice," JJCS, 50, 1976, p. 277.

⁹²*Ibid*, p. 277.

PART III: CURRENT TRENDS

Introduction

In addition to the literature discussed thus far regarding the various components that should comprise an education program for JCWs, current literature speaks to recent trends which have emerged in the field of JCS. The primary trends identified are: the credentials required of the entering professional due to technological advancements and the growth and wider acceptance of the profession; satisfaction; mobility and upward mobility; and the feminization of the field.

Credentials Required Due to Technological Advancements

Since the late 1970's, the literature points toward an overall trend of organizational change and expansion. This significantly affects the nature and needs of current human services as well as the functioning and needs of Jewish community organizations. Several authors note that settings such as Jewish Community Centers (JCC's) and Federations have also broadened their scope and expanded their focus of services. As a result there is an increased need to expand and develop in management and organization by incorporating knowledge from other professions.⁹³

⁹³Andrew B. Hahn and Arnold Gurin, Op. cit., p. 125-139.

Sophisticated management and accountability procedures require functional budgeting and accrued accounting. "The term marketing, which used to conjure up pleasant images of rolls, eggs, cheese and milk, stuffed in a mesh bag, now involves words such as: customers, competition and macro environment."⁹⁴ This demands a new and specialized knowledge for the Jewish communal professional. This situation becomes even more critical due to the new economic situation which was created by the scarcity of resources. The executives of today have to become experts in seeking alternative forms of funding while at the same time producing expanded quality of services with diminished resources.⁹⁵

Due to these changing emphases, younger professionals are moving into executive positions and must cope immediately, not only with this complexity, but with a less experienced staff as well. Further, young professionals receive a minimum of assistance from supervisors who are themselves striving to succeed at jobs which have become more complex.⁹⁶

All this leads to the recognition that expanded education programs for professionals should be developed. Some authors advocate expanding the present Jewish communal

⁹⁴Solomon Greenfield, Op. cit., p. 166.

⁹⁵Ibid, p. 165-171.

⁹⁶Ibid, p. 165-171.

field to include a greater influx of high quality professionals from business, government, academic life and other fields. "They should be sought out for the new skills and view-points that they might bring to the Jewish communal services, that need so much to find their way in a rapidly changing social and communal environment."⁹⁷

The same trend of expansion and the need to cope with new needs of the general society is reflected in the literature coming from the field of human services. Many discuss the need for social workers to increase their understanding in fiscal training, marketing, administration and legal implications of government regulations.^{98,99,100}

One major area where today's professionals need to increase and develop their knowledge is in the area of computers, for use in administration, public relations, information, programming and fiscal management. During the last eight years, there has been a virtual revolution both in the technology of computer hardware and in software innovation. These remarkable developments, coupled with an

⁹⁷Andrew B. Hahn and Arnold Gurin, Op. cit., p. 135.

⁹⁸Eugene Fram, "Do Human Services Executives Need Management Education?" Journal of Administration in Social Work, 6, 1982, p. 69-80.

⁹⁹Stanley Blotstein, Op. cit., p. 34-42.

¹⁰⁰Vicentia Joseph and Ann P. Conrad, "Teaching Social Work Ethics for Contemporary Practice: An Effectiveness Evaluation," Journal of Social Work Education, 19, 1983, p. 59-68.

equally remarkable marketing strategy and media obsession, have made the computer an instrument of broad general interest and enthusiasm. Many agree on the importance and necessity of this developed technological instrument in working in human services today. "The pressure to join the bandwagon and "computerize" is almost irresistible ..."¹⁰¹

Parker et al state this conviction: "The failure of any human service profession to take advantage of computer technology, means that it will not realize its full potential"¹⁰² This new trend of technology and the expansion in general of the human service field, has to be taken into consideration when evaluating and developing a curricula for human services training.

Satisfaction

Satisfaction relates to professional qualifications, skills, competencies and education needed by JCWs to enhance success and effectiveness in the field; salary; and length of time professionals remain in the field. The requirements and expectations for entry-level workers have expanded. Professionals must possess a variety of skills

¹⁰¹Henry Miller, "The Use of Computers in Social Work Practice, An Assessment," Journal of Social Work Education, 22, 1986, p. 52.

¹⁰²M. W. Parker, G. Chynoweth, D. Blankinship, E. Zaldo, and M. Matthew, "A Case for Computer Applications in Social Work," Journal of Social Work Education, 23, 1987, p. 57.

and competencies that are generic, portable and transferrable across settings. Social work education and Judaica/Jewish studies remain key components, but education and training from other fields (i.e. fundraising, research, data processing, business and public relations) prove necessary.

While Jewish communal leaders expect higher levels of competencies from workers, they do not appear committed to professionals. There are wide gaps in salaries between entry-level workers and executives and women in higher positions still receive less than men in commensurate positions. Additionally, although many professionals feel they have job security, half who begin in JCS choose to leave the field within two years. Thus, there are discrepancies in levels of satisfaction among professionals. Current literature and studies reflect these trends.

Recently, some studies have begun to examine empirically which basic qualifications will enhance "success" in the field and which of these are being required and demanded by agencies and organizations in the Jewish community. Jewish agencies expect more skills, knowledge, competencies and experiences in the people they hire. Reitman and Rotto identified two categories of

desired competencies: 1) generic skills and methods, and
2) Jewish knowledge components.¹⁰³

Seventy percent of all employers indicated that they expect entry-level workers, at least occasionally, to use all of the competencies listed with the exception of lobbying and computer skills. The list included work with lay boards, fundraising, community organization, casework, program development and public relation skills.¹⁰⁴

Most employers felt the "how-to" skills are lacking - the "how-to's" of performing day-to-day tasks, rather than the "why". Thus, the results of this study suggest that education and training of Jewish professionals needs to involve a greater emphasis on skill development and how to be effective.¹⁰⁵

Dubin states that:

workers often shift intra-agency or inter-agency from one area of specialization to another. Agency assignments often require skills that go beyond the worker's original educational concentration. Agencies are often staffed by personnel from a multitude of disciplines with job tasks not always following predictable lines. Given these realities, it would seem valuable to identify essential competencies that are portable and productive and can help workers understand job expectations and achieve successful employment.¹⁰⁶

¹⁰³Gerald Bubis, et al, "The Consumer Report: Hiring of Entry-Level Jewish Communal Workers," 62, 1985, p. 103-107.

¹⁰⁴Ibid, p. 105.

¹⁰⁵Ibid, p. 103-107.

¹⁰⁶David Dubin, Op. cit., p. 12.

The Federation lay leaders feel that the most important qualifications that professionals must possess are: the ability to motivate lay leadership, Jewish commitment and community organization. When asked what kind of educational background they felt professionals should have, over 1/3 felt a social work degree was essential while the same amount felt that a specific educational background in JCS was needed. 22% considered Jewish studies to be essential. This suggests that these lay leaders "put somewhat more weight on specifically Jewish preparation for Federation work than on generic social work education, although many undoubtedly would want to combine both."¹⁰⁷ Additionally, these lay leaders felt that an educational background in administration was "'desirable,' if not 'essential.'"¹⁰⁸

While agencies and organizations seem to be demanding a wide variety of skills and competencies, the focus of education is still in social work combined with Jewish studies or Jewish communal studies. In addition, professionals in the field also seem to prefer degrees in social work and in Jewish studies.

Although a social work degree is seen as the basic requirement, more than 40% of the 1,000 federation positions require training that is considered outside of

¹⁰⁷Andrew B. Hahn and Arnold Gurin, Op. cit., p. 131.

¹⁰⁸Ibid, p. 125-139.

social work (i.e. research, community relations, religious affairs, public relations, data processing and accountants).¹⁰⁹ In JCC's the Master's of Social Work (MSW) has traditionally been the degree of choice, but because the necessary skills and abilities have become more specialized, the proportions of MSW's to other Master's degrees (MA) has changed significantly. In the last three years, other MA's have outnumbered MSW's. However, the MSW continues to be the optimum degree for advancement in the field. Eighty percent of the professionals holding top positions have advanced degrees with the MSW being the degree most frequently held.¹¹⁰ "In the Greater New York City area 29 out of 31 executives, (93.5%) are MSW's."¹¹¹

An inconsistency which currently exists in the field is also addressed. "There is a lack of commitment among the leaders in the field to recognize the need for specially trained Jewish communal workers"¹¹² while there is a desire for more professionals with increased Jewish knowledge and competencies. They found that "there is a lack of significant hiring standards which is in contrast

¹⁰⁹Ibid, p. 125-139.

¹¹⁰Jewish Welfare Board, 1987 Statistical Reports, Professional Salaries and Personnel Trends in Jewish Community Centers and YM-YWHA's, New York: JWB, 1987, p. 23.

¹¹¹Ibid, p. 1.

¹¹²Gerald Bubis et al, Op. cit., p. 106.

to the employer's explicit need for specially trained entry-level workers."¹¹³ Thus, there is a tension between Jewish communal programs and the field - the field looking for better trained workers and the training programs espousing the integration of Jewish components in practice as part of their mission.¹¹⁴

With all of this, there is a variety of issues which impinges upon career satisfaction among professionals. According to a 1979 CJF study:

there is a general picture of high levels of job satisfaction among Federation professionals; almost all feel their work to be important and challenging. Professionals feel that lay leaders value their work and respect their profession although many tend to think that the lay leadership have unrealistic expectations about what their jobs entail and what are achievable objectives. . . . Half or more of respondents in all groups except fiscal and management personnel also express satisfaction with the social relationships surrounding their jobs. Only the long hours of work are a clearly negative element.¹¹⁵

A discrepancy exists between satisfaction with salaries and fringe benefits. Large majorities of executives, assistant executives, community relations professionals and public relations personnel expressed satisfaction with salaries and fringe benefits.¹¹⁶ Over

¹¹³Ibid, p. 103.

¹¹⁴Ibid, p. 103-107.

¹¹⁵Andrew B. Hahn and Arnold Gurin, Op. cit., p. 130.

¹¹⁶Ibid, p. 125-139.

the last two years, salaries with JCC's have increased by 11.5% versus a 5.0% increase in the cost of living. According to the JWB, this may be attributed to JCC's recognizing the value of attracting and retaining quality professionals.¹¹⁷

However, in the JCC's, the salary level for women remains lower in commensurate positions than for men. "For Assistant Directors women earn 18% less, female Branch Directors earn 22% less and for Program Directors the differential is 19%.¹¹⁸ There is virtual equality in salaries for men and women at the entry level Program Assistant position.¹¹⁹

In addition:

there is a growing gap between the beginning salary of the communal worker and executive recompense, which has now, in some instances, reached astronomical proportions. There should be some formula based on fairness and reality that would close the gap between the salary of the executive and the beginning salary of workers. This is not to suggest that it should be accomplished by lowering the salaries of executive's, but rather raising the floor that is now so low as to be close to what is considered poverty level for some families.¹²⁰

Hahn and Gurin found that:

¹¹⁷Jewish Welfare Board, Op. cit., p. 1-64.

¹¹⁸Ibid, p. 15.

¹¹⁹Ibid, p. 1-64.

¹²⁰Gerald Bubis, "Recruitment and Retention of Professional Staff for Jewish Communal Service," JJCS, 60, 1984, p. 338.

Almost all (lay leader respondents from the CJF study) believe that the field pays at least as well as others requiring equivalent qualifications, but 57% are nevertheless of the opinion that higher salary levels would help to attract more highly qualified people.¹²¹

The CJF study findings also reveal that the respondents have a sense of job security.

Large majorities in all categories of personnel believe that they could find another job easily if they were to leave their present positions. For the most part, they also believe that there is no shortage of jobs in the field.¹²²

Additionally:

the great majority of Federation professionals tend to stay in Federation work or at least in the Jewish field. One telling finding is that the overwhelming majority of professionals report that they think of Federation work as a long-term career.¹²³

Other indicates that "as many as 50% of the people that begin in JCS are out within two years. Those who begin in JCS are too often disillusioned and discouraged."¹²⁴ In addition, there exists a heavy turnover of entry-level workers, especially with JCC's and family service agencies. "Here is where many test the field as a career option, use it as a temporary measure enroute to another profession or simply are not suited or

¹²¹Andrew B. Hahn and Arnold Gurin, Op. cit., p. 131.

¹²²Ibid, p. 130.

¹²³Ibid, p. 129.

¹²⁴Gerald Bubis, Op. cit., p. 340.

interested and either choose to leave or are counseled out."¹²⁵

Mobility and Upward Mobility

Mobility and upward mobility are other components of job satisfaction. In a major study in the Federation field, variation was found in response to questions concerning advancement. For most assistant executives, clearly, advancement is not likely within the same Federation but requires moving. For most other professional sub-groups, responses were about equally divided between those who see opportunities for advancement within their present Federations and those who do not, except for community relations and fiscal and management personnel, who are apparently more sanguine about their opportunities.¹²⁶ However, (in Centers) more recently there has been a subtle change as more professionals are becoming reluctant to pick up their family and relocate which often requires a second professional position for a spouse who is committed to his/her own career.¹²⁷

¹²⁵Jewish Welfare Board, Op. cit., p. 4.

¹²⁶Andrew B. Hahn and Arnold Gurin, Op. cit., p. 125-139.

¹²⁷Jewish Welfare Board, Op. cit., p. 1-64.

Geographic mobility characterizes the Jewish professional. Yet,

moving in order to increase upward mobility for one or two of the partners is a high price to pay. Today's field of Jewish communal service must take greater care to assist both husband and wife if it is to provide for the necessary opportunities for advancement. Recommendations include: 1) low cost mortgages for housing, 2) tuition credits or subsidies for young professionals, 3) time for quality experience in the home as a result of the heightened place of family among the professionals as opposed to earlier generations, 4) shared jobs for those couples ready and qualified to take them.¹²⁸

Feminization of the Field

The feminization of the field is an additional current trend identified in the literature. It encompasses issues of mobility and salaries and stands on its own as a unique and complex subject. During the mid 20th Century women entered into the work force at a rapid and dramatic pace. The 1950's, 1960's and 1970's saw more women with pre-school age children, and more women over 45 years of age joining the labor force than ever before. Yet, in spite of their advancements women maintain the status of a minority group. Their efforts to advance socially, politically, and economically have not earned them complete access or participation. Women are still novices in the realm of paid wages. They have entered into a male-controlled

¹²⁸Gerald Bubis, Op. cit., p. 337.

domain but they have not acquired the necessary and prized power.¹²⁹

In order to understand the nature of the Jewish woman as professional, and the specific obstacles she encounters, one needs to take into account Judaism's traditional classical view of women. One first interpretation states that Judaism imposed a second class citizen and second class worshiper status on women. Women were granted no rights, given no responsibilities (outside the home), and allowed to assume no leadership roles in the community a synagogue. The second more positive stance focuses on the vital role Jewish women play within the family emphasizing the specialness of her role. According to Rabbi Saul Berman as cited by Rosenberg:

Jewish women have been culturally and religiously colonized into acceptance of their identities as 'enablers'. Jewish society has projected an unidimensional "proper" role for women which denies to them the potential for fulfillment in areas other than that of home and family.¹³⁰

Today, Jewish women in community life seem to be saying that they often feel either under used or misused by male Jewish community leaders. Women want to share as equals in decision-making processes which shape their Jewish community. When qualified, they want to be hired on

¹²⁹Martha Ozawa, "Women and Work," Journal of Social Work, 21, 1976, p. 455-462.

¹³⁰Jane Rosenberg, "From Patriarchy to Partnership-The Evolving of the Jewish Woman," JJCS, 55, 1979, p. 340.

staffs of Federations and to become executives of agencies and preside over the boards of synagogues. The literature demonstrates the emergence of a trend. Today's Jewish women struggle with contradictory messages:

"Times have changed and women should go to work and fulfill themselves." At the same time Jewish women hear another message, "To truly fulfill your Jewish commitment as a woman, you should remain at home and nurture your children." . . . If we risk examining our Jewish tradition and institutions, if we modernize some of our Jewish traditions and community organizational patterns to respond to today's Jewish woman who is asking for full participation, I think we will be contributing to an enriched personal life for the Jewish woman as well as her family and to a stronger Jewish community.¹³¹

Women in the JCS field have a problem. According to Babis:

Males do not yet want women in leadership roles and the nature of the world is such that many men will probably continue to do everything they can do to prevent it, to make sure that that remains the case.¹³²

It is generally understood that those with power have little desire to give any of it up. In addition, they will usually do their utmost to stop others from obtaining a share of it.

Women are at a disadvantage because if they use the leadership attributes people want in a male, they are viewed as unfeminine and somehow unworthy of leadership. The male involved in leadership roles who is "sharp" and able to really bring things together, articulate,

¹³¹Ibid, p. 344.

¹³²Gerald Babis, "Women in Leadership," JJCS, 59, 1983, p. 238.

dynamic, exciting, able to marshal resources and energize people, is seen as a leader. The woman leader manifesting these self-same patterns "does not know her place", because she is using "unfeminine" attributes, that is to say, "masculine" attributes.¹³³

In a 1978 CJF survey, the overwhelming majority of respondents (women) identified sex discrimination attributed to boards, male executives and general prevailing practices as the main barriers to their advancement. 7 out of 10 women believed that their agency supports the concept of career advancement. But as one astute woman pointed out: "The rhetoric is changing. The roles remain the same". 8 out of 10 women were interested in career advancement while 4 out of 10 indicated willingness to relocate to another community if necessary. After sex discrimination the other factors seen as barriers were (in descending order of importance) family responsibility, mobility, women's reluctance to accept executive and administrative positions, tradition and lack of personnel policies and practices between agency boards and executives and women.¹³⁴

The CJF Personnel study found that women in the field of Jewish Federations constituted about one-fourth of the

¹³³Ibid, p. 238.

¹³⁴Andrew B. Hahn and Arnold Gurin, Op. cit., p. 125-139. (This survey was conducted to obtain an overview of the professional qualifications, career goals, geographic mobility and advancement possibilities of women in the Jewish communal service field.)

total universe but occupied quite different positions from men.

Females in Occupied Full-Time Positions
(including Executives)¹³⁵

Population Group	Total Occupied Full-Time Positions	Females	
		No.	Percent
I	530	167	32
II	153	31	20
III	69	13	19
IV	40	12	30
<hr/> Total 792		<hr/> 223	<hr/> 28

Women are almost totally absent from top executive and campaign director positions, are most heavily represented in women's division activities and constitute about half of the personnel in public relations and community relations. Women tend to be somewhat younger, are less highly educated professionally and have less Jewish background. More of the women are single and without family responsibilities. Women felt that sex discrimination played a part in explaining lower salaries. But because salary is usually a function of the level and type of position it naturally follows that the real issue is the limited range of positions in which women were represented. Many more men than women were found to come to Federation work directly

¹³⁵Ibid, p. 138.

from other Federation positions. More women than men come into Federation from private sector work.¹³⁶

A Sacramento based study found that the overwhelming majority of women saw sexism as a problem. In response to a general statement "Sexism is not a problem at my agency", 53% of males agreed and only 34% of women concurred. No agency or type of agency was free of sexism in the perceptions of some of its social work staff. Men consistently reported less sexism than women evidencing a serious credibility gap. Women perceived more sexism in hiring, work assignment, and access to career advancement possibilities.¹³⁷

In the context of promotion and job mobility the data point toward very serious problems of sexism. In response to the statement: 'My chances of being selected for a top administrative post are about as good as anyone else's'. 54% of men argued while 29% of the women shared the belief.¹³⁸

In another study, the dearth of women in upper level management positions in Jewish social agencies was addressed.

Despite the growth in the number of agencies, the proportion of women in top management declined approximately two percent a year over two decades.

¹³⁶Ibid, p. 125-139.

¹³⁷Dorothy Zietz and John Erlich, "Sexism in Social Agencies: Practitioners' Perspectives," Journal of Social Work, 21, 1976, p. 434-439.

¹³⁸Ibid, p. 437.

Not only were women under-represented in social work administration and paid lower salaries, but their mobility was slower. Another study found that it took women three times as long as men to be promoted from the position at which they were hired to the next level and twice as long for the next promotion.¹³⁹

The issue of the feminization of the field of JCS was addressed at the General Assembly of the Council of Jewish Federations in 1983 by Bubis. He discussed the enormous ramifications of the feminization of the field, stating that most of them would be positive for women. Historically, however, any profession which began as male-dominated and moved to being primarily female suffers a downward step in status. Although social work was traditionally a field of women, the Federation system and the field of JCS include a much higher proportion of men than woman. The certainty of having so many women in the field in the years ahead must be addressed. It is an inevitable challenge that awaits this field.¹⁴⁰

Summary

In summary, the literature reflects several trends affecting both general society and the field of Jewish communal service. These trends emphasize the need to

¹³⁹Ruth A. Brandwein, "Where are the Women - and Why: An Analysis of Women Administrators in Jewish Communal Services," JJCS, 60, 1984, p. 204-205.

¹⁴⁰Gerald Bubis, "Recruitment and Retention of Professional Staff for Jewish Communal Service," JJCS, 60, 1984, p. 337-340.

provide students with new and adequate training and preparation as well as skills and tools necessary to meet the realities of the field.

A major trend discusses the increasing feminization of the field and the struggle of women to succeed. Women struggle with upward mobility, discrimination and continual inequities of positions and salaries. In spite of the increasing feminization of the field, and the decreased number of men entering the field, women are still not given higher positions or being advanced like men. In order to compete with men, women need to be highly mobile which could inhibit their career advancement and their motivation to remain in the field when wanting to have children. Additionally, women find that they need to be more assertive in order to succeed yet this behavior is often perceived by men as aggressive and pushy.

In terms of credentials required of entry-level workers, there is an increasing demand for a wider range of skills and knowledge. This is a result of increased technology and the need to keep pace with the larger community. However, it has resulted in a paradox in the field. In spite of the higher credentials required by agencies and organizations, they are not showing commitment to professionals by increasing salaries or providing incentives to remain in the field.

The literature also discusses the area of skills and knowledge required for the JCW. The area of skills which are identified are: social work skills, Jewish knowledge and generic skills.

There is an ongoing debate regarding how and whether or not Jewish components should be integration into social work practice. Most of the JCS authors consider the Jewish component to be crucial and essential while those in the field of social work emphasize the value of self-determination. This is often contradictory to the integration of the Jewish component in practice. However, all of the writers agree upon the need to increase generic knowledge from other fields in order to keep pace with the expansion and complexities of organizations and administrations.

HUC, since its inception, has tried to accommodate and better prepare its students for these realities. It is clear, though, from the literature that professionals are continuing to signal the importance of an ongoing interaction and dialogue between the school and the field.

CHAPTER TWO

METHODOLOGY

This chapter describes the methodology used to construct the present study. Sampling method, data collection, questionnaire construction, method of analysis and limitations of the research are addressed.

The research was undertaken to determine the extent the Hebrew Union College 'School of Jewish Communal Service' program and curriculum meets the needs of its graduates. The current study was loosely based upon a previous thesis¹, which examined aspects of the HUC curriculum more specifically. In the present case, the researchers chose to examine the program in broader terms to ascertain the extent to which alumni are able to incorporate their studies as a whole into professional practice. The study conducted was exploratory in nature since little is known about this specific research question and no clear

¹ Leslie Goldfarb, Marie-Jeanne Lambert and Debra Schlossberg, Evaluation of Hebrew Union College-Jewish Institute of Religion School of Jewish Communal Service Curriculum (Master's Thesis, May 1983).

hypotheses could be formulated beforehand based on previous research.²

Sampling Method

The universe for this study consisted of any individual who had attended the Hebrew Union College School of Jewish Communal Service, since its inception. This included all degree and certificate recipients, as well as individuals who attended without graduating. They numbered 360. Of 360 possible respondents, 3 were deceased and 23 left no address with HUC. Of the remaining 334, 17 could not be located. Six questionnaires were returned unanswered with a note of explanation and six more were returned after the cut-off date set and were therefore not analyzed. The final universe was 305.

The response rate was 63%; 209 questionnaires were returned out of a total number of 334 sent. Of these 209, 180 were analyzed. According to Babbie³, a response rate of 50% is considered "adequate" for analysis and reporting, while a response rate of 60% is considered "good".

² Tony Tripodi, Phillip Fellin and Henry J. Meyer, The Assessment of Social Research, Itasca, Illinois: F.E. Peacock Publishers, Inc., 1983, p. 20.

³ Earl Babbie, The Practice of Social Research, Belmont, Calif.: Wadsworth Publishing Co., 1986, p. 221.

Data Collection

The research instrument (see Appendix A, Thesis Questionnaire) was mailed to all subjects whose names were supplied to the researchers by the School of Jewish Communal Service. The questionnaire was accompanied by a cover letter (see Appendix B, Cover Letter), which described the research and encouraged the subjects to participate in the study. The letter assured that all information provided by the subjects would be kept confidential. In addition, the researchers offered to provide a summary of the study's findings to all subjects having made this request.

In order to insure confidentiality, the questionnaires were numbered by the researchers when mailed. After this point, a record was kept, by number only, as to which questionnaires had been returned.

A small note pad was included as an incentive to return the questionnaire, the first page of which had a "Thank You" message stamped, thus hoping to encourage the individuals to participate in the study.

Approximately three weeks after the surveys were mailed, a reminder card was sent to all individuals who had not yet returned their questionnaire. This was done in order to increase the rate of response.

Questionnaire Construction

As discussed previously in this chapter, the current research was loosely based upon a study done five years ago. The earlier study's questionnaire was largely relevant to the present research, and therefore, it was used as a basis for the current study. The current study had two purposes: 1) to update the findings of the earlier research, thus including alumni who had attended the program since the previous research was completed, 1983-1987 and 2) to examine new areas.

The present researchers expanded some areas for study. As an example, the previous survey addressed specific course work taken by respondents; the present study focused more on the areas of knowledge garnered from these courses. Further, the present research examined the issue of physical mobility, an area not previously addressed. The goal was to more fully understand the demands of the field of Jewish Communal Service.

The current questionnaire was divided into four sections: 1) Learning experience at Hebrew Union College; 2) Work experience since graduating from Hebrew Union College; 3) Specific aspects of the School of Jewish Communal Service Program; and 4) Demographic information.

The questionnaire consisted of thirty-nine questions, of which thirty-three were primarily closed-ended. Respondents were given an opportunity to add specificity to

the lists contained in many questions. Six open-ended questions allowed respondents to supply comments. These questions were used to gain a better understanding of the respondents' impressions. However, the number of open-ended questions was limited to increase uniformity and ease of coding.⁴

The research instrument was pretested prior to mailing. Individuals not connected with the study or with Hebrew Union College reviewed the questionnaire for purposes of clarity.

Method of Analysis

SAS, Statistical Analysis System, was used as the method of statistical analysis in this study. Craft notes that this is one of "the most powerful statistical packages available on mainframe and minicomputers."⁵

Limitations of the Study

In the beginning stages of the research, there were certain limitations. As potential subjects reside worldwide, a mail-in questionnaire was chosen. Participation in the study depended upon respondents having informed Hebrew Union College of their current whereabouts.

⁴Ibid., pp. 127-128.

⁵John L. Craft, Statistics and Data Analysis for Social Workers, Itasca, Illinois: F.E. Peacock Publishers, Inc., 1985, p. 109.

A second limitation involved the research instrument itself. The reliability and validity of this original questionnaire can be questioned.

Subject recall was a third limitation. In the current research, the time frame for recall is one to eighteen years. Thus, results may not be completely generalizable.

A further limitation was a potential bias against those not currently working in the field of Jewish Communal Service. Many of the questions are geared to the application of skills to work as a professional in this field.

Finally, time frames precluded a representative response from respondents now abroad. Of 28 potential subjects living outside of the United States, three responded to the survey.

CHAPTER THREE

PROFILE OF RESPONDENTS

This chapter profiles and compares respondents according to demographic attributes. The sample's representativeness is examined and other demographic data are analyzed.

The school began in 1968 solely with the certificate program which mainly attracted established Jewish professionals. Their age ranged from late twenties to mid-fifties. Many were married with children and were mostly men. As a variety of programs were introduced into the curriculum and the school of JCS became more recognized and accepted, many younger individuals and a larger percentage of women began attending the school. And as the school became more established and developed a reputation, it has grown in numbers. Table 3-1 profiles the school's graduates and illustrates trends in relation to program attended, gender and year of attendance.

The entire population shared certain attributes with regard to gender, year of graduation and program attended. Thus, the respondents formed a representative sample of the total population. (See Tables 3-2 through 3-4.)

TABLE 3-1: PROFILE OF DEGREE/CERTIFICATE RECIPIENTS*

	Certificate	DM/						
	Only	MAJCS	DM/USC	DM/GWB	DM/PA	Gerontology	JM	DM/OTHER
	M/F	M/F	M/F	M/F	M/F	M/F	M/F	M/F
1970	10/1							
1971	2/3							
1972	6/2							
1973**	10/3	1/-						
1974***	6/5		2/2					
1975+	7/4	2/2	-/2				1/-	
1976	8/6	-/2	2/3				-/1	
1977	3/3	1/4	1/4				1/-	
1978++	3/1	1/2	1/4	1/2			-/1	
1979	3/2	-/4	1/8	2/2			2/1	
1980	2/3	1/3	3/4	2/3			-/1	
1981	3/1	1/3	-/3	-/1			-/2	
1982+++	1/7	1/1	2/5	2/2		-/2	-/2	
1983	4/1	2/1	4/5	1/2			-/1	
1984*+	1/1		5/3		1/1	-/1		
1985	1/1	1/-	3/10	1/3	2/4		-/2	-/1
1986	2/2	1/-	1/5		1/2	-/1		
1987	1/2	1/-	2/6	-/1			-/1	
<u>TOTALS:</u>								
	73/48	13/22	27/64	9/16	4/7	-/4	4/12	-/1

* -- Fifty-six individuals who attended, but did not complete a program, are not included. All degree recipients also receive certificates, however these certificates are not reflected.

** -- First MAJCS degree granted.

*** -- First DM/USC degrees granted.

+ -- First JM (Joint Master) degree with School of Education.

++ -- First DM/GWB degrees granted.

+++ -- First DM/Gerontology degrees granted.

*+ -- First DM/PA degrees granted.

TABLE 3-2: COMPARISONS BY GENDER

Gender	Total Population		Total Respondents	
Male	156	43.3%	75	42.2%
Female	204	56.7%	103	57.9%
	<u>360</u>	<u>100.0%</u>	<u>178</u>	<u>100.0%</u>

Missing Observations = 2

TABLE 3-3: COMPARISONS BY YEAR OF GRADUATION

Year Grouping	Total Graduated		Total Respondents	
'68-'75	69	22.9%	35	20.2%
'76-'81	115	38.2%	65	37.6%
'82-'87	117	38.9%	73	42.2%
	<u>301*</u>	<u>100.0%</u>	<u>173</u>	<u>100.0%</u>

Missing Observations = 2

* -- This includes degree or certificate only recipients. Fifty-six who did not complete programs and three deceased individuals are not included.

TABLE 3-4: COMPARISONS BY PROGRAM ATTENDED

Program	Total Population		Total Respondents	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
CERTIFICATE	119	39.5%	54	30.7%
MAJCS	34	11.3%	20	11.4%
DM/USC	91	30.2%	63	35.8%
DM/GWB	25	8.3%	16	9.1%
DM/PA	11	3.7%	6	3.4%
DM/Gerontology	4	1.3%	3	1.7%
JM	16	5.3%	6	3.4%
OTHER	1	0.3%	8	4.5%
	<u>301*</u>		<u>176</u>	

Missing Observations = 4

* -- This includes degree or certificate only recipients. Fifty-six who did not complete programs and three deceased individuals are not included.

One exception is the under-representation of certificate recipients among the respondents (30.7%) as compared to those in the universe (39.5%). Possibly, the questionnaire did not adequately address the certificate program. This was clear from subjects' comments:

- I feel you need either different questions in many of the areas (or a separate response space) for certificate students or do a survey for double masters students only. I found it difficult to answer many of your questions since they seemed geared towards someone entering the field - not someone who has been in it for a while.

- Much of this survey is geared towards full-time HUC students/graduates. There was not much dealing with certificate only students. We had a different concentration and a very different perception of our experiences.

The certificate program is unique in that students attend for two consecutive summers and are most often professionals in the field. In addition, the researchers themselves are DM/USC students. This may contribute to a bias towards an emphasis on social work issues.

Once the study sample proved representative, other respondents' descriptive data could be examined. The descriptive data used to profile the respondents further were: age; gender; marital status; number of children under 18 living at home; current geographic location; the year graduated; program enrolled in; consideration of other graduate programs and prior work and educational experience.

Table 3-5 through Table 3-8 illustrate significant demographic attributes of the study sample. Although the age range of respondents was 25-60, most subjects were forty years of age or younger. There were also more women than men in the sample and a very large percentage of the respondents were married. The respondents were split fairly evenly between those who had children under eighteen living at home or no children in this category. Almost half are currently living in California.

Table 3-5 shows the age range of respondents. Nearly 78.5% (138) are forty years of age or younger. This conforms with studies reporting a larger percentage of younger professionals entering the field of JCS. The increase of younger attendees is also related to more diverse programs introduced into the school in recent years. The 1974 addition of the double masters program with social work was aimed at entrants or those seeking career changes. In addition, higher academic degrees are now more necessary for entry level positions into the field.

TABLE 3-5: AGE OF RESPONDENTS

Age Groupings	Frequency	Percent
25 - 32	65	36.9%
33 - 40	73	41.5%
41 - 60	38	21.6%
TOTAL	<hr/> 176	<hr/> 100.0%

Missing Observations = 4

There was significant gender differentiation related to marital status (Table 3-6). Nearly 20% more men than women were married. In addition, there was a slightly greater number of females who are single compared to men. Marital stability is evident in the large number of married respondents compared to those divorced.

TABLE 3-6: MARITAL STATUS BY GENDER

	Male		Female		TOTAL	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Single	11	14.9%	22	21.4%	33	18.5%
Divorced	4	5.4%	9	8.7%	13	7.3%
Widowed	0	0.0%	2	1.9%	2	1.1%
Married	60	81.1%	66	64.1%	126	70.8%
Living Together	0	0.0%	4	3.9%	4	2.3%
	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>
TOTAL	75	42.2%	103	57.9%	178	100.0%

Missing Observations = 2

Over half of the subjects have between one and three children living at home (Table 3-7). This may relate to: 1) respondents' young age; 2) the current trends of more women in the workplace; and 3) Jewish families electing to have fewer children. Those who indicated "0," either have no children at all or have children no longer at home.

TABLE 3-7: NUMBER OF CHILDREN UNDER 18 LIVING AT HOME

Number of children	Frequency	Percent
0	74	44.6%
1 - 3	90	54.2%
Over 3	2	1.2%
TOTAL	<u>166</u>	<u>100.0%</u>

Missing Observations = 14

Almost half of the respondents (48.6%) live in California. This was expected as many attend the school to remain close to home. Additionally, many alumni stay in the area because the program enables them to become familiar with the community and to network for jobs. The next largest grouping is the east coast (17.7%) with the greater numbers in areas with large Jewish communities (New York, New Jersey, Massachusetts, Pennsylvania and Washington D.C.). The midwest follows with a significant number from Ohio. Understandably, graduates are drawn to large, well-established Jewish communities. Job possibilities are greater and these areas provide adequate starting experience. The south also shows fair representation with the greater numbers residing in states with large Jewish communities (Texas, Florida and Georgia). Not surprisingly, the northwest and southwest have a lower representation. The low response rate from Canada and abroad was discussed in the methodology chapter. (Table 3-8.)

TABLE 3-8: RESPONDENTS' REGION OF RESIDENCE

Region/Area	Frequency	Percentage
California	85	48.6%
East Coast *	31	17.7%
Mid-West **	21	12.1%
South ***	18	10.3%
South-West +	9	5.2%
North-West ++	5	2.8%
Canada	2	1.1%
Abroad +++	4	2.3%

Missing Observations = 5

- * Includes: New York, Massachusetts, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Washington, D.C., Rhode Island, Maryland.
- ** Includes: Ohio, Wisconsin, Missouri, Illinois, Kansas, Michigan, Minnesota.
- *** Includes: Texas, Florida, Georgia, Virginia, Tennessee.
- + Includes: Arizona, Colorado, New Mexico.
- ++ Includes: Oregon, Washington, Wyoming.
- +++ Includes: Israel, Australia.

Additional characteristics of the study sample are shown in Table 3-9 through Table 3-12. Nearly half (47.7%) of the respondents graduated between 1980 and 1985. This reflects the predominantly large classes enrolled in the program between these years. Forty-five percent of respondents are social work double master's graduates from USC or GWB. Of these alumni, most were COPA (Community Organization, Planning and Administration).

TABLE 3-9: YEAR GRADUATED FROM HUC

Year	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Total Respondents
1968	1	0.6%
1969	1	0.6%
1970	4	2.3%
1971	0	0.0%
1972	5	2.9%
1973	7	4.0%
1974	8	4.6%
1975	9	5.2%
1976	13	7.5%
1977	6	3.5%
1978	11	6.4%
1979	9	5.2%
1980	16	9.2%
1981	10	5.8%
1982	11	6.4%
1983	15	8.7%
1984	12	6.9%
1985	18	10.4%
1986	9	5.2%
1987	8	4.6%
TOTAL	N = 173	100.0%

Missing Observations = 7

A comparison of program attended by year of graduation indicates that the number of "Certificate only" recipients decreased as the years progressed (Table 3-10). The 25 "Certificate only" recipients from the years 1968-1975 represent 49% of all "Certificate only" recipients in the study sample. During the second year of graduation cluster, the MAJCS increased dramatically and had its greatest number of graduates. DM/USC and DM/GWB represent over half of all degrees granted in the third time period. Thus, the sample demonstrates how the school has moved from solely a certificate program to primarily a masters program.

TABLE 3-10: PROGRAM ENROLLED BY YEAR OF GRADUATION

	Years of Attendance			TOTAL
	68-75	76-81	82-87	
CERTIFICATE	73.5%	21.5%	16.7%	29.8%
MAJCS	5.8%	23.1%	4.2%	11.7%
DM/PA	0.0%	0.0%	8.3%	3.5%
DM/USC	11.8%	36.9%	45.8%	35.7%
DM/GWB	0.0%	12.3%	11.1%	9.4%
DM/Gerontology	0.0%	0.0%	1.8%	1.8%
JM	0.0%	4.6%	4.2%	3.5%
OTHER	8.8%	1.5%	5.6%	4.7%
TOTAL	19.9%	38.0%	42.1%	100.0%

Missing Observations = 9

Nearly fifty-five percent did not apply or consider a graduate program in another field, but those who did, often chose sociology/psychology, Judaica/Jewish studies and "other" areas (Table 3-11). Backgrounds of the alumni ranged from educational experience in history, science, Judaica/Jewish studies and education to work experience in administration, public relations, business and social work.

TABLE 3-11: APPLIED OR CONSIDERED GRADUATE PROGRAM
IN OTHER AREA

	Frequency	Percent
Yes	77	45.3%
No	93	54.7%

Missing Observations = 10

Alumni came with a wide variety of educational and work experience. (Table 3-12). The four most frequently designated areas of undergraduate or prior educational experience were: 1) history (31), Judaica/Jewish studies (26), education (20) and science (16). Lower prior educational experiences noted by respondents were: 1) administration (4), public relations (6), business (6), politics (12), social work (13) and computers (13). Ironically, more of these less frequently studied prior educational experiences are found to be largely needed in the field.

Many alumni indicated more frequent prior work experience in these same areas. Administration (41), education (36), social work (33), business (30) and public relations (26) were most frequently settings for prior work experience. These are all areas that are valuable and needed in the field. Thus, attendees received important work experiences prior to attending the program.

For those respondents who indicated both prior educational and work experience in the same area, social work was most often designated (26.3% or 44) with Judaica/Jewish studies (22.4% or 37) the second highest. Thus, alumni had adequate underpinnings in two of the most vital components of the field.

TABLE 3-12: PRIOR WORK AND EDUCATIONAL EXPERIENCES

	Work	Education	Both	Number of Respondents
History	1.2%	19.3%	1.9%	N = 161
Judaica/Jewish Studies	10.3%	15.8%	22.4%	N = 165
Education	21.4%	11.9%	19.0%	N = 168
Science	1.3%	10.1%	1.3%	N = 159
Administration	25.5%	2.5%	7.5%	N = 161
Public Relations	16.0%	3.7%	3.7%	N = 162
Business	18.8%	3.8%	7.5%	N = 160
Politics	9.9%	7.5%	3.7%	N = 161
Social Work	19.8%	7.8%	26.3%	N = 167
Computers	5.7%	8.2%	1.9%	N = 158

CHAPTER FOUR

FINDINGS

Motivations for Choosing the HUC Program:

Respondents were asked to indicate factors affecting their decision to attend Hebrew Union College - Jewish Institute of Religion (HUC). The possible responses were: financial aid; cost of education; reputation of school; reputation of faculty; opportunity to study with the founding director, Jerry Bubis; quality of social work education; quality of education about Jewish community; Jewish content; specialized preparation to work in the Jewish community; availability of the dual degree; quality of the field placements; the Reform movement as a sponsor of the program; to be identified as a Jewish communal worker; and "other."

Overall, respondents were attracted to the specifically Jewish nature of the program. However, there was gender differentiation in certain areas. Men in significant numbers over women chose the opportunity to study with Jerry Bubis. This was especially a phenomenon in the early years. Women came more for Jewish content and to gain specialized preparation to work in the Jewish community. Gaining specialized preparation to work in the

Jewish community remained a primary motivating factor for attending HUC throughout the years. In recent years, however, the reputation of the school has increasingly become a main reason for attending. Availability of the dual degree was understandably the most important motivation for attending for those in the Double Master's/Public Administration (DM/PA), Double Master's/George Warren Brown (DM/GWB) and Double Master's/Gerontology (DM/Gerontology) programs. Specialized preparation to work in the Jewish community was the primary motivation for those in the certificate only program, Master's of Jewish Communal Service (MJCS) and Double Master's of Jewish Communal Service and Social Work at the University of Southern California (DM/USC). When "other" reasons were identified, many respondents chose HUC due to its geographic location. (Examples were: "In Los Angeles and did not want to move," "Program on West Coast," and "Only program I heard about located in California.")

The three most frequently chosen reasons for attending HUC were: 1) to gain specialized preparation to work in the Jewish community (128 or 71.5%); 2) the reputation of the school (116 or 64.8%); and 3) Jewish content (99 or 55.3%). The three reasons least frequently indicated were: 1) cost of education (10 or 5.6%); 2) quality of field placements (16 or 8.9%); and 3) quality of social work education (32 or 17.9%).

Understandably, attendees came to HUC for its specialized program. However, the high cost of the program was either not appealing to many individuals or was not a factor. This is discussed further, later in this chapter.

The low response to quality of social work education could relate to the number of attendees who came for HUC programs other than those with a social work component. In fact, of the 176 respondents who indicated which program they were enrolled in, 97 (55.1%) attended a non-social work program. Some individuals may have read this question to mean that the HUC program itself had a social work component but this was not a primary motivation for attending.

Although the Jewish component was a factor in choosing HUC, the quality of field placements was not a high consideration. This was surprising, since students were to be placed in Jewish settings. Those responding to this question did so after having attended the program. Armed with this information, they may not have been able to remember clearly the reasons they came to the school as separate from their satisfaction with aspects of the program. They may also have been so young that they did not understand the intended connection between field work and the Jewish emphasis of the program at the time of admission.

Table 4-1 illustrates variance over time for the three reasons most frequently selected for attending the school. The factors of specialized preparation for the field and Jewish content did not vary over time. However, reputation of the school as a reason for choosing HUC increased significantly by year of graduation clusters. This undoubtedly reflects the time necessary for the school to establish its reputation.

TABLE 4-1: REASONS FOR ATTENDING BY YEAR OF ATTENDANCE

	Overall Percentage	Years of attendance		
		68-75	76-81	82-87
Specialized preparation to work in the Jewish community	71.5%	77.1%	79.7%	65.8%
Reputation of the school	64.8%	48.6%	64.1%	76.7%
Jewish content	55.3%	57.1%	57.8%	52.1%
	N = 173	N = 35	N = 65	N = 73

Missing Observations = 7

Availability of the dual degree as a reason for enrollment increased by year clusters, while the reputation of the faculty as a motivation for choosing HUC decreased consistently by year of graduation. (See Table 4-2.) Respondents increasingly choosing the availability of the dual degree probably related to the introduction of new

programs beginning in 1974. Initially, students were solely certificate recipients. The decrease of the importance of faculty reputation probably relates to the early students more likely being professionals in the field. Thus, they were motivated to study with the faculty, most of whom were major figures in Jewish communal life. As the school grew and offered a variety of programs, knowledge of the faculty probably became less of a factor for entering students. Students more recently are younger, less established, more concerned with receiving the degree in order to be "marketable" in the field and as previously noted, less likely to know of the field in general and faculty reputation in particular.

TABLE 4-2: REASONS FOR ATTENDING BY YEAR OF ATTENDANCE

	Overall Percentage	Years of attendance		
		68-75	76-81	82-87
Availability of dual degree	47.5%	8.6%	46.9%	68.5%
Reputation of faculty	29.1%	42.9%	25.0%	27.4%
	N = 173	N = 35	N = 65	N = 73

Missing Observations = 7

Comparisons by gender support the traditional involvement of women in social work and human services. Table 4-3 illustrates a significantly greater number of women compared to men who chose the program for specialized preparation to work in the Jewish community. Additionally,

more women chose the school in order to be identified as Jewish communal workers, for Jewish content and for the availability of the dual degree. Almost one-half of the men chose the opportunity to study with Jerry Bubis as compared to only one quarter of the women.

TABLE 4-3: REASONS FOR ATTENDING BY GENDER

	Overall Percentage	Male	Female
Specialized preparation to work in the Jewish community	71.5%	64.4%	76.7%
To be identi- fied as a Jewish communal worker	43.3%	38.9%	45.6%
Jewish content	55.3%	48.0%	61.2%
Availability of dual degree	48.0%	34.3%	58.3%
Opportunity to study with Jerry Bubis	36.0%	48.0%	26.2%
	N = 178	N = 75	N = 103

Missing Observations = 2

The data show some disparity in motivations for attending when compared by program. The researchers compared alumni from the DM/USC (62 respondents) and DM/GWB (16 respondents) programs (Table 4-4). A larger percentage of DM/GWB students were motivated by the Jewish components

of the program as well as the reputation of the faculty. They were also less likely to choose the quality of social work education as a motivation in comparison with the DM/USC students. Possibly, those coming to the DM/USC program were aware of the high reputation of the USC School of Social Work. In addition, these individuals, most of whom came from cities with larger Jewish populations, may have been more exposed to Jewish life before entering the program. Thus, the Jewish aspects of the program did not hold as much attraction for them.

TABLE 4-4: REASONS FOR ATTENDING BY SOCIAL WORK PROGRAM

	Overall Percentage	DM/USC	DM/GWB
Reputation of the faculty	29.1%	14.5%	31.3%
Identified as a Jewish communal worker	43.3%	46.8%	56.3%
Jewish content	55.3%	48.4%	68.8%
Opportunity to study with Jerry Bubis	35.8%	22.6%	31.3%
Quality of social work education	17.9%	35.5%	18.8%
	N = 79	N = 63	N = 16

Debt:

When asked to indicate whether alumni primarily used loans or scholarships/grants to pay for their education, almost half (42.2% or 68 out of 161) predominantly used loans¹. The primary loan sources were HUC and U.S. government Guaranteed Students Loans (GSL's). Almost eighty percent (86 out of 108 responding) had HUC loans upon leaving. This is understandable as HUC loans are interest-free. Additionally, almost all who get loans also get scholarships and stipends. Thus, it is advantageous to take HUC loans over other sources. However, the amount of debt incurred through these loans was exorbitant. Thirty-three and one-half percent (36 respondents) had HUC loans between \$5,000 and \$10,000 and 21.4% (23) indicated that they received HUC loans of \$10,500 or more.

Over sixty-seven percent (45 out of 67) took GSL's. Of this 45, 26 (57.8%) had loans of \$10,000.00 or more. Thus, the need for this type of loan was also great.

Data on loan sources other than HUC and GSL - Jewish Free Loan, loans from parents/family, bank loans, USC/GWB

¹HUC School of Jewish Communal Service has always subsidized students with either grants/scholarships or interest-free loans. In the early years, most students were sponsored by agencies or HUC scholarship. In 1974, with the introduction of double degrees, HUC offered interest-free loans. The ratio was \$2.00 of loan to \$1.00 of scholarship. A Federation stipend for field work was introduced in 1982 and kept this formula standard. As of 1987-88, the school provides \$125,000.00 in grants and \$250,000.00 in interest-free loans each year.

loans and "other" - are not statistically significant as very few subjects used them. For example, only 39 subjects even addressed the issue of loans from family. Of these, 29 stated that they had taken no loans from family, while 10 said that they had. This concurs with HUC's significant financial support of students, which most likely relieved parents of this burden. The extent to which parents could have provided financial aid or repayment of loans is unknown. Only eight out of 37 respondents indicated that they took loans from USC or GWB. This could relate to the fact that once attendees receive HUC loans, they are rarely eligible for any USC or GWB loans.

The costs of attending HUC vary greatly according to program and time of attendance. For example, because it is only two summers, the Certificate program is much less expensive and many agencies underwrite the students. Additionally, costs were covered for early students, who were mostly certificate recipients. Thus, most certificate attendees did not need loans. However, as HUC introduced new programs in conjunction with other schools, costs increased greatly. This seriously affected the large majority of students.

Table 4-5 illustrates cost trends by year of attendance. The use of loans increased greatly in recent years while reliance on scholarships alone decreased. With the rising costs of education and more non-professionals

attending, loans are needed in larger quantities and scholarships are often not sufficient. Additionally, with less established professionals entering the program, agency sponsorship is not as readily available.

TABLE 4-5: DEBT SOURCE BY YEAR OF ATTENDANCE

	Overall Percentage	Years of attendance		
		68-75	76-81	82-87
Loans	42.2%	12.9%	31.6%	66.9%
Scholarships/ Grants	34.8%	74.2%	29.8%	19.1%
Not Applicable	23.0%	12.9%	38.6%	14.7%
	N = 173	N = 35	N = 65	N = 73

Missing Observations = 24

Other financial information revealed that 61.6% of those responding (61 out of 99) still owe on their HUC loans. Of those who supplied their current debt information, \$447,210.00, or almost one-half million dollars, is still owed the school. It can be estimated that at least \$725,990.00 is the total HUC loan debt of the study sample. In addition, 60.3% of those responding (38 out of 63) still owe \$289,865.00 in GSL's. It is probable that as much as \$480,000.00 may be the total GSL debt.

Many respondents did not answer aspects of the questions pertaining to financial debt. The options in the question may not pertain to their HUC experience or they took no loans at all. Respondents may also not have been

willing to share their financial information with unknown researchers or simply may not have remembered their exact financial debt.

Subjects Areas:

In the questionnaire's first section, respondents were asked to assess their learning experience at Hebrew Union College. The first question discussed twenty-eight subject areas offered in HUC's curriculum. These were divided into those with and without Jewish content. Respondents had the option of checking either "had too much," "just about right," or "would have liked more." In interpreting the responses, "just about right" was understood to express satisfaction with the amount of attention given to the subject area.

Very few respondents (an average of 3.4%) "had too much" of any subject. A majority responded that the quantity of each subject was satisfactory; it was either "just about right" or that they "would have liked more". It was primarily in the skills areas of management where any dissatisfaction existed.

Management:

Course work related to management especially stood out as the area in which graduates wanted to gain more expertise. In this context, the term 'management' is used

to describe those skills necessary to administer a program, department, agency or organization.

Respondents wanted more course work available in the areas related to technical and administrative skills and included: budgeting and fiscal management, planning, administration, fund raising, grant writing and public relations/publicity.

Fifty-three percent, in answer to the question of fund raising, responded that the amount was "just about right", compared to the 41.7% who responded "would have liked more." However, in analyzing this question by year of graduation, an increase of satisfaction towards fund raising was noted. From the years 1968-75, 58.8% of the respondents "would have liked more" fund raising, as compared to 35.3% who were content with the amount offered. Since a majority of students at this time were non-clinical in orientation, it is probable that this subject was of prime importance to them. (See Table 4-6.) From the years 1982-87, these percentages were essentially reversed, with 38.6% wanting more, as opposed to 60% being satisfied with the fund raising component of the curriculum offered. Increases in satisfaction may be due to a fund raising class introduced into the curriculum in 1974.

TABLE 4-6: SATISFACTION WITH AMOUNT OF
FUND RAISING EMPHASIS

	total respondents	by years of attendance			N
		'68-75	'76-'81	'82-'87	
Had too much	4.6%	5.9%	7.7%	1.4%	8
Just about right	53.7%	35.3%	58.5%	60.0%	92
Would have liked more	41.7%	58.8%	33.9%	38.6%	69
	total n = 175	N=34	N=65	N=70	N=169

Missing Observations = 5

Missing Observations = 11

In the responses to planning and budgeting/fiscal management questions, 57.7% and 59.5% of respondents, respectively, "would have liked more." (See Table 4-7.) The strongest dissatisfaction was evident in the responses for those who graduated between the years of 1976 and 1981. Two-thirds of this group "would have liked more." The increase in satisfaction level between the years of 1982 and 1987 may be due to the requirement that COPA and PA students attend a course containing this material. However, 41.1% and 38.2% of the respondents, respectively, indicated that they had "just about right" amount of both planning and budgeting/fiscal management. Further, PA students were most dissatisfied with the amount of planning, budget and fiscal course work offered. Of the six PA respondents, only one was satisfied, while the other five wanted more of these subjects.

TABLE 4-7: SATISFACTION WITH AMOUNT OF PLANNING AND BUDGETING/FISCAL MANAGEMENT BY YEAR

	Had too much	Just about right	Would have liked to have more	N
Planning: total respondents	1.1%	41.1%	57.7%	175
	N=2	N=72	N=101	N=175
Missing Observations = 5				
1968 - 1974	5.9%	38.2%	55.9%	34
1975 - 1981	0.0%	35.4%	64.6%	65
1982 - 1987	0.0%	47.1%	52.9%	70
	N=2	N=69	N=98	N=169
Missing Observations = 11				
Budgeting/Fiscal: total respondents	2.3%	38.2%	59.5%	173
	N=4	N=66	N=103	N=173
Missing Observations = 7				
1968 - 1974	5.9%	35.3%	58.8%	34
1975 - 1981	3.2%	30.2%	66.7%	63
1982 - 1987	0.0%	45.7%	54.3%	70
	N=4	N=63	N=100	N=167
Missing Observations = 13				

TABLE 4-7a: SATISFACTION WITH AMOUNT OF PLANNING AND BUDGETING/FISCAL MANAGEMENT BY PROGRAM

	Had too much	Just about right	Would have liked to have more	N
Planning: total respondents	1.1% N=2	41.1% N=72	57.7% N=101	175 N=175
Missing Observations = 5				
Certificate	3.8%	41.5%	54.7%	53
MAJCS	0.0%	30.0%	70.0%	20
Public Admin.	0.0%	16.7%	88.3%	6
USC Social Work	0.0%	44.3%	55.7%	61
GWB Social Work	0.0%	56.3%	43.8%	16
Gerontology	0.0%	33.3%	66.7%	3
Joint Masters	0.0%	66.7%	33.3%	6
Other	0.0% N=2	14.3% N=71	85.7% N=99	7 N=172
Missing Observations = 8				
Budgeting/Fiscal: total respondents	2.3% N=4	38.2% N=66	59.5% N=103	173 N=173
Missing Observations = 7				
Certificate	3.9%	36.5%	59.6%	52
MAJCS	0.0%	31.6%	68.4%	19
Public Admin.	0.0%	16.7%	88.3%	6
USC Social Work	3.3%	44.3%	52.5%	61
GWB Social Work	0.0%	56.3%	43.8%	16
Gerontology	0.0%	33.3%	66.7%	3
Joint Masters	0.0%	16.7%	83.3%	6
Other	0.0% N=4	28.6% N=66	71.4% N=100	7 N=170
Missing Observations = 10				

For administration and supervision, there was a relatively even split (5% difference or less) between respondents who indicated "just about right" and those who "would have liked more." For administration, while 47% noted the curriculum was "just about right"; 51.8% "would have liked more." The division for supervision is even closer, with 49.7% satisfied as opposed to 47.9% desiring more. (See Table 4-8.) The similarity in responses between supervision and administration may be due to the perspective that they are interconnected.

Finally, an examination of responses to questions of organizational behavior and development indicate that the majority, 58.4% and 61.6% respectively, agreed that the curriculum offered an appropriate amount of this material. (See Table 4-9.) However, earlier graduates wanted more attention given these subject areas than more recent graduates. 51% of the graduates between 1968 and 1975 were satisfied with the amount of organizational behavior and 46% with organizational development. For those having graduated between 1982 and 1987, 61.4% were satisfied with organizational behavior and 65.7% with organizational development. These changes in satisfaction levels may be attributed to the reformulation and refocusing of these courses during the late 1970's. When examined for program attended, no significant trend was obvious except from

**TABLE 4-8: SATISFACTION WITH ADMINISTRATION
AND SUPERVISION**

	Had too much	Just about right	Would have liked to have more	N
Administration: total respondents	1.2%	47.0%	51.8%	166
	N=2	N=78	N=86	N=166
	Missing Observations = 14			
1968 - 1974	6.6%	38.7%	54.8%	31
1975 - 1981	0.0%	41.7%	58.3%	60
1982 - 1987	0.0%	55.1%	44.9%	69
	N=2	N=75	N=83	N=160
	Missing Observations = 20			
Supervision: total respondents	2.4%	49.7%	47.9%	169
	N=4	N=84	N=81	N=169
	Missing Observations = 11			
1968 - 1974	6.1%	51.5%	42.4%	33
1975 - 1981	0.0%	41.0%	59.0%	61
1982 - 1987	2.9%	55.1%	42.0%	69
	N=4	N=80	N=79	N=163
	Missing Observations = 6			

TABLE 4-9: SATISFACTION WITH ORGANIZATIONAL BEHAVIOR AND ORGANIZATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

	Had too much	Just about right	Would have to liked have more	N
Organizational Behavior:				
total respondents	6.9%	58.4%	34.7%	173
	N=12	N=101	N=60	N=173
Missing Observations = 7				
1968 - 1974	3.0%	51.5%	45.6%	33
1975 - 1981	12.5%	57.8%	29.7%	64
1982 - 1987	4.3%	61.4%	34.3%	70
	N=12	N=97	N=58	N=167
Missing Observation = 13				
Organizational Development:				
total respondents	5.2%	61.6%	33.1%	172
	N=9	N=106	N=57	N=172
Missing Observations = 8				
1968 - 1974	3.1%	46.9%	50.0%	32
1975 - 1981	7.8%	64.1%	28.1%	64
1982 - 1987	4.3%	65.77	30.0%	70
	N=9	N=102	N=55	N=166
Missing Observations = 14				

Gerontology respondents. Two of the three Gerontology respondents, "would have liked more."

In sum, respondents indicated that inclusion of this management material is necessary, especially for those whose career will incorporate management. This is particularly true as over 50% of the graduates will hold management positions in their second or third jobs. As one respondent stated, "I left HUC unprepared in terms of managing an agency and contributing to the management of the agency." This may occur because of the HUC curriculum can only prepare graduates for their first job in the field. Although this may be the primary function of a graduate school, it is imperative that the program address the necessity for the acquisition of the skills needed for advancement.

The majority of respondents were satisfied with the amount of the following subjects offered: community relations, programming, and research. In examining the responses to the subject of programming, 61.1% were satisfied. (See Table 4-10.) No significant difference was found between year of graduation and satisfaction level. As one respondent indicated:

"Clearly my social work/Jewish communal service credentials have placed me ahead of other colleagues in other areas: Professional-lay role and relationships, supervision, group work skills, CO, human behavior, etc."

TABLE 4-10: SATISFACTION WITH COMMUNITY RELATIONS,
PROGRAMMING, AND RESEARCH

	Had too much	Just about right	Would have liked to have more	N
total respondents				
Community Relations:	1.1%	66.7%	32.2%	174
Programming:	3.0%	61.1%	35.9%	167
Research:	7.8%	68.3%	24.0%	167
Research by year:				
1968 - 1974	10.3%	69.0%	20.7%	29
1975 - 1981	12.7%	52.4%	34.9%	63
1982 - 1987	1.5%	82.6%	15.9%	69
	N=12	N=110	N=39	N=161
Missing Observations = 19				

The same holds true in the area of research; however, the statistics vary slightly: 68.3% responded with "just about right". Differences arise when years of attendance are examined. Where 69% of those attending between 1968 and 1975 stated they had "just the right amount" of research, in the years '76 to '81, it falls to 52.4%. Those having responded "would have liked more", increases by 14.2%. Those attending HUC between 1982 and 1987, the figure for "just about right" rises dramatically to 82.6%, lowering both statistics relating to dissatisfaction. The

cause of these changes in satisfaction levels is uncertain. The changes between the first and second third of the year groupings would likely be due to the shift in the student body from Certificate students to Masters and Double Masters candidates. Since research per se is not part of the Certificate program these respondents may have had fewer expectations and academic needs for research. As the student body shifted to dual degree students their needs for research increased. By the third year cluster the school was able to adjust to the changed population.

Overall, the levels of satisfaction are above 60% for non-management subject areas (community relations, research, programming) signifying the importance and strength of this segment of the SJCS program. This high level of satisfaction indicates that this section of the curriculum is well developed and adequately meets the needs of the respondents.

Jewish Content:

Of all the subjects containing Jewish content, only one showed slight dissatisfaction in the amount offered. This was in the area of Jewish culture (art/music). While 48.3% of the respondents noted the amount offered was "just about right", 50.6% "would have liked more". (See Table 4-11.) This desire for more Jewish cultural studies has increased from the year grouping 1968 to '75 when 39.4%

TABLE 4-11: SATISFACTION WITH AMOUNT OF JEWISH CULTURE

	total respondents	by years of attendance			N
		'68-'75	'76-'81	'82-'87	
Had too much	1.2%	0.0%	0.0%	2.8%	2
Just about right	48.3%	60.6%	43.6%	45.1%	79
Would have liked more	50.6%	39.4%	56.5%	52.1%	85
	N=172	N=33	N=62	N=71	N=166

Missing Observations = 8 Missing Observations = 14

responded "would have liked more" as compared to 52.1% between the years of 1982 to '87.

In subjects ranging from Jewish Thought and Jewish History to Holocaust Studies and Israel/Diaspora Relations, respondents generally expressed great satisfaction. (See Table 4-12.) This satisfaction levels ranged from 56.3% to 86.5%, indicating "just the right amount." The one exception was PA respondents; they had much higher levels of dissatisfaction with Israel/Diaspora Relations, Zionism, Jewish history and Organization of the American Jewish community. Although PA respondents only accounted for 6 of the 174 respondents to these questions, when asked about Israel/Diaspora Relations, only one of the six had had enough. Conversely, of the three Gerontology respondents, all expressed 100% satisfaction in these subjects.

TABLE 4-12: SATISFACTION WITH JEWISH SUBJECT AREAS

	Had too much	Just about right	Would have liked to have more	N
total respondents				
Holocaust Studies:	1.7%	86.5%	11.8%	178
Org. of American Jewish Community:	6.1%	80.4%	13.4%	179
History of Jewish Communal Service:	8.4%	79.8%	11.8%	178
Jewish History:	2.3%	75.6%	22.2%	176
Israel/Zionism:	2.2%	74.3%	23.5%	179
Current Jewish Issues:	0.0%	63.6%	36.7%	180
Israel/Diaspora Relations:	1.7%	60.7%	37.6%	178
Jewish Thought:	3.4%	58.8%	37.9%	177

Among those subjects with the highest satisfaction levels were Holocaust Studies with 86.5%, Organization of the American Jewish Community with 80.4%, and History of Jewish Communal Service with 79.8%. Again, only PA respondents indicated dissatisfaction with the amount of History of Jewish Communal Service offered. Of six PA respondents, four indicated they had too much of this subject. On the other hand, the three Gerontology respondents were all satisfied with the amount of History of Jewish Communal Service offered.

Respondents expressed great satisfaction with the subject of Jewish history; the current trend reveals a

growing desire for an increase in the amount of Jewish history offered. The number of people who would have liked to have more Jewish history has increased from 11.8% in 1968 through '75 to 30.6% in 1982 to '87. In response to student's request for more of this subject in previous years, the School has responded: raising the total number of required credits in Jewish History from 2 credits in the early years to a current requirement of 5 credits. Concurrently, the School has also increased the material covered in History courses from a choice of two of the three following historical time periods: Ancient, Medieval or Modern to encompass all time periods of Jewish History.

Similarly, a 26.6% increase was evident in those having responded "would have liked more" to the subject area of current Jewish issues. This figure is significant in that it represents a doubling of those who would have preferred more of this subject; 20% of those between the years of 1968 to '75, while those respondents between the years 1982 to '87 indicated 46.6%.

Conversely, respondents have shown an increase in satisfaction levels for both the History of Jewish Communal Service and the Organization of the American Jewish Community. Each has increased by 19% from the first six year cluster to the most current one. This increase in satisfaction level may be because as the years progressed, students attending the program were younger, had less

experience in the field of Jewish Communal Service and had less of a knowledge base in the areas of the History of Jewish Communal Service and Organization of the American Jewish community.

Overall, the Jewish component of the Jewish Communal Service program was considered to be satisfactory by the respondents. This is reflected by a respondent who noted "These topics (Jewish) are very valuable to me today regardless of my profession, and were well worth the effort and time." Only the PA students regularly, and the George Warren Brown and Gerontology students less consistently, were not as satisfied. This may be attributed to the lack of integration between HUC and the other programs as well as the fact that George Warren Brown students and many of the PA students are only at HUC for fourteen months.

Although PA and GWB students have most of their classes at HUC for this period, the classes are not necessarily solely oriented to specifically Jewish content. PA students enter the program with specific expectations regarding their field of study. While the PA, Gerontology and George Warren Brown masters programs are extremely focused, the social work program at USC leads to a more generic understanding of social work practice. USC social work students are more content. This may account for the difference expressed by the respondents.

Where Does the Learning Take Place:

The second question contained six components that examined where learning took place. The choices available to the respondents were: "from course work" and "from field placement" or if both applied, to so indicate. This question was directed to those participants whose program included field placement. As the certificate program does not require field work, it is assumed that the approximately 50 respondents who did not answer this question were certificate students.

Both the "skills I use most" and "understanding myself as a professional" were gained primarily from the field placement as indicated by the respondents, while the "concepts I use most" and "began to think about myself as a practicing professional" were learned primarily from course work. (See Table 4-13.) The six Public Administration students and the three Gerontology students unanimously felt that the skills they use most were learned through field work. Again, PA and Gerontology students enter the program with focused expectations. Their expectations of the program are clear; they know what they want to learn in the field, and the field is where they are gaining "hands-on" experience. Hence, their field work experiences may be more specifically related to the work they want to do upon graduation than the field placements of social work students.

Responses of this group also differed somewhat from the overall statements. Half of the respondents indicated that they learned concepts used most from field while the other 50% indicated that these concepts were learned through course work.

Both "began to think about myself as a Jewish professional" and "learned the most overall" had course and field work checked almost equally. For "thinking about myself as a Jewish professional" 36.6% gained this identity from course work, 41.2% gained this from field placement, and 19.1% indicated both. When asked where they learned the most overall, the distribution was similar in that 41.4% indicated that overall learning had come from course work, 38.3% indicated from field work and 19.5% responded with both.

The differences between how the Social Work students and the Gerontology and Public Administration students perceive the value of the course and field work at HUC is a result of the differences in their professional goals. Those students who do not aim to be "generic social workers", namely the Gerontology and PA students, view the school's curriculum as social work based. Therefore, they derive the majority of their learning and self-understanding from the field where their specific needs are more fully addressed.

TABLE 4-13: WHERE LEARNING TOOK PLACE

	From course work	From field placement	From both	N
Learned the skills I use most	19.2%	65.4%	14.6%	130
Began to think about myself as a professional	18.7%	64.2%	15.7%	134
Learned the concepts I use most	56.0%	22.4%	22.9%	134
Began to understand issues facing the Jewish community	60.1%	17.4%	21.7%	138
Began to think about myself as a Jewish professional	36.6%	41.2%	19.1%	131
Believe I learned the most overall	41.4%	38.3%	19.5%	133

The fifth question was directed at respondents who had participated in a dual degree program and asked whether that they learned at Hebrew Union College complemented, contradicted, was irrelevant or was repetitive to what they learned in their other program. 67.7% of the respondents felt that the programs were complementary, 1.1% felt they were contradictory and 31.2% responded that what they learned at HUC was largely irrelevant to what they learned at USC or George Warren Brown. It is important to note is that 87 of the total 180 respondents did not answer this question. It can be assumed that most of the non-respondents were either certificate students or in a single

masters program and therefore could not compare two schools. In response to this question, a respondent stated:

"Unfortunately, I have yet to utilize what I learned at HUC since I ended up working outside the Jewish community. My education at USC was most practical--at HUC I gained a sense of identity and built a special community of friends and colleagues. But I didn't really need the HUC degree to do the social work which I ended up doing."

This question integrated aspects of several typical comments. It addresses the practicality of the USC programs and the unique components of the SJCS program.

Specific Aspects of the SJCS Program:

Question seventeen asked respondents to agree or disagree with a series of sub-questions; both remembering how they would have felt as a student and how they think now, as a graduate. The question asked, "I would like to have spent more time with:" and then listed six categories of people. In addition, respondents were asked whether or not they would have liked to have attended more HUC activities.

When asked whom they would have like to spend more time with from their current perspective, "now", (as opposed to their perspective at the time they were students, "then"), respondents generally felt they would like to have spent more time with: rabbinic and education students (65.7%), SJCS faculty (58.4%), and other HUC

faculty (63%). From their perspective as students, "then", respondents would have liked to spend more time with: rabbinic and education students (61.8%), SJCS faculty (58.3%), and other HUC faculty (57.8%). (See Table 4-14.) Statistics vary slightly between "now" and "then" perspectives, the numbers do not indicate a dramatic change with whom students would have wanted to spend time. When examined by class cluster, no definitive pattern can be seen.

TABLE 4-14: RETROSPECTIVE THOUGHTS

	<u>Now</u>			<u>Then</u>		
	Agree	Disagree	N	Agree	Disagree	N
I would like to have spent more time with:						
a. USC/GWB students:	33.3%	66.7%	129	34.1%	65.9%	126
b. other SJCS students:	44.1%	55.9%	136	47.4%	52.6%	133
c. rabbinic/education students:	65.7%	34.3%	137	61.8%	38.2%	136
d. USC/GWB faculty:	40.5%	59.5%	126	39.8%	60.2%	128
e. SJCS faculty:	58.4%	41.6%	137	58.3%	41.7%	139
f. other HUC faculty:	63.0%	37.0%	135	57.8%	42.2%	135
I would like to have attended more HUC activities:	34.3%	65.7%	134	27.9%	72.1%	136

In answering the question as to whether or not respondents would have liked to participate in more HUC activities, where 34.3% indicated affirmatively, 65.7% indicated negatively. When examined for year of attendance clusters, the difference in responses was small.

Israel Seminar:

Questions were asked regarding the Israel seminar portion of the School of Jewish Communal Service curriculum. Of the 167 people who answered the question, 49 people said they participated in the Israel trip. Although this is a small portion of the respondents, these data are valuable in that the Israel trip was only made mandatory beginning in 1987.

For this topic, a majority of respondents ranging from 58.8% to 90.4% felt that the questions asked regarding the Israel seminar applied to them. Included among these questions was whether knowledge gained on the seminar has been used in their work. 47.1% said "very much" so and 33.3% said "somewhat" so for an cumulative percentage of 80.4. An even larger percentage stated that the seminar gave them personal inspiration as a Jew. 55.8% indicated this very much applied to them and 34.6% indicated that this statement somewhat applied to them for a cumulative total of 90.4%. Other queries had similarly high responses. The following comment was reflects the general

feeling of those respondents who participated in the Israel seminar: "It was a terrific experience; a superb seminar."

Additional Requirements Outside of Coursework:

In addition to course work, the School of Jewish Communal Service requires participation in various activities including co-curricular days, case presentations, evening seminars and camp weekends. Respondents were asked whether or not these activities were helpful in their learning experiences. (See Table 4-15.) Of those who responded, 68.6% found the evening seminars helpful. Similarly, 88.8% found the camp weekend helpful. The other activities were also found to be helpful. The high rate of people who indicated "does not apply" may be attributed to certificate students who are not in classes during the school year when these activities (except for the Camp Weekend, which all are required to attend) take place and that these activities were added until 1982.

TABLE 4-15: SATISFACTION WITH EXTRACURRICULAR REQUIREMENTS

	was helpful	was not helpful	does not apply	N
Evening seminars	68.6%	16.4%	15.1%	159
Camp weekend	88.0%	9.9%	1.2%	161
Co-curricular days*	44.3%	6.7%	49.0%	149
Case presentations*	61.7%	7.8%	30.5%	154

* introduced in 1982

Retrospective Considerations About Entering Graduate School

Respondents were asked what type of graduate education they would choose if they were to have the opportunity to start over again. While only 0.6% reported that they would enroll in a Jewish Communal Service program that was not at HUC, 45.5% would enter one of HUC's Jewish Communal Service Dual Masters programs. An additional 7.6% would begin a Jewish Communal Service Single Masters degree and 10.1% would pursue the Jewish Communal Service Certificate. 43 of the 74 people who completed the Dual Masters degree in social work noted that they would do it over again, indicating that they were satisfied with the program they chose. 7 of the 74 social work graduates would complete the Public Administration program while only 2 of the 5 Public Administration students would repeat the program. Of the other 24 social work graduates, 15 designated other. Numerous people who indicated "other" had comments along the line of "enter another profession given the low pay of the field--unreasonable demands made upon us as professionals." Some of the other fields noted as possible options included medicine, law, business, and education.

Issues Related to Gender:

Findings show that women come into the program more frequently than men for specialized preparation for work in the Jewish community. The hypothesis is that since there

is a difference in the Jewish motivations between men and women for attending the SJCS program, there would be a difference in satisfaction levels with the Jewish subject areas. For topics such as Jewish culture and world Jewry, men were more satisfied with the amount taught in these subject areas. On the other hand, women were more satisfied with the subjects of history of the Jewish community and organization of the American Jewish community. Upon examination of the data, no definite conclusions can be drawn between entry motivations and Jewish subject area.

More females than males indicated that they would like more preparation in the following secular areas: casework and counseling, group work, crisis intervention, assertive skills and strategies, and advocacy. Ten percent more women than men would have liked more casework and counseling. This seems to coincide with the data on the number of women as opposed to men who enter the clinical field in that more than twice as many women hold clinical positions in their current job. (See Table 4-16.)

Men, however, would have liked more preparation regarding community organization, leadership development, and fund raising. They also would have liked additional preparation in meeting with representatives of community agencies. This could be because more numerous of the female respondents are working in the direct service arena

while men tend to be in community organization jobs, and each needs mastery of specific skills that relate to their employment.

TABLE 4-16: LACK OF SATISFACTION WITH PREPARATION FOR WORK AS RELATED TO GENDER

	where genders would have liked more emphasis		N
	male	female	
Casework and Counseling	44.6%	54.9%	70
Group Work	43.9%	54.1%	71
Crisis Intervention	45.6%	70.2%	85
Assertive Skills and Strategies	44.3%	63.5%	82
Advocacy	36.1%	45.4%	62
Community Organization	33.3%	21.3%	43
Leadership Development	57.1%	44.1%	81
Fund raising	47.8%	34.0%	65
Meeting with Representatives of Community Agencies	21.4%	11.7%	26

Alumni In the Work Place:

Question 7 tracks the careers of Jewish communal workers, asking about the employment history of the alumni. Answers indicated the status of the alumni as it related to their "job setting", "job title", "full or part time employment", "length of employment", "number of people supervised" and their "necessity to relocate." By analyzing the respondents' answers a profile was obtained of the careers of the alumni.

Ninety percent (90%) of the alumni indicated they were employed full time in a Jewish setting in their first jobs. Nearly half (45%) held positions as entry level line workers or sub-department heads. One third of the respondents held positions as department heads, regional directors or unit directors in agencies. The remainder of those who responded (22%) were employed in other positions within other Jewish settings including executive directors (5%), rabbis (5%), and program directors (6%), while approximately 4% became employed outside the Jewish community. (See appendices A and D for job titles and job settings respectively.)

Table 4-17 illustrates increases in the starting salaries of alumni. Nearly one fourth (27%) of respondents who attended the program between 1968 and 1975 received salaries over \$20,000. Thirty one percent of the alumni who attended between 1976 and 1981 received salaries of more than \$20,000 while 65% of the alumni who attended between 1982 and 1987 earned salaries in excess of \$20,000. These increases though fail to account for inflation. Although there were four salary ranges between \$20,000 to \$40,000, the percentage of alumni receiving salaries over \$40,000 in their first jobs decreased after 1975. Of respondents who received over \$40,000, 80% were men. This is probably attributed to the number of alumni who attended HUC for its certificate program while they were in the

field. It is unclear whether there is currently a significant difference between starting salaries of men and women.

TABLE 4-17: SHIFTS IN FIRST JOB SALARIES
BY YEARS OF ATTENDANCE

	'68-'75	'76-'81	'82-'87	total respondents
UNDER \$20,000	73%	69%	35%	91
OVER \$20,000	27%	31%	65%	74
	N = 33	N = 61	N = 71	N = 165

Missing observations 15

Three fourths of the respondents remained in the same job for 3 1/2 years or less. Furthermore, in order to obtain their first jobs, approximately half (45%) of the respondents had to relocate. Fifty eight percent of the men relocated while only 35% of the women relocated. Except for alumni who held five jobs, a higher percentage of men than women needed to relocate for their position.

In comparison to their first jobs, 30% of respondents continued to hold positions as line workers or sub-department heads in their second jobs while 40% held middle management positions. The remainder held various positions including executive director (9%), rabbis (2%), and program directors (5%). Approximately 7% were not employed in a Jewish agency.

Salaries of alumni increased in their second job. While 55% of the respondents had salaries of \$20,000 or less for their first jobs, the same percentage had salaries of up to \$25,000 in their second jobs. This increase may be attributed to the number of alumni moving into positions with greater responsibility. There was a slight decrease in the percentage of respondents who had to relocate in order to obtain their second job and there was no significant change in the length of employment.

Fewer than half of the respondents indicated that they have held a third job since graduating from the program. Of those that had, there was a significant increase in the number of respondents employed in a variety of fields and positions outside of a Jewish setting. This increase appears to be from respondents who had held middle management positions in their second jobs. There was also a significant decrease in two categories. First, there was a decrease (from 20% to 10%) in the percentage of entry level positions held by graduates who had a third job. There was also a decrease in the percentages of respondents who had to relocate in order to obtain their third jobs (from 42% to 29%). This appears to indicate that alumni needed to be fairly mobile in the beginning of their careers. This need diminishes as they enter middle management positions. It then increases again as they move into top management. An explanation for the increase in

mobility may be due to the limited number of top management positions available.

The decrease in mobility as alumni enter middle management positions may also be attributed to family life. As alumni begin to marry and establish families, they become less mobile.

Joint Masters students tend to move more frequently for their first job (83%) than other alumni (43%). A possible explanation for this difference is the limited number of available positions in the Los Angeles area.

Salaries of graduates in their third jobs varied. Twenty six respondents (31%) indicated that they earned a salary of less than \$20,000. Another twenty four (28%) earned \$20,000 to \$30,000 while 40% indicated that they earned \$30,000 or more.

The dual degree program with USC School of Public Administration is a relatively new program with a limited number of alumni. Because only six of the respondents (3% of the total) indicated that they had attended this program, it is not possible to compare them with alumni of other programs. However, four obtained middle management positions in their first jobs while the other two were employed by the government.

Only 37 of the 180 respondents indicated that they had held a fourth job. Of those 37, 31 respondents (82%) did

not need to relocate. There was also a significant increase in the number of line workers from 12% to 20%.

In an overall assessment of the careers of alumni, most graduates remain in any job for less than five years. Furthermore, alumni tend to move to different settings as they advance in their careers. Tables 4-18 through 4-20 indicate the movement of alumni to various job settings. Table 4-18 demonstrates the movement of alumni from their first to their third job setting. Table 4-19 elaborates on this by demonstrating the differences between alumni's first and current job settings. There is a 10% decrease in the percentage of alumni employed by JCCs, a 1% increase of alumni employed by family service agencies, no change in the percentage of alumni in community relations settings and a 13% increase in percentage employed in "other" job settings. An explanation for these shifts will be addressed later.

Table 4-20 shows the shifts of first job settings of alumni by year of attendance. There has been a dramatic decrease in the percentage of alumni entering Jewish Community Centers from 32% for the first classes to 10% for the most current classes. There has been a steady increase in the number of alumni who enter "other" settings from 18% to 27%. There has also been a marked increase in the percentage of alumni entering Federations, from 9% to 23%.

TABLE 4-18: PATTERN IN JOB SETTING AND TIME IN FIELD

Job Setting	1st Job	2nd Job	3rd Job
JCC	17%	12%	14%
Federations	20%	23%	15%
Health Settings	2%	5%	6%
Family Service	14%	8%	12%
Synagogues	12%	12%	8%
Comm. Relations	5%	8%	4%
Hillel	6%	5%	1%
Other	23%	25%	37%
	N = 174	N = 140	N = 85
Missing observations	6	40	95

TABLE 4-19: SHIFTS IN JOB SETTINGS - FIRST JOB AND CURRENT

Job Setting	1st Job	Current Job	Percentage Change
JCC	17%	7%	-10%
Federations	20%	19%	- 1%
Family Service	14%	10%	- 4%
Health Setting	2%	5%	+ 3%
Comm. Relations	6%	6%	0%
Synagogues	12%	15%	+ 3%
Hillel	6%	3%	- 3%
Other	23%	36%	+13%
	N = 174	N = 173	
Missing observations	6	7	

TABLE 4-20: SHIFTS IN FIRST JOB SETTINGS
BY YEAR OF ATTENDANCE

Job Settings	'68-'75	'76-'81	'82-'87
JCC	32%	19%	10%
Federations	9%	24%	23%
Family Service	15%	11%	15%
Health Setting	0%	3%	1%
Comm. Relations	12%	5%	4%
Synagogues	15%	11%	11%
Hillel	0%	5%	8%
Other	17%	22%	27%
	N = 34	N = 63	N = 71
Missing observations	1	3	2

These shifts can be partially explained by the changes in status and role that the various Jewish organizations play in the Jewish community. For example, JCCs do not play as dominant a role in the Jewish community in the 1980s as they did in the 1960s and 1970s. This may be partially due to the increasing service of non-Jewish clientele. Salary levels have also not kept pace with Federations. This combination of salary and community status may explain this.

The Jewish communal service field is becoming increasingly professional. As organizations become more mature and complex, they look toward a staff with more professional education. Therefore, as organizations

compete for professionals holding advanced degrees who "specialize" in the field of Jewish communal service, graduates have a variety of settings from which to choose. This increase in percentage of students entering "other" settings indicate that students are becoming more qualified to enter more diverse settings. This may be attributed to the variety of programs that are currently being offered through HUC.

The interest of students themselves in entering "other" settings should not be discounted. Alumni indicated that the four most important criteria for accepting their first jobs were 1) "opportunity for professional growth and advancement", 2) "variety of responsibilities", 3) "the mission of the work" and 4) "personal job satisfaction." This will be discussed more thoroughly later.

There is a trend though for students not to enter settings that are either non-Jewish or Jewish settings that are seen as less "establishment."

As might be expected, the specific program that alumni attended influenced their first job settings. Of the 50 Certificate respondents, ten (20%) were employed by synagogues in their first job, while three of the six Joint Masters respondents were employed by synagogues. This can be attributed to the number of rabbinic students enrolled in the Certificate program and the number of education

students who eventually become educators in synagogues. Social work students were more likely to work in Federations, JCCs and Family Service agencies than other students.

There is a difference in the career levels of men and women. Although women constitute 58% (103) of the alumni who responded, they represent only 36% (18) of the top two levels of management in agencies. (See Appendix D) The data are skewed due to a higher percentage in the early years. Between 1968 and 1975, 71% (25) of the alumni were men. However, the number of alumni who attended during these years (35) compromise only 20% of all respondents. Since more men have been in the field longer than women, it can be expected that men are found in higher managerial positions. However, even by taking this into account, women still tend to be under represented in top levels of management. Of the 48 top level positions held by alumni, 30 (63%) are held by men. Men also comprise 30% of the 51 middle management positions, while only 31% of the 31 entry level positions.

As previously mentioned, mobility is important for career advancement, especially for entry level and executive level positions. Women tend to be less mobile than men. Fifty eight percent (58%) of men moved for their first job as compared to 35% of the women. (See Table 4-21.) This is despite only women attending "high mobility"

Joint Masters and Gerontology programs, where seven of the nine participants relocated for their first jobs.

TABLE 4-21: RELOCATING FOR EMPLOYMENT

	Overall Percentage	Male	Female	total respondents
1st Job	45%	58%	35%	171
2nd Job	42%	57%	30%	136
3rd Job	29%	35%	25%	86
4th Job	16%	24%	10%	38

Women's inability to move as easily as men may be due to a large percentage of women being married and having children. Table 4-22 indicates that 19% of the women who responded, indicated that one criterion in accepting their first job was either to remain close to a parent, other family member (e.g. child), partner or significant other.

TABLE 4-22: IMPORTANCE OF STAYING CLOSE TO FAMILY, CHILDREN, SPOUSE/SIGNIFICANT OTHER IN CHOOSING JOBS

	overall percentage	Male	Female	total respondents
1st Job	16%	12%	19%	145
Current Job	21%	18%	21%	108

This percentage rises to 21% for their current jobs. Twelve percent (12%) stated that these criteria influenced

them in selecting their first job and 18% indicated that they were a factor in accepting their current job. As one female respondent commented, "I moved not for my job but for my husband's job." This is further supported by Table 4-23, which indicates that women tend to work part time more often than men, though both work part time more often as they advance in their careers. For example, for those in their sixth job, 38% are part time employees as compared to 10% who are part time employees in their first job. This may again be due to women needing to care for children. However, when asked how many children under age 18 are currently living with them, there was no significant difference between men and women. The limitation of mobility hinders the career advancement of women.

TABLE 4-23: WORKING PART TIME

	overall percentage	Male	Female	total respondents
1st Job	10%	10%	11%	173
2nd Job	14%	5%	20%	136
3rd Job	17%	6%	24%	84
4th Job	29%	18%	40%	38

Women tend to continue entering job settings traditionally held by women. Of the 99 female respondents who indicated job settings, 18 (18%) are in synagogues. Of those 18, four are rabbis or assistant rabbis and 13 work

in education. In contrast, of the 72 men who indicated job settings, 7 (10%) worked in synagogues; four are rabbis and two are in education. These differences can be attributed to the imbalance between men and women entering the rabbinate and Jewish education fields respectively. Furthermore, 27 women indicated that they are currently working in health settings, family service agencies and JCCs, as compared to 19 men in the same settings. In contrast, where 35% of men (25) are currently working in Federations and community relations settings only 17% (17) of women work in these settings.

Finally, though some alumni do find employment outside the Jewish community, a much larger percentage remain within the community (75%-85%). Table 4-19 illustrates that 36% of the 172 respondents indicated that they work in "other" settings, meaning those not listed. These settings include Jewish and non-Jewish agencies or placements. It was not possible to obtain an exact figure because of how the question was phrased. However, by examining the various "other" settings respondents indicated, an approximation was obtained. Furthermore, though some alumni may not be "employed" in a Jewish setting full time, they indicated that their experience at HUC was valuable, as is evident by the following comments:

"Although I was not planning to work within the Jewish community, I benefited greatly on a personal level."

"The degree and my experience at HUC were both helpful in my work experience and both in and out of the Jewish community and volunteer work."

"Currently [I] apply what I learned in one of the largest non-Jewish minority communities in the US and have notable success and been positively received. It is highly transferable."

"Even though I am not at a Jewish agency, my HUC experience was invaluable."

Respondents who remain working for Jewish agencies tend to work in a variety of different Jewish settings throughout their careers.

Criteria for Alumni Accepting First and Current Jobs:

Table 4-24 demonstrates the four most important factors in accepting first and current jobs. Forty three percent (43%) indicated "opportunity for professional growth and advancement", 40% responded "variety of responsibilities", while 34% indicated both "the mission of the work" and "personal job satisfaction" (34%). In accepting their current jobs, "opportunities for professional growth and advancement" (57%), "personal job satisfaction" (43%) and "the variety of responsibilities" (29%) were the three most important influences, while the "mission of the work" (27%) ranked fourth.

TABLE 4-24: CRITERIA FOR ACCEPTING FIRST AND CURRENT JOBS

	1st Job	Current Job
Opportunity for professional growth and advancement	43%	57%
Variety of responsibilities	40%	29%
Mission of the work	34%	27%
Personal job satisfaction	34%	43%
	N = 142	N = 108

Before assessing these differences, an inconsistency in attributing criteria must be noted for those who have only had one job. This population inconsistently attributed their criteria to their "current job" or their "first job". This said, there was a 14% increase in the importance of "the opportunity for professional growth and advancement" and a 9% increase in "personal job satisfaction". There was a decrease in the importance of "variety of responsibility" and "mission of the work". Possibly alumni begin to specialize in their job skills. Thus, use of their specialties is more important than the agency's "mission of the work".

In addition, alumni become concerned with becoming more proficient in a field which becomes increasingly competitive as one advances. As one respondent indicated, "You get pragmatic as you get older! Idealism jades."

This may also explain why some alumni will work at different jobs settings during their career or leave the field entirely.

Alumni who graduated during specific time periods indicated shifts in criteria for accepting first and current jobs. However, there was no consistent pattern to these shifts. (See Tables 4-25 and 4-26) There was a significant increase in the percentage of respondents who indicated that the "highest salary offered" was an important consideration in accepting their current jobs (from 4% to 25%). Graduates become increasingly concerned with income levels as personal and professional responsibilities increase.

TABLE 4-25: CRITERIA FOR ACCEPTING FIRST JOB
BY YEAR OF ATTENDANCE

	overall percentage	'68-'75	'76-'81	'82-'87
Opportunity for professional growth and advancement	43%	54%	41%	41%
Variety of responsibilities	40%	46%	43%	34%
Mission of the work	34%	35%	27%	50%
Personal job satisfaction	34%	42%	31%	34%
	N = 142	N = 26	N = 52	N = 64

TABLE 4-26: CRITERIA FOR ACCEPTING CURRENT JOB

	overall percentage	'68-'75	'76-'81	'82-'87
Opportunity for professional growth and advancement	57%	43%	58%	61%
Variety of responsibilities	29%	43%	23%	22%
Mission of the work	27%	26%	26%	27%
Personal job satisfaction	43%	35%	46%	42%
	N = 105	N = 23	N = 42	N = 40

The vast majority of the respondents felt their attendance at HUC made a difference in the way they are perceived and how they perceive themselves in the work place. Sixty-four percent (111) of the respondents felt that they were better able to work with lay people and three fourths of the respondents felt that they were a Jewish representative of the community due to attending the program. Thirty-nine percent (64) of the respondents definitely felt they were selected over other candidates in obtaining their jobs because they are HUC alumni. Twenty-four percent thought that it might have helped while thirty-seven percent (60) didn't think so. (See Table 4-27)

Only 10% (18) of the respondents felt that being an HUC alumni definitely helped them achieve greater responsibility while 14% definitely felt that it assisted

them in receiving a higher salary. In contrast, 72% (119) and 69% (112) did not feel that being an HUC alumni affected their salaries or responsibilities. (Tables 4-28 and 4-29.) Though alumni feel that the program helps them enter the field of Jewish Communal Service, they do not feel it helps them obtain higher salaries or increased responsibilities. Alumni who graduate in later years felt that the degree from the school was more influential than those who attended earlier. This may be due either to the increased reputation of the school or that many of the alumni in the first years were certificate students who were employed in the field.

TABLE 4-27: BEING SELECTED/PROMOTED OVER OTHER CANDIDATES BECAUSE OF HUC PROGRAM - BY YEAR OF ATTENDANCE

	overall percentage	'68-'75	'76-'81	'82-'87
Definitely	39%	29%	44%	39%
I think so	24%	15%	23%	30%
Probably not	37%	56%	33%	30%
	N = 164	N = 34	N = 61	N = 69

TABLE 4-28: RECEIVING GREATER RESPONSIBILITY BECAUSE OF THE HUC PROGRAM - BY YEAR OF ATTENDANCE

	overall percentage	'68-'75	'76-'81	'82-87
Definitely	14%	9%	18%	12%
I think so	24%	9%	18%	22%
Probably not	37%	82%	64%	66%
	N = 163	N = 31	N = 62	N = 70

TABLE 4-29: RECEIVING A HIGHER SALARY BECAUSE OF
THE HUC PROGRAM - BY YEAR OF ATTENDANCE

	overall percentage	'68-'75	'76-'81	'82-'87
Definitely	10%	6%	15%	9%
I think so	24%	12%	16%	23%
Probably not	37%	82%	70%	69%
	N = 166	N = 34	N = 62	N = 70

Evaluation of Secular and Non Secular Skills Obtained:

Alumni were asked to evaluate skills and knowledge obtained at HUC and how they helped in preparing them for their first job. Fifty percent or more of the respondents reported they would have liked more education in almost half of the skills listed. Over 50% of the respondents would have liked to acquire more knowledge in a number of areas: casework and counseling (70), group work (71), crisis intervention (85), assertiveness skill strategies (82), lobbying (81), policy formulation/analysis (81), supervision (90), staff development and training (101), writing grants and proposals (102), computer skills (114), human resource development (80), and public relations/publicity (89). (The number in the parenthesis refers to the number of respondents who indicated this desire). Though there were some shifts by year of attendance of graduates, no significant changes occurred.

Alumni who attended the George Warren Brown program represent 20% (16) of respondents enrolled in double Masters social work programs at either GWB or USC (63). When compared to USC alumni, GWB alumni indicated they generally felt less prepared for entering the field. A larger proportion of GWB alumni indicated they lack a variety of skills. Table 4-30 illustrates the differences between USC and GWB alumni.

TABLE 4-30: OVERALL DIFFERENCES BETWEEN USC AND GWB SOCIAL WORK STUDENTS - DESIRE FOR INCREASED SKILLS

	overall percentage	USC	GWB	total respondents
casework and counseling	62%	44%	80%	76
group work	59%	54%	63%	75
crisis intervention	64%	59%	69%	74
assertiveness skills	57%	51%	63%	73
advocacy	40%	42%	38%	75
lobbying	44%	56%	31%	75
policy formulation	47%	49%	44%	77
supervision	62%	48%	75%	77
community org.	25%	11%	38%	78
administration	53%	38%	69%	77
leadership dev.	49%	47%	50%	76
staff dev.	66%	57%	75%	76
staff consult.	39%	28%	50%	76

TABLE 4-30: OVERALL DIFFERENCES BETWEEN USC AND
GWB SOCIAL WORK STUDENTS - DESIRE FOR
INCREASED SKILLS (Continued)

	overall percentage	USC	GWB	total respondents
fund raising	32%	26%	38%	78
grant writing	65%	61%	69%	77
computer skills	82%	84%	80%	70
research	24%	15%	33%	76
program dev.	34%	36%	31%	77
writing skills	27%	13%	40%	75
hum. res. dev.	46%	42%	50%	76
community relations	37%	35%	38%	79
p.r./publicity	59%	55%	63%	76
meeting agency reps	14%	8%	19%	78
meeting community groups	29%	20%	38%	76
meeting public officials	42%	46%	38%	75
staff committees	36%	27%	44%	79
work w/boards & lay	32%	25%	38%	79
work w/service volunteers	32%	26%	38%	78
work w/other volunteers	31%	24%	38%	75
	N = 79	N = 63	N = 16	N = 79

These differences may be attributed to the differences in the schools' curricula and formats rather than to specifics lacking in the HUC program. For instance, GWB

students indicated a greater desire for clinical skills than USC students. This may be due to USC requiring clinical placements for all first year students.

The three "secular" skills used most often by alumni are "working with boards and lay people" (40%), administration (27%) and fund raising (22%). (see Table 4-31.) Men used these skills more frequently than women (see Table 4-32.) They were also less satisfied than women with their preparation of those skills at HUC (see Table 4-34.) In contrast women use clinical skills more frequently than men. Nearly one forth of the women indicated that casework and counseling, and group work were two of the three skills they used most often compared to approximately 10% for men. More women tend to go into "traditional" settings but they still have been unable to advance to management levels where they would be more likely to use the other skills. Furthermore they tend to be more satisfied with the quantity of "overall" used skills than men. This indicates that alumni would like to acquire more of the skills that they use most.

The majority of respondents felt that they had an adequate amount of training in the three skills used most often. Though there are skills and knowledge areas that respondents would like to see increased (see Table 4-30.) they feel adequately prepared to use those skills and knowledge bases which they need most often. (Table 4-33.)

TABLE 4-31: SECULAR SKILLS USED MOST OFTEN -
BY YEAR OF ATTENDANCE

	overall percentage	'68-75	'76-81	'82-'87	total respondents
working with boards/lay	40%	42%	40%	35%	61
administra- tion	27%	21%	37%	20%	42
fund raising	22%	21%	23%	18%	32
	N = 173	N = 35	N = 65	N = 73	

TABLE 4-32: SECULAR SKILLS USED MOST OFTEN - BY GENDER

	overall percentage	Male	Female	total respondents
working with boards/lay	40%	50%	34%	66
administration	27%	31%	24%	44
fund raising	22%	31%	14%	34
	N = 177	N = 74	N = 103	

TABLE 4-33: HAD AT LEAST ENOUGH PREPARATION FOR
SECULAR SKILLS USED MOST OFTEN -
BY YEAR OF ATTENDANCE

	overall percentage	'68-'75	'76-'81	'82-'87	total respondents
working with lay/ boards	62%	61%	60%	62%	163
adminis- tration	60%	47%	41%	64%	159
fund raising	60%	40%	64%	65%	159
	N = 173	N = 35	N = 65	N = 73	

TABLE 4-34: HAD AT LEAST ENOUGH PREPARATION OF THE SECULAR SKILLS USED MOST OFTEN - BY GENDER

	overall percentage	Male	Female	total respondents
working with boards/lay	61%	58%	62%	168
administration	60%	53%	54%	164
fund raising	60%	52%	66%	155
	N = 177	N = 74	N = 103	

Alumni were also asked to evaluate the Jewish skills and knowledge acquired at HUC. A majority of respondents felt that they were well prepared in all the listed categories of Jewish skills and knowledge. The two exceptions were Hebrew, which has never been offered, due to the time constraints caused by an already extended curriculum, and Jewish aspects of emotional issues. Of the Jewish skills and knowledge learned, respondents indicated that the three which they utilize most often at work are a knowledge of the Jewish community (52%), knowledge of contemporary Jewish issues (46%) and knowledge of Jewish values (36%). (See Table 4-35.) Though as previously stated, there are skills and knowledge areas that respondents would like to see increased, they report being adequately prepared to use those Jewish skills and knowledge bases which they need most often.

TABLE 4-35: NON-SECULAR SKILLS USED MOST OFTEN -
BY YEAR OF ATTENDANCE

	overall percentage	'68-'75	'76-'81	'82-'87	total respondents
Knowledge of Jewish Community	52%	68%	43%	53%	74
Knowledge of Contemporary Jewish issues	46%	36%	48%	47%	63
Knowledge of Jewish values	36%	43%	40%	28%	135
	N = 173	N = 35	N = 65	N = 73	

In comparing GWB alumni evaluation of the Jewish skills and knowledge obtained with USC alumni, the former desired more skill/courses. Table 36 illustrates the percentage of alumni in the GWB and USC programs who wanted increased Jewish skills. Overall, alumni appear more satisfied with the quantity of non-secular skills than of the secular skills.

While differences between the USC and GWB alumni are generally statistically insignificant, those that do exist may be attributed to several factors. Those skills which GWB alumni may feel they lack may be attributed to USC students having continuous contact with HUC for two full years.

TABLE 4-36: GWB AND USC ALUMNI DESIRE FOR INCREASED
JEWISH SKILLS/COURSES

Jewish Skills	overall percentage	USC	GWB	total respondents
Jewish values	14%	13%	13%	75
Jewish ethics	26%	22%	31%	75
Jewish practice/rituals	33%	25%	40%	75
Jewish ethnic groups	32%	32%	31%	75
Organization of Jew. Comm.	5%	3%	6%	76
Scripture	36%	40%	31%	76
Jewish history	30%	28%	31%	76
Jewish Literature	31%	24%	38%	75
Contemporary Jew. issues	37%	37%	38%	76
Hebrew	56%	52%	60%	67
Jewish family life	7%	7%	6%	77
Sociology/demog. Jew. people	16%	18%	13%	76
Aspects of emotional issues	61%	58%	63%	76
N = 99 N = 63 N = 16				

There were more Double Masters USC graduates reporting being used as a Jewish resource than reported by GWB graduates. Furthermore, 14 (88%) of the sixteen GWB graduates indicated that the HUC and GWB programs complimented each other while only 44 (72%) of the USC graduates indicated that their programs complemented each other. Twenty-six percent (16) of the USC alumni stated

that what they learned at HUC was irrelevant to what they learned at USC as compared to only 13% (2) of GWB alumni. This creates a paradox. The USC-GWB programs are intended to facilitate students' abilities in entering the field. However, though USC Double Masters social work students indicate they feel better prepared to enter the field than GWB students, they are more likely to view the two programs as contradictory and irrelevant than GWB students.

Possibly, students who bring strong career orientations to the program at the onset are more likely to experience conflicts due to the different tracks each school emphasizes. HUC emphasizes a Community Organization Planning and Administration (COPA) track while the first year of USC is clinically oriented.

Typical comments were:

"There was tremendous pressure to enter [the] community organization track. Little option or emphasis was placed on clinical skills to the detriment of the HUC program and its students. This was also reflected in the lack of clinical social work faculty."

"[The] program was geared to CO students. Clinically oriented students got inadequate 'support', treated as second-class. The attitude that prevailed was that the CO concentration was a more important group of people."

"Had HUC respected clinical work and explained the relevance to the COPA people, there would have been less alienation of the two clinical people and more integration for COPA people."

"There was great dynamic tension over our thesis; HUC pushing for Jewish research, USC focusing in on minority relevance. It was

however a valuable experience negotiating competitive systems."

"I have a very strong negative feeling toward the first year field placement, my career path is/was oriented toward COPA. The first year USC placement is 'generic', which usually means clinical. There I found the clinical experience to be of little use in my practice or grounding for every day use."

"I often felt that I was 'different' than the other students because I was always interested in being a clinician. This goal was not encouraged by the school [HUC] as they were interested in training [people for] community agencies."

Since GWB students tend to have two COPA placements, they feel the programs complement each other more often. However, the clinical skills acquired at USC appear to be an important component for the preparation of students in both tracks.

A possible explanation for USC students who feel that they lack non-secular skills more than GWB students may be that they compare themselves to rabbinic and education students with whom they have more contact. The latter groups are generally better versed in Jewish text and knowledge. There was an almost even split among the respondents concerning their feeling of being utilized as a Jewish resource due to their degree. Of the 169 respondents who indicated whether they felt they were used as a Jewish resource because of their degree, 53% (89) felt they are/were, while 47% are/were not. This contrasts with 85% of respondents who indicated that their attendance at HUC made them a Jewish resource in their work places.

Alumni may feel they are a Jewish resource and their colleagues and clients may even consider them as such, but respondents are often not utilized as Jewish resources. Some rabbinic/certificate students and education/communal service students may be seen more specifically as Jewish resources because of their other degrees. "Because of my degree in Jewish Education others see me as a 'Jewish resource'."

Only one out of six Public Administration students felt himself to be a Jewish resource. There was also a marked difference between the responses of USC and GWB social work graduates. Of the fifteen GWB graduates that responded, only one third indicated that they were used as a Jewish resource, while more than 60% of the sixty USC graduates indicated in the same way. This may also indicate that GWB graduates do not feel as prepared in their Jewish skills as USC graduates.

Of those 89 graduates who indicated that they were used as a Jewish resource, 40% were proud of and 41% felt that being used as a Jewish resource was part of the role of a Jewish communal worker. A very small percentage resented it or felt that being used as a Jewish resource was a burden.

Alumni Expectations:

Alumni were asked to evaluate their expectations prior to entering the field with the realities encountered in the field. Over 60% of respondents indicated that they were well prepared for the realities of the field. The only exception concerned the "professionalism of the field". (See Table 4-37) Fifty-one percent of the 166 respondents indicated it was at least what they expected, while 49% indicated that it was worse than they expected. A high percentage (47%) of social work students indicated their job satisfaction was worse than expected. In contrast, thirty-three percent or less of the students in other disciplines indicated their job satisfaction was worse than expected.

When asked if they were to start over again, of the 74 social workers who responded, 43 (52%) indicated that they would enroll in the Double Masters program with social work. In contrast, the 82 alumni enrolled in the other programs who responded, fewer than 30% (23) would enroll in their original programs. Twenty percent (31) of all respondents would choose to do "other" programs, while 9% (14) would enroll in an MSW, MBA or MPA program without a degree in Jewish communal service. Only one individual would enroll in a Jewish communal service program at another institution.

TABLE 4-37: ALUMNI EXPECTATIONS MET VIS-A-VIS
REALITIES OF THE FIELD - BY YEAR OF
ATTENDANCE

Expec- tations vis-a-vis:	overall percentage	'68-'75	'76-'81	'82-'87	total respondents
respect from lay leaders	75%	76%	75%	75%	152
working with lay leaders	78%	76%	74%	83%	152
salary	64%	69%	64%	62%	159
"profes- sionalism" of field	51%	47%	47%	55%	161
impact- job on personal life	67%	72%	58%	72%	161
Jewish commitment of colleagues	63%	56%	66%	61%	157
job satisfaction	79%	84%	71%	82%	157
career advancement	68%	76%	64%	68%	159
necessity to relocate	93%	87%	90%	97%	143
	N = 173	N = 35	N = 65	N = 73	

These figures indicate that there is a high degree of dissatisfaction with the program that alumni chose. However, a large majority of alumni (approximately 75% or

111 of 156 who responded to the question) indicated that, if they were able to begin again, they would obtain a Certificate or degree in Jewish communal service. (This does not include alumni who indicated that they would choose a single Masters in Jewish education or rabbinic degree.) Therefore, alumni may desire to obtain different skills because they are not adequately trained for their job settings. They may also wish to change their current job settings for personal or professional reasons (e.g. salaries, responsibilities, etc.). At least forty percent (18) of Certificate graduates indicated that they would choose to pursue a graduate degree in Jewish communal service. (See Table 4-38.)

TABLE 4-38: SATISFACTION OF ALUMNI WITH PROGRAM CHOSEN

PROGRAM	NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS	SAME PROGRAM	CHANGE PROGRAM
Certificate	45	31%	69%
MAJCS	18	33%	67%
MAJCS/PA	5	40%	60%
MSW/MAJCS	74	52%	48%
MA Gerontology and MAJCS	3	33%	66%
Joint Masters	5	0%	100%
	N = 150	N = 66	N = 84

Networking:

Alumni were asked to whom they most likely turn to for learning about jobs, discussing professional/work related issues, deciding about job changes or career moves, deciding about remaining in the field of Jewish communal service, discussing personal matters. About 50% did not differentiate between alumni and other colleagues except to discuss personal matters and to decide about remaining in the field. For the former, only 30% of all respondents did not differentiate, while for the latter, 40% did not differentiate.

Individuals who did differentiate, consistently indicated that they would turn to other colleagues more frequently than to other alumni. This may be an indication that alumni do not have close or continuous contact with one another after graduation. Many may not work in close proximity to other alumni and therefore, may not have easy access to other graduates (see Table 4-39.) These findings

TABLE 4-39: NETWORKING WITH ALUMNI

CATEGORIES	HUC ALUMNI	OTHER COLLEAGUES	BOTH	OTHER	TOTAL RESPONDENTS
Find out about other jobs	10%	29%	51%	10%	175
Discuss work related issues	7%	37%	52%	4%	175
Decide about job changes	11%	25%	49%	15%	175
Decide to remain in JCS	11%	19%	41%	30%	173
Discuss personal matters	6%	18%	30%	47%	175

are generally consistent by year of graduation, gender and program, except for Joint Masters students who, if they differentiated, would most likely turn to alumni.

Alumni were asked to indicate their interest in participating in school activities. There were mixed responses. (See Table 4-40). Over 75% (133) of the 174 respondents indicated no interest in raising money for the

TABLE 4-40: WILLINGNESS TO PARTICIPATE IN SCHOOL ACTIVITIES - BY YEAR OF ATTENDANCE

	overall percentage	'86-'74	'76-'81	'82-87	total respondents
Attend continuing ed. classes at HUC	47%	40%	40%	58%	169
Sit on JCS school comm.	36%	43%	22%	46%	169
Recruit new students	41%	37%	32%	54%	169
Interview applicants	62%	51%	62%	72%	169
Raise money for JCS school	24%	26%	13%	31%	169
Help college relations w/other alumni	22%	26%	13%	30%	169
Serving as mentor to JCS students	56%	60%	49%	62%	169
	N = 173	N = 35	N = 65	N = 73	

school or in helping the college maintain relations with other alumni. However, of those willing to raise money for the school, 34% (25) were male, while only 16% (16) were female. Furthermore, twenty-seven percent (20) of the men were interested in helping maintain college relations with other alumni as compared to 17% (17) of women. In contrast, over 55% of alumni expressed an interest in interviewing applicants and serving as mentors. While fifty-nine percent of the women who responded would participate in continuing education courses at HUC, only 32% of male respondents indicated similarly.

Respondents who graduated between 1976 and 1981 were generally less likely to become involved in school activities. This may be an indication that this group was less satisfied with their education, possibly because this period is characterized by many changes in the HUC curriculum.

Though most alumni obtained financial support from the school, the majority are not interested in helping the school raise funds. Furthermore, alumni generally do not wish to participate in school activities unless those activities involve individuals students. A possible reason for this is that alumni do not identify with the school as an institution as much as they identify with students within the school. Alumni may also feel dissatisfied with

the school and/or the field than generally realized. The next chapter deals with the recommendations growing out of this study.

CHAPTER FIVE

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

As previously noted, the School of Jewish Communal Service (SJCS) was founded in 1968. In its early years, the mission of the institution was to upgrade the Jewish commitment and background of the professionals already in the field. Later, the school adjusted to the changing needs of its students and of the field and altered its mission to educating and preparing students to enter the profession. Overall, the mission of the SJCS has remained the same: to prepare students to work in the field of Jewish communal service, at many levels. The current research was undertaken to explore whether or not the school is attaining its goals.

In formulating conclusions, the researchers felt it imperative to highlight the overall satisfaction respondents indicated concerning Jewish content. This finding demonstrates that the school has indeed generally been successful in attaining the aforementioned goal.

In developing the program of the School of Jewish Communal Service, a balance was sought between the cognitive and emotional, contemporary and historical,

intellectual and ideological.¹ In order to achieve such a balance, the inclusion of extra-curricular activities was necessary. Thus, the HUC experience included a camp weekend, evening discussion seminars and cocurricular days. As a result, collegial relationships develop among students, enriching the total ambience of the school. Typical were these responses: "Evening seminar brought out less formal teaching opportunities, camp bonded the class more tightly, case presentations gave us a taste of the real thing instead of just the academic perspective" and "Jewish philosophies: rituals were explored during [camp] weekend, case presentations [provided] examples of how to apply practice principles to problems [and were] always helpful".

The research findings, including comments made by respondents, support the importance of more than just curriculum. When asked to comment on their HUC experience, respondents typically stated, "Learning, meeting staff and students, community building . . . gave me a great feeling of togetherness, and also different perspectives to the learning experience at HUC." Another indicated, "It was a nice Jewish communal experience affording an opportunity to become connected to a network of significant Jewish professionals."

¹Gerald Bubis, "The Birth of a School," Central Conference of American Rabbis Journal, 1971, p. 2-20.

Recommendations regarding the Jewish component of HUC's School of Jewish Communal Service, include a continuation of the high caliber of subjects and experience provided. However, as gathered from the data, both Public Administration students and those who have attended Washington University's George Warren Brown School of Social Work, tended to be less satisfied with their overall Jewish experience as students. This may be because they are not at HUC for the full two years and/or are dissatisfied with the social work emphasis of the school. Although their time at HUC is more intensive, 18 of the 56 HUC credits they take during that year do not deal specifically with Jewish subject matter. In their year away from HUC, no formal possibility to study Jewish subject matter is available. Thus, some organized Jewish course work while they are at their secular institution, should be made available. Further exploration is also needed to determine if their time at HUC could be better spent with a more in depth focus in areas of Jewish relevance.

Where USC students spend two years at HUC in Los Angeles, GWB students spend only one. Therefore, GWB students do not have ongoing contact with HUC and all the activities which are an undeniable part of it. As a result, they also do not have as much access to full time HUC faculty.

Several specific recommendations can be made concerning the general dissatisfaction of the Public Administration students while they are at HUC. Public Administration students have expressed a dissatisfaction with what they perceive as a social work bias in their SJCS courses. To counter this, HUC should consider removing the social work emphasis in the texts, professors, and socialization provided for these students. HUC should consider inviting Public Administration professors to teach these classes, thus removing the bias from those Public Administration classes that must be taken at HUC. If it is possible, however, the majority of non-Jewish coursework should be taken at USC. HUC should also explore using text and materials from the not-for-profit and human resource development literature rather than social work materials. If HUC is committed to the Public Administration program and to the validity of the degree's use in the Jewish community these changes should be seriously investigated and implemented.

Gender Differences:

As a result of the high response rate, it was possible to determine certain attitudes with regard to gender differences. No consistent trends became evident by gender vis a vis the amount of subject areas taught. Nor were there gender differences noted within the school's curriculum; alumni felt equally treated. However, gender

differences do become apparent when alumni report experiences in their work settings. Men are in community-oriented and administrative positions to a higher degree than women, who tend to hold more direct service positions. Of all executive respondents, 72% are male and 28% are female. Of all the men surveyed 44% hold executive or sub-executive positions whereas only 19% of the women are executives or sub-executives (see Appendix D for job titles). Executive positions include Executive Director and Associate Director. Sub-executive positions include: Regional Director, Unit Director, and Director of Social Services.

The findings concur with the literature on the upward mobility of women. As discussed by Rosenberg, Jewish women in community life often feel under utilized by male Jewish community leaders. Further, women have not been able to advance to the same extent as men have in their chosen profession.² As shown in the data, women still tend to be under represented in higher levels of management.

Women are in a double bind. The prevalent power structure is such that no matter how good the training at HUC, women are prohibited from advancing at the same rate as men. According to Bubis, men, using the qualities of forthrightness and assertiveness, are considered dynamic

²Janet Rosenberg, "From Patriarchy to Partnership-The Evolving of the Jewish Women," JJCS, 55, 1979, p. 339-344.

and charismatic in their ability to energize and organize others. Women, on the other hand, when using the same qualities, are perceived as too pushy and aggressive in struggling to attain positions of power equal to their male counterparts.³

Two comments were typical of the above view:

"While my experience at HUC was one of the most rewarding experiences of my life, the skills and Jewish communal service background could not save me from the "politic" of Jewish lay leadership and the "old boy network" which ended my 20 year career in the Jewish Community Center a year before I had planned to retire at age 52."

"HUC built me up too much. Despite the fact that I am an HUC/GWB grad and I was trained as a professional Jewish communal service worker - my colleagues treat me as they treat every other young woman. As a matter of fact, I feel as if I, as a trained Jewish communal professional, am before my time in the field."

Technological Advances:

In the domain of technological advances the findings conformed to previously cited work. As already indicated, the field is expanding at a rapid pace. The main areas of expansion are in the realm of computers and advanced use of accounting and budgeting skills.⁴ Thus, respondents indication of the need for additional course work in the

³Gerald Bubis, "Women in Leadership," JJCS, 59, 1983, p. 237-240.

⁴Solomon Greenfield, "Perspectives on Executive Function," JJCS, 56, 1971-1980, p. 165-171.

areas of administration, budgeting, marketing, and computers should not come as a surprise.

The need for an understanding of computers was evident by the following respondent's comment: "I do believe that HUC needs to consider additional high tech/business skill options. I find basic computer skills to be of growing importance." The above statement exhibits a recommendation concurrent with the researchers' findings. To this end, the school should acquire computers. Additionally, if budgeting and fiscal management is to be taught in a manner relevant to the field, then this course must address the basics: the practical skills of computer use and elementary accounting.

HUC should take on these responsibilities because the majority of alumni holding their third job are in management positions in Jewish agencies. Due to the changing realities of the field, these skills are necessary in all areas of Jewish communal work. While all students attending the SJCS program attend classes at HUC Los Angeles, they do not necessarily attend another institution in addition nor participate in the same programs at those institutions. Hence, teaching the computer and budgeting skills at HUC would insure that all SJCS graduates have this preparation. The burden of teaching the necessary computer skills should fall upon HUC rather than on the multiple schools and departments of the secular

institutions involved. It is therefore recommended, that HUC begin developing a substantial computer training center, bringing itself and its students into the technological era.

The Cost of the Program:

The cost of the SJCS program was a key issue for many alumni. Four-fifths of the students needed to borrow a great deal of money to attend the school. This is especially true in the case of dual degree students, for whom the cost of two programs borders on the prohibitive. Ironically, these students who often owe the greatest amounts of money are also those who are not yet established in jobs and must often take entry-level positions in the field upon graduation.

In the open-ended portions of the questionnaire, many individuals expressed an added frustration about the cost of the program. One subject recommended: "More financial aid. Too much debt for a low paying profession." Another stated that he would not have been able to participate in the program had it not been for financial help from parents. A third respondent seemed to articulate the central concern: "In 1988, I have difficulty understanding why individuals would spend so much money to attend a program when salaries are so absurdly low." Thus, alumni who graduate with a substantial debt may never be compensated in their work commensurate with the size of

their debt. The questions then become: Is such a costly education worthwhile for a field with such comparatively low financial rewards? What will be the ultimate result of this dilemma? One comment from an alumnus painted the bleakest scenario: "I emerged from HUC heavily in debt and would not consider ever working for another Jewish agency under any circumstances." Will the program continue to train Jewish communal workers who cannot afford to work in the Jewish community?

What then, becomes the responsibility of the School of Jewish Communal Service to address the issue of financial indebtedness? This study represents the first time that alumni have "spoken out" on this issue and shown their dissatisfaction with the disparity between HUC debts and the financial awards they can accrue in the field. The literature reiterates this disparity. Organizations and agencies in the Jewish community want more highly trained professionals, yet do not show a commitment to their professionals by providing appropriate salaries and benefits⁵.

It is vital that the College administration take note of this important warning sign and begin to evaluate courses of action. Much can be done to begin to alleviate

⁵Gerald Bubis, et al, "The Consumer Report: Hiring of Entry-Level Jewish Communal Workers," 62, 1985, p. 103-107.

this problem and create more incentives for professionals to remain in the field.

If the field of Jewish communal service wants skilled professionals, it needs to be strongly encouraged to "put its money where its mouth is." As was stated in the literature review, many, including Bubis, have begun to exert pressure on the field to pay higher salaries for entry level Jewish communal workers. Additionally, there must be more assistance given to families in terms of shared jobs, more time for quality experience in the home, low cost mortgages, resettlement costs and tuition credits or subsidies. Child care is another need to be considered as such a high number of professionals in the field are married.⁶ Such issues and possible responses must be given further attention.

Perhaps, this stance could be strengthened if a consortium of graduates of Schools of Jewish communal service is formed, in which these students agree not to work for less than a given salary. Entering professionals need to unite and put pressure on the community in order to obtain results. There is a tremendous disparity between the amount of debt and starting salaries. This must be addressed if there is to be continued encouragement to enter the field.

⁶Gerald Bubis, "Recruitment and Retention of Professional Staff for Jewish Communal Service," JJCS, 60, 1984, p. 337-340.

Additionally, agencies and organizations need to assume some of the responsibility for the great number of outstanding debts. A system should be devised in which agencies pay off educational debts for every year that an alumnus stays on the job, and most importantly, in the field. This can be negotiated at time of hiring and agencies could "sell" themselves to graduates on this basis. In this way, the agency and the field would invest in the alumnus and a longer term commitment would be made. The message would become that JCS' special training is valued. Thus future communal service workers would be encouraged to attend these specialized programs.

It is important to note that responsibility must be shared by the alumni, as well as the field of Jewish communal service. Alumni must have realistic expectations concerning their value to the field as a result of their training. Alumni must question themselves with utmost honesty asking whether they are in actuality the "commodity" they see themselves as being. After having been in the field, alumni must assist the school by reflecting back and sharing their insights and experiences.

Serious attention must be given to the decreasing number of "Certificate only" students in recent years. These students are often established in the field of Jewish communal service and their presence can add an important

perspective to the program. If the school wishes to attract more of these individuals, it is important to determine why they are enrolling in fewer numbers. Unlike the early years, agencies infrequently sponsor their workers to attend the Certificate program.

While the commitment of the field of Jewish communal service is questioned, another possible reason for the decline of Certificate students could relate to the realities of cost and time spent away from work. There are many more options now for Jewish communal service workers. Jewish community centers have middle management programs. Other schools of Jewish communal service have one week programs and other short-term alternatives. The Council of Jewish Federations (CJF) provides a continuing professional education program.⁷ Thus, the school needs to take a hard look at what it can offer these special students. In certain cases, it may be beneficial to sponsor "Certificate only" participants, as the school did in its early years. It may also be shown that the Certificate program could best serve students from abroad, the rabbinic program and other different sources.

Expectations of the School of Jewish Communal Service:

The data show that subjects had a variety of reasons for choosing the HUC program. These various motivations

⁷Gerald Bubis, Conversation held in April, 1988.

taken together indicate that individuals had high expectations of the school. The subjective comments provided by respondents suggest that in a vast majority of cases alumni were extremely satisfied with most of the program. However, some comments indicate that expectations of the school may have been too high. One subject wrote:

I came to HUC with educational expectations that were unmet. It was my desire to learn more Judaica as opposed to Jewish communal classes . . . I was in a double masters program and had little time to take electives in areas that were of interest to me. Scheduling conflicts between the two school also made this impossible.

Potential students need to be informed properly about what the program can offer them. They must be told not only what the program is, but also what it is not. The subject quoted above obviously expected that the program was to be something besides a school of Jewish communal service. The school cannot be a rabbinic school, a Judaic studies school and a school of Jewish communal service at the same time. It does not and cannot purport to be the place where participants will find their Jewish identity. This is too great a task. However, if students do "find" themselves Jewishly, which many subjects indicate they did, this should be seen as a fringe benefit.

A significant area of dissatisfaction with the program was evident in respondents' comments. Many felt the

program was not as receptive to future clinical social workers. One individual wrote:

"I often felt that I was "different" than the other students because I was always interested in being a clinician. This goal was not encouraged by the school as they were interested in training (for) community agencies."

A second subject commented:

"There was tremendous pressure to enter a community organization track. Little option or emphasis was placed on clinical skills to the detriment of the HUC program and its students. This was also reflected in the lack of clinical social work faculty on staff."

The administration needs to maintain a strong commitment to all areas of service to the Jewish community. If the school wishes to attract those with various career goals, it has a responsibility to encourage all Jewish communal options. Perhaps this presents a paradox to the school: The community needs strong Jewish leaders and often looks to the HUC program to provide them. However, if the clinical social work option is made possible through course work and field placement, this needs to be followed through in all aspects of the program. If the school wants to open its arms to everyone, it must be careful not to indicate that one kind of Jewish communal service is more important than another.

The School of Jewish Communal Service can do a great deal to facilitate this openness. First, this can be reflected in the curriculum. Currently, there are too few courses addressing the Jewish component in social work

practice. The number of courses that deal with this important subject should be increased. This does not mean that entire courses need to be devoted to the subject, but rather, that various courses can include a treatment of clinical issues in relation to Jewish communal life. All communal service students should be required to take a set number of these courses within the program. In this way, students can be sensitized to clinical issues, no matter what their eventual career goals are.

A second recommendation involves an exchange of faculty between HUC and USC. This has already begun, in that professors from the USC School of Social Work are beginning to teach some courses on the HUC campus. Communal service students should be encouraged to take such courses and apply the concepts later to their work in the community. This interchange of ideas between the schools can only benefit the field.

Career Tracking of Alumni:

A large majority (over 75%) of the alumni of the program remain in the field of Jewish communal service. This unusually high percentage may be due to a variety of factors including the various components of the program which help prepare alumni to enter the field. Though it is not possible to measure the impact of each component of the school there are several which appear to have greatly shaped the quality and commitment of the alumni.

Alumni work in a variety of jobs and job settings throughout their careers. Furthermore, the beginning of their careers is characterized by frequent job changes. Over half of all respondents had a second job within two and a half years of graduation while over a half of those held a third job within another two and a half years. Data concerning other communal workers in general were not collected. Therefore, it is not possible to determine if this is uncommon in the field. However, these factors indicate that there may be a high degree of dissatisfaction on the part of alumni with their entry level positions. Alumni may change jobs and job settings frequently in order to find a position that is satisfying to them. This might also be influenced by alumni, who obtain a generic Jewish communal service education, specializing in particular areas (e.g. fund raising, family and child counseling, planning, etc.). This too is supported by the shift of criteria alumni considered in choosing their first and current jobs.

High mobility characterizes the alumni. Almost half of the respondents relocated for their first jobs and 42% relocated for their second jobs. The tendency to relocate continues to diminish as alumni enter middle management positions. "For most assistant executives clearly advancement is not likely within the same federation but

requires moving."⁸ The study supports the observations and findings that mobility increases by top management positions across the board for all alumni graduating from every program during all years. Certainly an important factor in influencing high mobility is the dearth of positions available at the top.

Men and women exhibit somewhat different patterns of mobility. This may be explained by the latter being married and/or with children. They are therefore unwilling or unable to move as easily.

Alumni consistently use several criteria more frequently than any other when choosing a job - whether their first or sixth: the opportunity for professional growth and advancement, the variety of responsibilities, personal job satisfaction, and the mission of the work. Alumni tend to focus on a particular cluster of considerations indicative of a high level of motivation and professionalism. As alumni move into their current and more specialized jobs, they place increasing emphasis on the importance of the opportunity for professional growth and advancement in their hierarchy of considerations. This trend reveals an increasingly prepared and capable professional.

⁸Andrew B. Hahn and Arnold Gurin, "Jewish Federation Professionals: Status and Outlook," JJCS, LVI, 1979, p. 130.

Evaluation of Skills:

Alumni indicated a general satisfaction with the amount of time allocated to the Jewish and secular skills they use most often in the field. The Jewish skills used most often were "knowledge of the Jewish community", "knowledge of contemporary Jewish issues", and "knowledge of Jewish values". The secular skills used most often were "working with boards and lay people", "administration" and "fundraising". Do alumni use these Jewish and secular skills most because these are the ones they feel best prepared to use or because these skills represent the essence of their work? It seems likely the curriculum is very closely aligned with the field's needs in this area enabling students to enter the field well equipped for the tasks presented to them.

When asked whether they felt they were seen as a "Jewish resource" by their colleagues because of their HUC degree, alumni were evenly divided between seeing it as an inherent role of a Jewish communal worker and being proud of it. Several comments refer to workers being turned to because of reasons other than their degrees. A typical example: "If I am a Jewish resource, it is not specifically due to my JCS degree". "People also came to me in that capacity who didn't know I had a MAJCS". On the whole, alumni appear solidly identified with aspects of Jewishness which others can readily recognize. In the

"realm of identity building or reinforcement" HUC has been successful. Alumni claim they have strong Jewish skills and knowledge which make them a valuable resource in their settings.

Generally alumni feel well prepared for the "realities" of the field. Satisfaction with the field was another matter. Almost half of social work students were dissatisfied with their jobs. Approximately one third of respondents expressed general dissatisfaction in the field. No matter how well prepared they may feel themselves to be, the world of work forces alumni to reconsider just how much preparation is possible. There are most likely ways which HUC fails to provide students adequately with the fullest possible picture of the field. There are also ways in which it should not be expected to provide that experience. HUC would be doing its alumni a great disservice if it were to instill false and/or unrealistic expectations of their value to the field. In any event it is imperative that a greater flow of communication should exist between recent graduates and the school in order to facilitate the most useful curricular adaptations. This would also enhance students' understanding of the realities of the educational experience. Perhaps this exchange could be achieved through letters, phone calls, and if geography permits, face to face visits between alumni and a special school committee. The purpose of the exchange would be to create

an open flow of information and ideas in order to provide HUC with useful and fresh input regarding its program. This exchange though cannot substitute for the ongoing communication that occurs in a classroom setting between faculty and students. In addition, the annual meetings of the Conference of Jewish Communal Service and of the Council of Jewish Federations and the JWB biennials should continue to include special separate opportunities for HUC graduates to come together, renew old ties, and build bonds for the future.

Given the large percentage (40%) of alumni living in the Los Angeles area there is a very small number who would turn to readily accessible alumni for either personal or professional needs. Approximately half of all respondents made no distinction between connections with other colleagues and HUC alumni. Perhaps a contributing factor which helps explain this phenomena is the extraordinary high mobility rate of communal workers. Moving often and moving to great distances may discourage long term relationships which might have otherwise developed between alumni. HUC can encourage alumni to connect with one another by developing stronger networking channels. When a respondent comments "I'd love to turn to other alumni--there are none nearby", it behooves HUC to develop creative ways to weave together its disparate graduates. The researchers recommend the school consider a Communal

Service School newsletter, centrally located conferences, and more readily available updated directories.

Alumni express varying degrees of enthusiasm for participating in HUC activities. The most popular activity was to serve as a mentor to a JCS student. This role could be separate from or in conjunction with a field work setting. The next most attractive activity was interviewing applicants. These two activities stand out as the most "people oriented", requiring the most intimate personal contact.

Conversely, fundraising was the least chosen option by a very great percentage. The low percentage was consistent regardless of year of attendance, gender or program attended. The differences between school activities which alumni choose to become involved, depend upon the level of personal contact they have with individuals and especially students. They appear to feel a greater connection with students rather than HUC as an institution. This is possibly due to identification as former students with current students. Alumni are going to become interested with recruitment only if they experience it as a personal involvement. This is not to say that sitting on a committee - which did not appeal to a large number of respondents - is not a medium for deep involvement. Rather, alumni have a clear vision of how they would most like to become involved in bettering HUC.

An articulate alumnus best summarized what HUC seems to mean to many:

"I had a very positive experience at HUC that got me off to a good start working in the field. The most important roles that the school played were: 1) socialization into the field 2) exposure to the professional and lay leadership through field placement, seminars and other opportunities 3) room to "practice" in [internship] frame work 4) thesis as opportunity to initiate and carry through major project."

As was evident by the depth and breadth of comments contributed by alumni, HUC clearly has a powerful and enduring impact on its graduates. This impact is both personal and professional, continuing far beyond culmination exercises. Lengthy comments, whether negative or positive, were clearly given out of deep connection with the school.

In less than two decades, HUC has grown immeasurably. Its curriculum is continuously evolving in order to meet the needs and demands of its students. Faculty members continue to be dedicated to the field of Jewish communal service and this dedication and role modeling is evident in the interactions between students and faculty.

As HUC moves into the future, it is the hope of this thesis group that the school will benefit in some way, from the work presented here. The school continues to influence and shape both its students, alumni and the field of Jewish communal service in profound ways. May it continue to do so.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Babbie, E. The Practice of Social Research, Belmont, California: Wadsworth Publishing Co., 1986.
- Ballin, J. and Prum, M. "Motivation, Expectation and Career Fulfillment of Workers in Jewish Agencies," Master's Thesis, Hebrew Union college and University of Southern California, 1978.
- Blotstein, S. "A Day Late and a Dollar Short: A National Survey of the Teaching of Financial Management in Schools of Social Work," Journal of Social Work Education, 1985, 21(2), p. 34-42.
- Brandwein, R. A. "Where are the Women - and Why: An Analysis of Women Administrators in Jewish Communal Services," Journal of Jewish Communal Service (JJCS), 1984, 60(3), p. 204-213.
- Bubis, G. "Professional Trends in Jewish Communal Service in America," JJCS, 1985, 62(2), p. 304-311.
- _____. "Recruitment and Retention of Professional Staff for Jewish Communal Service," JJCS, 1984, 60(4), p. 337-340.
- _____. "The Birth of a School," Central Conference of American Rabbis Journal, Winter, 1970-71, p. 2-20.
- _____. "Women in Leadership," JJCS, Spring, 1983, 59(3), p. 237-240.
- _____. "Introduction to Professional Education," In G. Berger (Ed.) The Turbulent Decades, New York: Conference of Jewish Communal Service, 1980, Vol. II, p. 1200-1202.
- _____. "Professional Education for the Jewish Component in Casework Practice," JJCS, 1976, 50(3), p. 270-277.
- _____. "The Jewish Component in Jewish Communal Service - from Theory to Practice," JJCS, 1980, 56(3), p. 227-236.
- _____. Statements from National Professional Advisory Committee Meetings for Hebrew Union College School of

Jewish Communal Service, Memorandums of meetings held from July 31, 1968 to October 16, 1968, on file at HUC, Los Angeles.

_____. Conversation held in April, 1988 at HUC, Los Angeles.

Bubis, G., Phillips, B., Reitman, S. and Rotto, G. "The Consumer Report: Hiring of Entry-Level Jewish Communal Workers," 1985, 62(2), p. 103-107.

Craft, J. L. Statistics and Data Analysis for Social Workers, Itasca, Illinois: F. E. Peacock Publishers, Inc., 1985.

Dubin, D. "Essential Competencies for the Jewish Communal Professional," JJCS, Fall 1983, 60, p. 12-18.

Fram, E. "Do Human Services Executives Need Management Education?" Journal of Administration in Social Work, 1982, 6(4), p. 69-80.

Gold, B. H. Feasibility Study for a Department of Jewish Communal Service for the Los Angeles School of Hebrew Union College - Jewish Institute of Religion, Submitted May 24, 1967.

Goldfarb, L., Lambert, M. J. and Schlossberg, D., "Evaluation of Hebrew Union College - Jewish Institute of Religion School of Jewish Communal Service", Master's Thesis, Hebrew Union College and University of Southern California, 1983.

Greenfield, S. "Perspectives on Executive Function," JJCS, 1971-1980, 56(2), p. 165-171.

Hahn, A. and Gurin, A. "Jewish Federation Professionals: Status and Outlook," JJCS, 1979, LVI(2), p. 125-139.

Hebrew Union College - Jewish Institute of Religions (Los Angeles), Self-Study, Prepared for Representatives of the Western Association of Schools and Colleges, Los Angeles, CA, June 1984.

Hollis, F. and Woods, M. Casework: A Psychosocial Therapy, New York: Random House, 1981.

Jewish Welfare Board, 1987 Statistical Reports, Professional Salaries and Personnel Trends in Jewish Community Centers and YM-YWHA's, New York: JWB, 1987.

- Joseph, M. V. and Conrad, A. P. "Teaching Social Work Ethics for Contemporary Practice: An Effectiveness Evaluation," Journal of Social Work Education, 1983, 19(3), p. 59-68.
- Kahn, W. "Jewish Communal Service and the Professional Today and Tomorrow," JJCS, 1985, 62(2), p. 239-242.
- Kaplan, R., "Summary of Responses to Alumni," Survey conducted January to March, 1978.
- Kutzik, A. D. "Jewish Values and Jewish Social Service," In G. Berger (Ed.) The Turbulent Decades, New York: Conference of Jewish Communal Service, 1980, Vol. II, p. 1143-1157.
- Levine, E. M. "Jewish Professional - Professional Jew: Commitments and Competencies for a Jewish Mission," JJCS, 1985, 62(1), p. 40-48.
- Miller, H. "The Use of Computers in Social Work Practice, An Assessment," Journal of Social Work Education, Fall 1986, 22(3), p. 52-59.
- Ozawa, M. "Women and Work," Journal of Social Work, Nov, 1976, 21(6), p. 455-462.
- Parker, M. W., Chynoweth, G., Blankinship, D., Zalzo, E. and Matthew, M., "A Case for Computer Applications in Social Work," Journal of Social Work Education, Spring-Summer, 1987, 23(2), p. 57-66.
- Perlman, H. H. Social Casework: A Problem-Solving Process, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1957.
- Pins, A. M., Ed.D. and Ginsberg, L. H. "New Developments in Social Work Education and Their Impact on Jewish Communal Service and Community Center Work," JJCS, 1971, XVIII(1), p. 60-71.
- Poole, D. L. and Theilen, G. "Community Planning and Organization in an Era of Retrenchment: Structural and Educational Approaches to Serving Human Needs," Journal of Social Work Education, 1985, 21(3), p. 16-27.
- Reisman, B. "The Jewish Component in the Training Programs of Jewish Communal Workers," JJCS, 1979, VIII(2), p. 95-102.

- _____. "Managers, Jews, or Social Workers? Conflicting Expectations for Communal Workers," JJCS, Autumn 1982, 13(3), p. 41-49.
- _____. "Social Work Education and Jewish Communal Service and Jewish Community Centers: Time for a Change," JJCS, Summer, 1972, 48(4), p. 384-395.
- Reitman, S. and Rotto, G., "The Consumer Reports: Hiring of Entry-Level Jewish Communal Workers," Master's Thesis, Hebrew Union College and University of Southern California, 1984.
- Rosenberg, J. "From Patriarchy to Partnership - The Evolving of the Jewish Woman," JJCS, Summer 1979, LV(55), p. 339-344.
- Streeter, C. L., Sherraden, M. W., Gillespie, D. F. and Zakour, M. J. "Curriculum Development in Inter-organizational Coordination," Journal of Social Work Education, 1986, 22(1), p. 32-39.
- Tobin, G. A., Ph.D. "Ethics in Planning in the Jewish Communal Service Professions," JJCS, Summer 1984, 60(4), p. 273-282.
- Tripodi, T., Fellin, P. and Meyer, H. J., The Assessment of Social Research, Itasca, Illinois: F. E. Peacock Publishers, Inc., 1983.
- Zietz, D. and Erlich, J., "Sexism in Social Agencies: Practitioners' Perspectives," Journal of Social Work, Nov. 1976, 21(6), p. 434-439.

APPENDIX A

QUESTIONNAIRE

THESIS QUESTIONNAIRE

This survey is divided into sections that address your learning experience, work experience, general aspects of the School of Jewish Communal Service (SJCS) curriculum, and demographic information. At the end of each section you will have an opportunity to make additional comments, if you wish (please add additional pages, if necessary).

Section I: In the first section, we would like to ask you a few questions regarding your **learning experience** at Hebrew Union College (HUC).

1. A number of topics are covered in the Jewish communal service program, whether formally in classes or informally through seminars, the camp weekend and other experiences at HUC. Please indicate your satisfaction with the amount of attention given to the following subject areas.

	Had too much	Just about right	Would have liked more
a. Israel/Zionism	_____	_____	_____
b. Israel/Diaspora relations	_____	_____	_____
c. Holocaust	_____	_____	_____
d. world Jewry	_____	_____	_____
e. history of Jewish communal service and social welfare	_____	_____	_____
f. organization of the American Jewish community	_____	_____	_____
g. sociology and demography of the Jewish people	_____	_____	_____
h. the Jewish component in practice	_____	_____	_____
i. current Jewish issues	_____	_____	_____

	Had too much	Just about right	Would have liked more
j. Jewish thought	_____	_____	_____
k. Jewish culture (music, art)	_____	_____	_____
l. Jewish literature	_____	_____	_____
m. Jewish history	_____	_____	_____
n. Jewish identity	_____	_____	_____
o. budgeting and fiscal management	_____	_____	_____
p. planning	_____	_____	_____
q. fundraising	_____	_____	_____
r. grant writings	_____	_____	_____
s. human growth and behavior	_____	_____	_____
t. group work	_____	_____	_____
u. organizational behavior	_____	_____	_____
v. organization development	_____	_____	_____
w. research	_____	_____	_____
x. supervision	_____	_____	_____
y. programming	_____	_____	_____
z. administration	_____	_____	_____
aa. community relations	_____	_____	_____
bb. public relations/publicity	_____	_____	_____

2. If the program you attended included field placement, please address the following statements by checking the appropriate columns (check both if both apply).

	From course work	From field placement
a. I learned the skills I use most	_____	_____
b. I learned the concepts I use most	_____	_____
c. I began to understand issues facing the Jewish community	_____	_____
d. I began to think about myself as a practicing professional	_____	_____
e. I began to think about myself as a Jewish professional	_____	_____
f. I believe that I learned the most overall	_____	_____

3. If you are a double masters graduate, do you consider field placement more related to:

- a. _____ HUC
b. _____ USC/GWB
c. _____ both schools

4. If you checked both in the above question, were both schools equally involved in the field placement process?

- a. _____ Yes
b. _____ No

5. If you were in a dual degree program, which one response below comes the closest to your experience in the program? (Check only one).

- a. _____ what I learned at HUC complemented what I learned at USC/GWB
- b. _____ what I learned at HUC contradicted what I learned at USC/GWB
- c. _____ what I learned at HUC was largely irrelevant to USC/GWB
- d. _____ what I learned at HUC was repetitive of what I learned at USC/GWB

6. Do you have any additional comments about your learning experience at HUC?

Section II: In the second section, we would like to ask you a few questions concerning your work experience since graduating from HUC.

7. We are interested in your career and the different types of positions you have had. Please check all items within each category which apply to each of the jobs you have held since graduation, with "JOB #1" representing your first job. If you have had more than six jobs since completing the program, please supply the additional information on a separate sheet of paper.

	JOB #1	JOB #2	JOB #3
<u>Job setting:</u>			
Jewish Community Center			
Federation			
Family service agency			
Community relations			
Synagogue			
Other (specify)			
<u>Job title:</u>			
<u>Hours:</u>			
Full time			
Part time			
<u>Salary range:</u>			
Under \$18,000			
18,000 - 19,999			
20,000 - 24,999			
25,000 - 29,999			
30,000 - 39,999			
40,000 - 49,999			
50,000 - 74,999			
75,000 and above			
<u>Number of people you supervise:</u>			
<u>Length of Employment:</u>			
years/months	/	/	/
<u>Did you move to a new community for this job?</u>			
Yes or No			

	JOB #4	JOB #5	JOB #6
<u>Job setting:</u>			
Jewish Community Center			
Federation			
Family service agency			
Health setting			
Community relations			
Synagogue			
Other (specify)			
<u>Job title:</u>			
<u>Hours:</u>			
Full time			
Part time			
<u>Salary range:</u>			
Under \$18,000			
18,000 - 19,999			
20,000 - 24,999			
25,000 - 29,999			
30,000 - 39,999			
40,000 - 49,999			
50,000 - 74,999			
75,000 and above			
<u>Number of people you supervise:</u>			
<u>Length of Employment:</u>			
years/months	/	/	/
<u>Did you move for this job?</u>			
Yes or No			

8. We would like to know how important the following considerations were for you in accepting your first job and your current job. Please rank your three most important considerations for your first and current jobs, with "1" being the most important.

	First job	Current job
a. highest salary offered	_____	_____
b. only appropriate job offer	_____	_____
c. opportunities for professional growth and advancement	_____	_____
d. mission of the work	_____	_____
e. personal job satisfaction	_____	_____
f. variety of responsibilities	_____	_____
g. prestige of the job position	_____	_____
h. prestige of the agency/ department/organization	_____	_____
i. identification with the philosophy of the agency/department/ organization	_____	_____
j. reputation as "a nice place to work"	_____	_____
k. job "perks" (e.g., benefits, vacation)	_____	_____
l. ease of commuting	_____	_____
m. staying close to parents or other family members	_____	_____
n. staying close to significant other/ partner	_____	_____
o. working with Jewish clientele	_____	_____
p. being involved in Jewish issues	_____	_____
q. using Jewish knowledge	_____	_____

		First job	Current job
r.	other _____	_____	_____
	_____	_____	_____
	_____	_____	_____

9. Did your attendance at HUC make a difference for you in any of the following ways in your work experiences?

	Definitely	I think so	Probably not
a. being selected/promoted over other candidates _____	_____	_____	_____
b. receiving a higher salary _____	_____	_____	_____
c. receiving greater responsibility than colleagues not having attended HUC _____	_____	_____	_____
d. being better able to work with lay people _____	_____	_____	_____
e. being a resource of Jewish knowledge _____	_____	_____	_____
f. being a Jewish role model for the community _____	_____	_____	_____
g. being a Jewish representative to the community _____	_____	_____	_____

10. Regarding your preparation for work upon graduation, how do you evaluate the skills and knowledge you acquired at HUC?

	Had too much	Had the right amount	Would have liked more
a. casework and counseling	_____	_____	_____
b. group work	_____	_____	_____
c. crisis intervention/ crisis management	_____	_____	_____
d. assertive skills and strategies	_____	_____	_____
e. advocacy	_____	_____	_____
f. lobbying	_____	_____	_____
g. policy formulation/analysis	_____	_____	_____
h. supervision	_____	_____	_____
i. community organization	_____	_____	_____
j. administration	_____	_____	_____
k. leadership development	_____	_____	_____
l. staff development and training	_____	_____	_____
m. consultation with staff members	_____	_____	_____
n. fundraising	_____	_____	_____
o. writing grants and proposals	_____	_____	_____
p. computer skills	_____	_____	_____
q. research	_____	_____	_____
r. writing skills	_____	_____	_____
s. program development	_____	_____	_____
t. human resource development	_____	_____	_____
u. community relations	_____	_____	_____

	Had too much	Had the right amount	Would have liked more
v. public relations/publicity	_____	_____	_____
w. meeting with representatives of community agencies	_____	_____	_____
x. meeting with community groups	_____	_____	_____
y. meeting with public officials	_____	_____	_____
z. staffing a committee	_____	_____	_____
aa. working with boards and lay people	_____	_____	_____
bb. working with direct service volunteers	_____	_____	_____
cc. working with other volunteers	_____	_____	_____
dd. other _____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____

10a. From the list above, please rank the three skills that you use most frequently, indicating their letter designations.

1. _____
2. _____
3. _____

11. Regarding your work experience upon graduation, how do you evaluate the Jewish skills and knowledge you acquired?

	Had too much	Had the right amount	Would have liked more
a. Jewish values	_____	_____	_____
b. Jewish ethics	_____	_____	_____
c. Jewish practice and ritual	_____	_____	_____
d. Jewish ethnic groups	_____	_____	_____
e. organization of the Jewish community	_____	_____	_____
f. scripture	_____	_____	_____
g. Jewish history	_____	_____	_____
h. Jewish literature	_____	_____	_____
i. contemporary Jewish issues	_____	_____	_____
j. Hebrew	_____	_____	_____
k. Jewish family life	_____	_____	_____
l. sociology and demography of the Jewish people	_____	_____	_____
m. addressing Jewish aspects of emotional issues (e.g. anger, mourning, loss, joy, and hope)	_____	_____	_____
n. enhancing Jewish self awareness	_____	_____	_____

11a. From the list above, please rank the three skills that you use most frequently, indicating their letter designations.

1. _____

2. _____

3. _____

12. Do you feel that because of your degree in Jewish communal service, your agency, colleagues and/or clients come to you as a "Jewish resource"?

a. _____ Yes

b. _____ No

12a. If yes, how do you feel about it? (Check all that apply.)

a. _____ feel proud

b. _____ resent it

c. _____ feel that it is a burden

d. _____ feel that it is part of your role as a Jewish communal service (JCS) worker

e. _____ other _____

13. How well prepared were you for the "realities of the field?" Have you found these "realities" to be better, worse or about what you expected? (Please address all items below.)

	Better than I expected	About what I expected	Worse than I expected
a. respect from lay people	_____	_____	_____
b. working with lay people	_____	_____	_____

	Better than I expected	About what I expected	Worse than I expected
c. salary	_____	_____	_____
d. "professionalism" of the field	_____	_____	_____
e. impact of job on personal life	_____	_____	_____
f. Jewish commitment of colleagues	_____	_____	_____
g. job satisfaction	_____	_____	_____
h. career advancement	_____	_____	_____
i. necessity to relocate	_____	_____	_____

14. If you wanted to talk to someone else in the field of Jewish communal service about the following matters, to whom would you be most likely to turn:

	HUC alumni	Other colleagues	Both	Neither	Does not apply
a. to find out about jobs	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
b. to discuss professional/ work related issues	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
c. to decide about job changes or career moves	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
d. to decide about remaining in the field of JCS	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
e. to discuss personal matters	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

15. Would you be interested in participating in any of the following activities related to HUC? (Please check those you would consider.)

- a. _____ attending continuing education courses at HUC
- b. _____ sitting on School of Jewish Communal Service committees
- c. _____ recruiting new students
- d. _____ interviewing applicants
- e. _____ raising money for the School of Jewish Communal Service
- f. _____ helping the college maintain relations with other alumni
- g. _____ serving as a "mentor" or advisor to a JCS student
- h. _____ other _____

16. Do you have any additional comments about your work experience in relation to HUC?

Section III: In this section, we would like to ask you about specific aspects of the SJCS program.

17. Please check whether you agree or disagree with the following statements. Indicate which apply to your experiences now as a graduate and, in retrospect, how you felt then, as a student in the program.

	<u>Now</u>		<u>Then</u>	
	Agree	Disagree	Agree	Disagree
I would like to have spent more time with:				
a. USC/GWB students	_____	_____	_____	_____
b. other SJCS students	_____	_____	_____	_____
c. rabbinic/education students	_____	_____	_____	_____
d. USC/GWB faculty	_____	_____	_____	_____
e. SJCS faculty	_____	_____	_____	_____
f. other HUC faculty	_____	_____	_____	_____
I would like to have attended more HUC activities	_____	_____	_____	_____

18. Please indicate the usefulness of the thesis.

	Very much applies to me	Somewhat applies to me	Does not apply to me
a. I learned research skills	_____	_____	_____
b. I was able to explore an area of interest	_____	_____	_____

		Very much applies to me	Somewhat applies to me	Does not apply to me
c.	I was able to develop expertise in a certain area	_____	_____	_____
d.	I was able to contribute to the community	_____	_____	_____
e.	It gave me a valuable opportunity to work with others in my class	_____	_____	_____

19. Please indicate which of the following statements best describes your feelings about writing the thesis.

- a. _____ It was a valuable experience
- b. _____ It was not particularly valuable
- c. _____ It was not valuable at all

20. Did you participate in the Israel seminar?

- a. _____ Yes
- b. _____ No

20a. If yes, how did the Israel seminar make a difference for you?

		Very much applies to me	Somewhat applies to me	Does not apply to me
a.	I have used it in my work	_____	_____	_____
b.	I made friends and professional contacts	_____	_____	_____
c.	I identify more closely with Israeli colleagues	_____	_____	_____
d.	It gave me personal inspiration as a Jew	_____	_____	_____

- | | Very much
applies
to me | Somewhat
applies
to me | Does not
apply
to me |
|--|-------------------------------|------------------------------|----------------------------|
| e. It gave me personal
inspiration for
my work | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| f. It made me more open
the issues of aliyah | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| g. other _____
_____ | _____ | _____ | _____ |
21. How would you change the Israel seminar? (Check all that apply.)
- a. _____ make it mandatory
 - b. _____ incorporate other countries/places (e.g. Europe, Poland, USSR)
 - c. _____ more sightseeing/field trips
 - d. _____ stay longer than three weeks
 - e. _____ stay less than three weeks
 - f. _____ include the price of the seminar in the HUC tuition
 - g. _____ other _____

22. Do you feel that the following were helpful?

- | | Yes | No | Does not
apply |
|-----------------------|-------|-------|-------------------|
| a. evening seminars | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| b. camp weekend | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| c. co-curricular days | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| d. case presentations | _____ | _____ | _____ |

22a. Regarding the above question, why or why not? _____

23. If you were to start over again, you would probably: (check only one)

- a. _____ attend a JCS program not at HUC
- b. _____ enroll in the USC/GWB social work double masters
- c. _____ enroll in the USC/GWB public administration double masters
- d. _____ enroll in the USC/GWB gerontology double masters
- e. _____ enroll in the HUC SJCS single masters
- f. _____ enroll in the HUC SJCS certificate program
- g. _____ enroll in a program such as MSW, MBA or MPA, but not with the dual degree in JCS from HUC
- h. _____ enroll in Jewish education and/or rabbinic programs
- i. _____ other _____

24. Do you have any suggestions for how HUC could better recruit students for the program? If so, please describe below.

25. Do you have any additional comments about specific aspects of the HUC School of Jewish Communal Service program?

Section IV: In this final section, we would like to obtain some demographic information from you.

26. How old are you? _____

27. _____ Male
_____ Female

28. What is your marital status?

- a. _____ single, never married
b. _____ divorced
c. _____ separated
d. _____ widowed
e. _____ married
f. _____ living together

29. How many children under 18 do you have living at home? _____

30. In what state do you live? _____

31. What year did you graduate from HUC? 19

32. In which program were you enrolled?

- a. ☐ Certificate in Jewish Communal Service
- b. ☐ Single Masters (MAJCS)
- c. ☐ Double Masters in Public Administration & Jewish Communal Service
- d. ☐ Double Masters in Social Work & Jewish Communal Service (at USC)
- e. ☐ Double Masters in Social Work & Jewish Communal Service (at GWB)
- f. ☐ Double Masters in Gerontology & Jewish Communal Service
- g. ☐ Joint Masters (Jewish Communal Service & Education)
- h. ☐ Other _____

33. If you attended a social work program, which concentration did you choose?

- a. ☐ Community Organization, Planning, and Administration
- b. ☐ Family and Children
- c. ☐ Clinical and COPA Combined
- d. ☐ Mental Health in Health Settings
- e. ☐ Other _____

34. Did you apply to or consider a graduate program in other areas of study?

- a. ☐ Yes
- b. ☐ No

34a. If yes, in which area?

- a. _____ law
- b. _____ business
- c. _____ Judaica/Jewish studies
- d. _____ education
- e. _____ health
- f. _____ sociology/psychology
- g. _____ other _____

35. Please indicate below in which fields you have had prior work and/or educational experience. (Please check all that apply.)

	Work	Education
a. social work	_____	_____
b. education	_____	_____
c. public relations	_____	_____
d. administration	_____	_____
e. business	_____	_____
f. politics	_____	_____
g. computers	_____	_____
h. science	_____	_____
i. history	_____	_____
j. Judaica/Jewish studies	_____	_____
k. other _____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____

36. Why did you choose HUC? (Please check all that apply.)

- a. financial aid _____
- b. cost of education _____
- c. reputation of school _____
- d. reputation of faculty _____
- e. opportunity to study with
Jerry Bubis _____
- f. quality of social work
education _____
- g. quality of education about
Jewish community _____
- h. Jewish content _____
- i. specialized preparation to
work in the Jewish community _____
- j. availability of the dual degree _____
- k. quality of the field placements _____
- l. the Reform movement as a
sponsor of the program _____
- m. to be identified as a Jewish
communal worker _____
- n. other _____

36a. From the list above, please rank the three most important reasons you chose HUC, indicating their letter designations.

- 1. _____
- 2. _____
- 3. _____

37. Please specify your financial debt at the time of graduation from HUC due to your graduate education costs. In addition, please indicate how much you still owe of that debt.

	Upon leaving HUC	Currently owe
a. loans from HUC	\$ _____	\$ _____
b. Jewish Free Loan	_____	_____
c. loans from parents/family	_____	_____
d. bank loans you took out	_____	_____
e. USC/GWB loans	_____	_____
f. Graduate Student Loan (GSL)	_____	_____
g. Other _____	_____	_____

38. Was your HUC education paid for primarily by loans or scholarships? (Check only one.)

a. _____ Loans

b. _____ Scholarships/Grants

c. _____ Not applicable

39. Do you have any additional comments, suggestions or recommendations that you feel would be helpful to the thesis group? (Use the back of this sheet, if necessary.)

THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR YOUR TIME AND ENERGY IN COMPLETING THIS QUESTIONNAIRE. WE APPRECIATE YOUR HELP.

APPENDIX B

COVER LETTER TO RESPONDENTS



HEBREW UNION COLLEGE—JEWISH INSTITUTE OF RELIGION
Cincinnati • New York • Los Angeles • Jerusalem

3077 UNIVERSITY AVENUE • LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90007-3796
(213) 748-3424

SCHOOL OF JEWISH COMMUNAL SERVICE

January 3, 1988

Dear Alumnus,

WE NEED YOUR HELP. How do you look back upon your HUC experience? How has or has it not been useful to you?

We are eight graduating students in the School of Jewish Communal Service. We have elected to work on an interesting thesis this year. Our goal is to examine the relationship between what HUC offers its students and what the field of Jewish Communal Service requires from its professionals. This study is both an update and an elaboration upon a thesis done five years ago. The information gathered by our study will once again help the school to make changes in the curriculum to better suit the needs of the students and the field as a whole.

We are asking you to please complete and return the enclosed questionnaire by January 30, 1988. It is very important to us to hear from all alumni, regardless of the type of work you are doing now.

The data will be analyzed by May 1988. A copy of the findings will be furnished to you upon request. We would also like to remind you that the material you share with us will remain completely confidential.

We realize that this questionnaire will take more than a few moments of your time. We thank you in advance for your willingness to participate and your help in enhancing the life of HUC.

Sincerely,

Deborah Burg-Schnirman
Deborah Burg-Schnirman

Ruth Dubin
Ruth Dubin

Ted Flaum
Ted Flaum

Holly Hollander
Holly Hollander

Estie Lidar
Estie Lidar

Jeanette Macht
Jeanette Macht

Karen Michel
Karen Michel

Lisa Ney
Lisa Ney

APPENDIX C

LETTER TO BALTIMORE HEBREW COLLEGE REQUESTING INFORMATION

HEBREW UNION COLLEGE—JEWISH INSTITUTE OF RELIGION

Cincinnati • New York • Los Angeles • Jerusalem

SCHOOL OF JEWISH COMMUNAL SERVICE

3077 UNIVERSITY AVENUE • LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90007-3798
(213) 748-3424

November 24, 1987

Dr. Levy Smolar
Baltimore Hebrew College
5800 Park Heights Avenue
Baltimore, Maryland 21215

Dear Dr. Smolar,

We represent a group of eight students graduating in May 1988 from the Hebrew Union College School of Jewish Communal Service. We are currently working on our Master's thesis, which examines the relationship between what HUC offers its students and what the field of Jewish communal service requires from its professionals. We plan to survey all alumni who have attended the program since its inception in 1969 in an attempt to determine how adequately the school prepared them for the field.

We are writing to inquire whether you are familiar with similar research done at your school, which might help us in formulating ideas for our thesis and questionnaire. If such materials exist, we would be most grateful if you could either send them to us or make them available through inter-library loan.

We thank you in advance for any materials or ideas that you might have. Through our research, we hope, in some small way, to better the field of Jewish communal service for all of us.

Sincerely,

Ruth Dubin

Ruth Dubin

Karen Michel

Karen Michel

APPENDIX D

LIST OF JOB TITLES

JOB TITLES

CODE #	CENTERS	FEDERATION	FAMILY SERVICE/ MEDICAL SETTING	COMMUNITY RELATIONS/ HILLEL
1.	EXEC. DIRECTOR EXEC. V.P. ASSOC. EXEC. DIRECTOR ASSIST. EXEC. DIRECTOR	EXEC. DIRECTOR EXEC. V.P.	EXEC DIRECTOR DIRECTOR	EXEC DIRECTOR DIRECTOR NATIONAL DIRECTOR INTERNATIONAL DIR.
2.	UNIT DIRECTOR DIRECTOR ASSISTANT DIRECTOR PROGRAM DIRECTOR	SENIOR REGIONAL DIRECTOR REGIONAL EXEC. DIRECTOR REGIONAL DIRECTOR	PROGRAM DIRECTORS DIR. OF SOC. SERVICES	REGIONAL DIRECTOR NATIONAL DIR. OF.... EXEC. DIR. OF AREA LOCAL DIRECTOR
3.	DEPARTMENT HEADS: -E.C.E. DIRECTOR -YOUTH DIRECTOR -TEEN DIRECTOR -ADULT DIRECTOR -SENIOR DIRECTOR -MEMBERSHIP DIRECTOR -P.E. DIRECTOR -GROUP SERVICES DIR. ETC.	ASSISTANT DIRECTORS: -CAMPAIGN ASSOCIATE -PLANNING ASSOCIATE -STAFF ASSOCIATE	CASE SUPERVISOR SUPERVISOR CLINICAL SUPERVISOR	ASSIST. DIR. OF.... PROGRAM DIRECTOR
4.	SUB-DEPARTMENT HEADS: -DAY CAMP DIRECTOR -CHILD CARE DIRECTOR -SENIOR DAY CARE DIR. -VOLUNTEER COORDINATOR -POOL DIRECTOR	DIVISIONAL DIRECTORS: -WOMENS DIVISION -OUTREACH -PROFESSIONAL SERVICES	RESOURCE DEVELOPER	DIRECTOR OF STUDENT SERVICES
5.	WORKERS: by department TEACHER COUNSELOR GROUP WORKER	STAFF ASSOCIATE	COUNSELOR THERAPIST CASE WORKER SOCIAL WORKER MOBILE WORKER MEDICAL SOC. WORKER PSYCH. SOC. WORKER PSYCHOTHERAPIST	STAFF ASSOCIATE
SYNAGOGUE		OTHER		
20. RABBI, ASSOC. RABBI		40. CONSULTANT	47. JEWISH OTHER	55. POLICY ANALYST
21. ASSISTANT RABBI		41. PARENT	50. OWN BUSINESS	56. CITY, COUNTY OR STATE GOVT.
22. ADMINISTRATOR EXEC. SECRETARY		42. HOMEMAKER	51. VICE PRESIDENT	57. POLITICS
23. DIRECTOR OF ED. PROGRAM DIRECTOR		43. TEACHER	52. INSURANCE AGENT	60. RESEARCHER
24. EDUCATOR TEACHER		44. SHALIACH	53. MANAGER ADMINISTRATOR BUSINESS	61. VOLUNTEER
25. CANTOR		45. PRIVATE PRACTICE	54. MARKETING MANAGER	
		46. STUDENT		

APPENDIX E

SELECTED COMMENTS

APPENDIX E

Selected Comments by Respondents

- "I especially enjoyed the interchange between myself and my classmates--the debates over ethical questions and just struggling together over issues."
- "HUC/USC programs went together well. I think I had better quality placements because of HUC. My placement experiences were invaluable to me and have largely made me into the practitioner I am today."
- ". . . As a student of HUC/GWB, I was very disappointed in the social work offerings during my year at HUC, as they were very limited."
- "Intellectual level of courses was sometimes disappointing. I would have appreciated opportunities for more advanced, in-depth text study, as related to issues of community organization."
- "As a joint master's graduate, I feel that the schools of Communal Service and Education complement each other immensely. I cannot imagine having completed only one program and feeling as competent professionally as I do."
- "All rabbis should be required to take courses or a summer program with the School of Jewish Communal

Service. Rabbinic school ignores issues of administration, community organization, fundraising and leadership training. The study of traditional sources needs to be supplemented with in-depth and professional training in the field of communal service. Clinical training in the psychodynamics of the human personality is essential to developing a rabbinic agenda. It is significant to both rabbis and communal workers."

-- "I feel the high cost of education and low salaries in the field prohibit many qualified people from considering a career in Jewish communal service."

-- "I really think an extended period of stay in Israel should be a mandatory part of the program...Knowledge of Hebrew and Judaica should make us competitive with other Jewish professionals. Additionally, time spent in Israel would familiarize communal service students with avenues for work and involvement in Israel.

-- "A program such as this needs to deal with finding a job, keeping a job, in other words, the realities of the world of work."

-- "It might be interesting to compile statistics pertaining to HUC alumni who are no longer in the field and analyze the reasons for dropout. It is my sense that some of the finest 'practitioners' have

been 'forced' out of the field by less competent professionals and misguided by unfit lay leaders ..."

-- "I enjoyed it tremendously and it was personally meaningful, but it did not assist me professionally."

-- "The work at HUC was complementary to that done at USC in that although completely different, it served another purpose. HUC did not enhance my ability as a clinician, but broadened my perspective and knowledge base as a Jew and Jewish professional."

-- "As a foreign student, HUC helped me a lot to understand the functioning of the American Jewish community, and to find the differences between the American Jewish community and Israel."

-- "My primary career focus is gerontology. Unfortunately, the Jewish community is far behind in salary range and opportunities...I use my Jewish education whenever I can, particularly at work, to make people who are not Jewish be more aware of cultural and religious differences. I also try to educate the place where I work to be more sensitive to the needs of the older Jewish residents--a minority group."

-- "I think HUC should seriously question whether it wants to accept clinical students. If so, work needs to be done with the executives of family service agencies to value HUC students."

- "Less favoritism by faculty members toward students. The log was draining and not helpful. More professionalism by staff in areas of field work and thesis. Not enough meaningful involvement in those areas."
- "The curriculum has a tangential benefit: in the event of a person leaving the field, it teaches us to be better, more committed lay people! I was considered a 'leader' immediately upon entering the lay world by virtue of my past profession and education and depth of understanding the Jewish communal process. I'm also (I hope) a better counterpart for my staff people, having been there. I've been used often as a lay speaker/expert/resource for Young Leadership Development programs."
- "Many of your questions were geared to college students or new college graduates with little work experience. When I attended HUC I was an agency director with twenty years of work experience."
- "Many of the [questions do] not seem to apply the same to someone in the certificate program as it does to someone in a double masters program. I also found it difficult as a professional in the field taking the certificate program even 5 years ago to respond to the questions in the first 2 pages."

- "I was pleased with the mixture of didactic and experiential and the opportunity for both formal and informal learning opportunities."
- "It was one of the most stimulating experiences of my life."
- "HUC was a more creative thinking experience whereas USC was a more practical course. They were both beneficial."
- "I found that I was - very early in my first job- needing much more knowledge of administrative skills. In field placement I had no exposure to the systems required to run an agency and given, the low level of involvement and responsibility that is understandable. In retrospect, the biggest failure of the course work is in the lack of concrete facts and skills related to personnel management ... and financial management."
- "I learned my theory of staff-lay relationships in our 'practicum' discussions in classes with Jerry B. That was stuff that I used every day of my working life and I was shocked to see the lack of such philosophical foundation among some colleagues & successors (even SCJS grads!). It is by far the most important concept I learned in school (the other important stuff must be learned on the job)."
- The first summer was very intense without adequate channels for discussing inner upheaval. The quality

of the semester course work did not match that of the summers..."

-- "I am not currently working outside the home."

-- "I work for the Lutheran society."

-- "My best friends are HUC alumni."

-- "I feel that writing the thesis was a good learning experience. However, I also think that advisors need to coordinate their expectations about the thesis in order to avoid confusion and frustration among the students. I also feel that the students should be better briefed about the whole process before beginning."

-- "The camp weekend helped in building our own sense of community."

-- "Enter another profession given the low pay of field-unreasonable demands made upon us as professionals."

-- "I would not encourage anyone to pursue a career in Jewish communal service. Bright and talented people will find no career niche nor respect in the organized Jewish community. This is a considered opinion as I have four years of progressively responsible experience in Federation and member agencies!!!!"

-- "All major Jewish agencies need to be convinced that it is important to give the time off and give partial scholarships to allow employees to attend the certificate program..."

- "Maintain extremely high standards no matter how few students . Secure complete financial aid package with minimal loans based upon agreement to waive loans prorated by the number of years worked in Jewish community following graduation."
- "Have deep questions about the clinical social Work tract - am unsure of its validity with HUC. I loved the program - I just don't know how it has continued to affect my practice to this day. Would have liked more administrative training and grant writing information."
- "Wish I had participated at a later stage in my professional development - would have appreciated the program now at 35 then I did at 22."
- "I would like to say that I am very happy with my career choice. I continue to love my work. Moreover, I am very glad that I attended HUC -- it was enriching, educational experience and it enhanced my identity as a Jewish professional."
- "How eight people ever write a thesis together is beyond me."